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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Committee of Permanent Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLAC</td>
<td>Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSOC</td>
<td>Economic and Social Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Governing Council of UN-Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFUP</td>
<td>International Forum on Urban Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCs</td>
<td>Least Developed Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Unit</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSIP</td>
<td>The Medium-term Strategic and Institutional Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEF</td>
<td>Urban Environment Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td>United Nations Human Settlements Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNON</td>
<td>United Nations Offices at Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESS</td>
<td>World Economic and Social Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUF</td>
<td>World Urban Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUF5</td>
<td>The Fifth Session of the World Urban Forum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Introduction, context and methodology

This report presents the evaluation results of the Fifth Session of the World Urban Forum (WUF5) conducted by the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (M&E Unit) of UN-Habitat. The World Urban Forum (WUF) was established by the United Nations General Assembly, through resolution 56/206, to examine one of the most pressing problems facing the world today: rapid urbanization and its impact on communities, cities, economies, climate change and policies. From 2002, the Forum has been held every two years, in different host cities, under the auspices of the UN-Habitat. It is a non-legislative forum and participation is encouraged from diverse stakeholders.

The WUF5 was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil from 22 to 26 March 2010 attended by 10,634 people from 149 countries. The Forum took stock of where the world stands with respect to theme of “The Right to the City: Bridging the Urban Divide.” More than 350 scheduled events were organised to understand who is getting the benefits of the urbanization process and who is left out, 6 dialogues, 12 thematic open debates, 6 concluding sessions, 12 roundtables, 7 special sessions, 150 networking events, 24 training events, 2 seminars, 49 side events, and exhibition of 110 exhibits. A business caucus was also held over two days and served as a major platform for the private sector. The internet-based debates (e-debates), where participants, were invited to share views on dialogue themes were held prior to the WUF session and the summary reports fed into the dialogue discussions in Rio de Janeiro. The Gender Equality Action Assembly, comprising of 15 separate meetings and the World Urban Youth Assembly, with total of 14 meetings, were both held on 19 and 20 March 2010.

The evaluation sought to address two broad questions: (i) How and to what extent did WUF5 contribute to positive outcomes? (ii) Was the design, planning, programming, management and delivery of WUF5 conducive for achieving outcomes? As such, using results-based management approach as the guide, the evaluation focused on assessment in the following areas:

- **Efficiency and effectiveness of the planning processes.** To what extent did UN-Habitat’s coordination and management structure for WUF5 allow effective planning? Was a results-oriented model followed?
- **Programme format and content.** Was the topics and themes relevant? Did the format and content facilitate positive outcomes?
- **Efficiency and effectiveness of conference delivery.** Was the administration and logistics satisfactory? Did conference management and logistics facilitate positive outcomes?
- **WUF participation and inclusiveness.** Did WUF5 reach out to Habitat Agenda partners?
- **Roles and outcomes of WUF.** What is the added value of WUF? Were the possible outcomes achieved?
A mixed methods approach was applied for this evaluation that covered the pre-session, during and after phases. Review of documents, on site observations, interviews before, during and after, as well as a participant survey questionnaire were used to gather data for the evaluation.

**Key findings**

(i) **Efficiency and effectiveness of the planning processes.**

The planning and delivery of WUF5 was a challenging task given its magnitude and many players involved, varying expectations, and often overlapping responsibilities. During the evaluability assessment, it was clear that WUF5 planning lacked a framework for results-based planning and budgeting. The host country contribution to UN-Habitat for the Forum was US$2.9 million. These funds were complemented by other contributions from UN-Habitat, and other sources, but the evaluation did not find evidence of strategic resource allocation.

Overall, aspects of planning and coordination appeared ad hoc. Roles and responsibilities were not clearly defined. As regarded a number of substantive and administrative aspects it was often not obvious within and outside UN-Habitat who was responsible. This led to blurred accountabilities which ultimately affected planning and organizing negatively.

There were, however, many positive elements as regards the joint planning between UN-Habitat and the host country for WUF5, including the engagement of the Permanent Representative of Brazil to UN-Habitat and the role played by the UN-Habitat office in Rio de Janeiro.

(ii) **Programme format and content**

The theme and topics were deemed relevant. Nevertheless, the evaluation found that the selection of topics and themes could have been more strategic, and key messages better integrated in the content of sessions.

An attempt was made to improve opportunities for discussions in WUF5 compared to WUF4, through more interactive facilitated dialogues, roundtables and network events. On average 74% of all respondents to the participant survey rated the events either useful or very useful. Most participants, 87%, found the Dialogues useful or very useful. The other events rated useful were the thematic open debates at 86%, networking events at 85%, exhibition at 82%, and training events at 76%.

While satisfaction rates were generally high, the evaluation identified a number of measures that could be taken to improve the quality of sessions, and as such facilitate improved outcomes of WUF.

(iii) **Efficiency and effectiveness of conference delivery**

Respondents to the participant survey were mostly positive about pre-conference organization. Feedback to logistics during the Forum were also largely positive, though more variable. Nevertheless, the report has pointed out a number of shortcomings that can
be improved for future sessions – earlier availability of programme and key information on the website, a more user friendly programme, better signage for services within the venue, improvements in the registration process, clearer criteria for the handling of VIPs, functional Internet connectivity at the venue, and improved information on transportation options.

(iv) WUF participation and inclusiveness.

The World Urban Forum has become the world’s premier platform for interaction among urban development practitioners, policy makers, national and local governments, non-government actors, researchers, youth, women’s groups etc. to discuss urban issues. WUF5 attracted a large number of participants, 10,634 in total, from 149 countries, 80 percent of whom are from emerging and developing countries and a wide range of organizations. Pre-forum internet debates were considered useful and became successful in engaging interested people in discussing urban issues.

(v) Roles and outcomes of WUF

The World Urban Forum has become the world’s premier platform for interaction among urban development practitioners, policy makers, national and local governments, non-government actors, researchers, etc. to discuss urban issues. The evaluation has shown that WUF has performed relatively well on a number of expected outcomes. Overall, the evaluation found that WUF served as a platform for advocacy. There were examples of both successful advocacy to get issues on the global agenda, and advocacy of more specific nature. A number of participants reported networking as the most valuable function of WUF. More than 95% of the respondents to the survey reported that they are likely to maintain new contacts they have established at WUF5. There is evidence that WUF helped to strengthen collaboration among and between professional networks. The evaluation also found that WUF has worked fairly well as a clearing house for knowledge and best practice. Above 90% of the respondents to the survey indicated that they are likely or very likely to apply ideas from the Forum in their work.

Nevertheless, most of the potential roles of WUF were not fully capitalized on. For this to happen, a number of improvements need to be made in planning, programming, and conference delivery.

Recommendations

As the planning for WUF6 is already underway, some recommendations are pertinent for consideration during the WUF6 process, while others should be implemented with the view to improve on future WUFs. The following key recommendations have been identified from the WUF5 evaluation:

1. Decide on the level of ambition for WUF7 and act accordingly

UN-Habitat needs to take WUF to the next visionary level of effectiveness in delivery and impact. This can only be fully effected during WUF7 since plans for WUF6 are already underway. Adopt a more ambitious approach by considering taking the following
decisions and actions: (i) appointment of a “strategist” (ii) outsourcing event organization and management functions to a specialized conference management agency, (iii) UN-Habitat to have a clear accountability function and use partners more strategically in substantive events.

2. **Decide and establish an internal management and coordination structure for the WUF**

The Executive Director should assign responsibilities for WUF to a lead officer and a small team to take responsibility for specific tasks. The lead office must have the authority to negotiate with the host country and take decisions as appropriate. The responsibilities of key officers should be clearly communicated to external parties. If a more ambitious route is followed for WUF7, a WUF “strategist” could be appointed, to lead the substantive aspects, and raise the performance of WUF to achieve its substantive goals.

3. **Define procedures for the selection of WUF themes**

Establish clear procedures for UN-Habitat to take a pro-active role vis-à-vis the host country for identifying strategic themes for WUF. This would involve identifying topics suitable for a public Forum linked to the MTSIP and work programme priorities.

4. **Develop a detailed action plan with related budgets for each WUF**

A detailed WUF plan should be developed for each WUF with expected accomplishments, indicators and targets, activities, timelines, responsibilities and related budgets. The plan should be developed in a transparent manner with clear links to the MTSIP and work programmes. All details should be included in the Plan, such as membership and support structure for an Advisory Group, security and IT services.

5. **Produce a WUF Manual**

The WUF Unit should take the lead in producing a Manual/Guidelines for WUF, to improve efficiency and effectiveness in planning, negotiations, and event management.

6. **Allow UN-Habitat staff to focus on core and strategic roles**

The preparation of the WUF report should be professionalized. Resources permitting, it should be outsourced to give more time to substantive staff to engage with partners. For substantive tasks that can be outsourced, the strategic role UN-Habitat staff should play, such as quality assurance, should be defined in the planning stage.

7. **All UN-Habitat staff attending WUF should be assigned specific roles and functions they will be accountable for**

Staff who participate in WUF sessions should have specific roles and responsibilities. Each Division, Branch, and unit should clearly link objectives of WUF activities with overall work plans of the unit and staff accountabilities. Delivery of the responsibilities should be defined in staff ePAS.
8. **Implement logistical “must dos” for WUF6**

- Detailed programme to be available at least 4 weeks before the event;
- Programme to be easier identified according to theme;
- Require all networking event organizers to submit a summary text to be posted on the Internet prior to WUF;
- Set up an electronic messaging system at WUF and communicate the presence of the system through the website and other means;
- Ensure that there is Internet connectivity in public areas in the Forum venue.

9. **Plan for and allocate resources for evaluating WUF sessions**

Plan for the evaluation of all future WUFs by allocating a budget line for evaluation.

10. **Follow up and implement recommendations resulting from WUF evaluations**

A management response to the WUF5 evaluation should be prepared, with a detailed action plan indicating the responsible offices/units to coordinate the implementation of the recommendations within specified timeframe.
1. Introduction and context

This report presents the outcome of the evaluation of the fifth session of the World Urban Forum (WUF5), conducted by the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. It has been carried out in accordance with Rules and Regulations Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Rules, Procedures and Methods of Evaluation (ST/SGB/2000/8). The evaluation responds to the UN-Habitat Medium-term strategic and institutional plan (MTSIP) for 2008-2013, which calls for results-orientation in all activities and the strengthening of the monitoring, evaluation and reporting.

The World Urban Forum (WUF) was established in accordance with resolution 18/5 of 16 February 2001 of the Commission on Human Settlements. The resolution requested the Executive Director of UN-Habitat to promote a merger of the Urban Environment Forum and the International Forum on Urban Poverty into a new urban forum to strengthen the coordination of international support to the implementation of the Habitat Agenda.

Through the General Assembly resolution 56/206, it was decided that the Forum was to be a “non-legislative technical forum in which experts would exchange views in the years when the Governing Council of UN-Habitat does not meet”. The main objectives of the WUF were identified and they include:

- Providing a common platform to discuss urban issues and come up with action-oriented proposals to create sustainable cities.
- Facilitating exchange of experiences, ideas, knowledge and good practices among cities and their development partners.
- Placing strong emphasis on inclusion and participation of Habitat Agenda partners, policy makers, civil societies, relevant international organisation and UN Agencies with the intent of strategic and targeted involvement in support of the world urban processes and, by extension, in support of the UN-Habitat work.
- Identifying overlaps and synergies, and to cooperate and coordinate among development agencies in the implementation of the Habitat Agenda, the Declaration on Cities and other Human Settlements related goals of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).
- Encouraging participation of leaders, experts and ordinary folk to discuss how urban way of life can be maintained – safely, inclusively and ecologically.

In the context of the UN-Habitat Medium-term Strategic and Institutional Plan (MTSIP) for 2008-2013, WUF is recognized as a platform for global advocacy and partnership building and for mobilizing a broad constituency of support for sustainable urbanization. This is outlined in MTSIP Focus Area 1: Advocacy, Monitoring and Partnership. The MTSIP also calls for a more systematic approach to partnership building and networking to “dramatically increase the number of networks of partners engaged in supporting the sustainable urbanization agenda.” The Work Programme and Budget 2010-2011, para. 15.10 highlights WUF as a significant mechanism for global advocacy on human settlements issues and cooperation with Governments and Habitat Agenda partners.
As a non-legislative forum, participation is encouraged from diverse stakeholders including, urban professionals, non-governmental organization, grass roots groups, international institutions, academia, private sector, media, national and local government authorities. These stakeholders participate in WUF with an advisory role to the Executive Director of UN-Habitat\(^1\). The Forum consists of a number of events scheduled for about one week. The Executive Director submits a report on the outcome of WUF to the UN-Habitat Governing Council for consideration and appropriate action.

Since 2002, five sessions of the WUF have been held with the following themes and number of participants:

- Barcelona, Spain (September 2004), “Cities: Crossroads of Cultures, Inclusiveness and Integration?”, 4389 participants.
- Vancouver, Canada (June 2006), “Sustainable Cities - Turning Ideas into Action”, 10,121 participants.
- Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (March 2010) “The Right to the City – Bridging the Urban Divide”, 10,634 participants.

The expanding scale, importance and the increasing engagement of the Habitat Agenda partners in the World Urban Forum sessions have been recognized by the Governing Council (GC) of UN-Habitat. At its 22\(^{nd}\) session in April 2009, the GC through resolution 22/10 called for a review of all the four WUF sessions held since 2002. The review was carried out by an external consultant and a report was completed in September 2009 entitled “Review of The World Urban Forum Sessions 2002-2008”. The report presented 19 recommendations. UN-Habitat management has provided a management response and action plans for implementing the recommendations.

Recommendation 9, on planning future WUF sessions using a results-based management approach, requested that expected results and success criteria be clearly articulated in WUF planning documents, taking into account the MTSIP results-framework and the work programme. The report also recommended an early appraisal of WUF plans (evaluability assessments) to be carried out to ensure that WUF sessions can be monitored and evaluated effectively. Although it was too late for this recommendation to be fully applied for WUF5, this evaluation was designed to assess the planning, programming, management, as well as results of WUF5.

---

1.1 Objectives of the Fifth Session of WUF

The objectives identified for the WUF5 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil took into account overall WUF objectives to build on the gains made from the previous four WUF sessions. These include:

- To strengthen the level of involvement, participation and engagement of partners in discussions.
- To share ideas, experiences and best practices.
- To identify solutions, commitments and actions.
- To build and strengthen networks and forge partnerships for bridging the urban divide.
- The Forum, by extension, is also designed to promote the common urban agenda in support of the work of UN-Habitat and its partners.

The WUF5 was also intended to facilitate participants to take stock of where the world stands with respect to the ‘right to the city’, to analyze who is getting the benefits of the urbanization process and who is being left out. The Forum was also to provide an opportunity for sharing perspectives and ideas on the ‘right to the city’ and to identify initiatives, solutions, commitments and actions that can be implemented to bridge the urban divide.
2. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

According to the Terms of Reference (Annex A), the evaluation is a forward-looking assessment of UN-Habitat’s planning, programming and organizing modalities for the WUF. The evaluation is also expected to help document experiences, results, and identify factors and lessons learned that will help to improve the delivery of future WUFs. The evaluation seeks to address two broad questions: (i) How and to what extent did WUF5 contribute to positive outcomes? (ii) Was the design, planning, programming, management and delivery of WUF5 conducive for achieving outcomes?

The main purpose of this evaluation, therefore, is to inform planning, organizing and managing of future WUFs for improved outcomes. It is expected that the findings will be used by both UN-Habitat management, its governing bodies, the host countries and Habitat Agenda partners. As the planning for WUF 6 is underway, some considerations are pertinent to consider for WUF6, while others should be considered for WUF7.

The evaluation covers the main Forum as well as the Gender and Youth Assemblies. In discussions of results of WUF, outcomes from previous WUFs have been included where appropriate. The discussions relating to the planning and management issues covers only WUF5.

Using results-based management approach as the guide, the evaluation focused on assessment in the following areas:

- **Efficiency and effectiveness of the planning processes.** To what extent did UN-Habitat’s coordination and management structure for WUF5 allow for effective planning? Was a results-oriented model followed?
- **Programme format and content.** Were the topics and themes relevant? Did the format and content facilitate positive outcomes?
- **Efficiency and effectiveness of conference delivery.** Were the administration and logistics satisfactory? Did conference management and logistics facilitate positive outcomes?
- **WUF participation and inclusiveness.** Did WUF5 reach out broadly to Habitat Agenda partners?
- **Roles and outcomes of WUF.** What is the added value of WUF? Were the possible outcomes achieved for WUF?

---

2 The reference to conference in this report is used interchangeably with the term Forum to signify the relevance of application of good practices for organization of big conferences.
3. **Approach and Methodology**

The “Review of WUFs 2002-2008” recommended the use of a results-based framework to assess achievements and results expected from WUF. The logic is built on the assumption of cause and effect relationship, where activities determine outputs, which determine outcomes, and outcomes determine impact. To better understand the outcomes to which WUF could contribute, a typology was developed before the Forum based on the stated objectives of WUF5 (refer to section 1.1) and refined after observation and interviews. The typology includes:

(i) **A platform for advocacy**
Degree to which WUF influence and advance the urban agenda.

(iii) **A platform for inclusive dialogue**
Ability of WUF to bring together representatives from key Habitat Agenda Partners to voice their views in an open debate.

(ii) **A clearing house for knowledge and best practice**
Ability of WUF to facilitate the dissemination and sharing of information and knowledge, such as best practices, experiences and practical solutions.

(v) **A platform for policy guidance**
Degree to which WUF effectively influences policies.

(iv) **A facilitator for networks and partnerships**
Degree to which WUF enables partnerships to be forged and networks to be developed and strengthened for promoting sustainable urbanization.

(vi) **An accountability mechanism**
Degree to which WUF facilitate the demonstration of Habitat Agenda Partners in meeting commitments and responsibilities related to the urban agenda.

Since this typology is meant to be applied to WUFs in general, the discussion in this report will look beyond a single WUF to explore the kind of outcomes even previous WUFs have contributed to.

In order to assess outcomes achieved and establish links between the different processes and events of WUF5, a variety of methods, both qualitative and quantitative, were applied. Five lines of evidence have been utilized in this evaluation as described below.

**(a) Pre-session assessment of WUF documents and interviews with UN-Habitat staff:** this was carried out as an evaluability study to assess the quality of planning documents and existence of clear objectives, expected accomplishments and indicators to measure achievements. Workplans, background documents to dialogues, networking and training events and reports from the e-debates were reviewed and interviews conducted with staff on their plans.
(b) Secondary data analysis
A review and verification of UN-Habitat participant registration database was carried out
to develop a profile of “true” WUF5 participants. A total of 22,269 people registered
online and 10,634 participated in the WUF5. The figure of 10,634 excludes over 3,000
logistics, volunteers and ground staff. The database was cleaned to remove duplication,
blanks and non-legitimate records before analyzing the records to identify the “true”
participants.

(c) Onsite data collection and interviews
A team of four evaluation team members attended WUF5 to observe events and
exhibitions and interview facilitators, organizers and event participants. A total of 85
semi-structured interviews were conducted before, during and after the WUF5. These
included interviews with the WUF management team, UN-Habitat staff, host country
Secretariat, UNON conference services, event organizers, representatives of UN-Habitat
governing bodies (CPR), representatives of the WUF Advisory Group and other key
informants that attended WUF5.

(d) Participant Survey Questionnaire
The questionnaire consisted of 34 closed-ended and two open-ended questions to assess
participant satisfaction (Annex D). The questionnaire was prepared in four languages:
English, French, Spanish and Portuguese. During the last three days of the Forum,
participants were requested to complete and return the questionnaires. 20 volunteers
assisted in distributing and collecting completed questionnaires. Questionnaires were
distributed in strategic places such as networking, training, seminar and dialogue rooms,
exhibition hall, information desks and at the main entrance. UN-Habitat staff, WUF staff
and volunteers were excluded from participating in the survey in order to reduce bias in
the assessment.

At the end of the Forum, 1,883 participants had responded to the questionnaire
(exceeding the statistical minimum sample size required of 371). Information from
respondents was computerized and analyzed. A variable was constructed – “Countries
level of development” to group respondents into Developed, Developing or Least
Developed Countries (LDCs) based on country of residence reported by the respondents.
The grouping of countries was done using UN World Economic and Social Surveys
(WESS), and statistics of Least Developed Countries found on: www.un.org/ohrlls.

The profile of 1,883 survey respondents differed insignificantly from the profile of true
participants targeted by the survey. Consequently data was not weighted to correct for
known biases. Having 1,883 respondents of a total of 10,634 targeted participants, a
confidence level of 95% and confidence interval of +/- 2.05 were established. This means
that if 50% of the respondents said “yes” to a question, the actual response lies between
48% and 52% with 95% of certainty.

Although the profile of survey respondents did not differ significantly from the profile of
the actual participants, the actual demographic data from the participant database has
been used in this report where possible. This was done to increase the accuracy of the
data. The participant data was provided by the WUF Secretariat and quality checked as
explained in (b) above.
(e) Post-forum interviews
Follow-up interviews were conducted after WUF session. This evaluation also benefited from the feedback and self-assessment obtained from the two internal post-conference review meetings on the WUF5 that were conducted in Nairobi. Most of the UN-Habitat staff who participated in the WUF5 attended the review sessions.

3.1 Limitations of the methodology

The methodology for this evaluation included five lines of evidence. The different lines of evidence allowed the evaluation team to collect information using both qualitative and qualitative methods from the broad range of stakeholders involved in WUF5. Although great caution has been taken to make the evaluation methodology as rigorous as possible, some limitations have been noted:

- The WUF5 evaluation was more comprehensive than previous WUF evaluations, which were conducted using participant surveys only. As such, this was a unique evaluation process with no similar WUF evaluation to serve as a comparison. While such opportunities were limited, where possible, comparisons with previous WUFs have been made.

- Interview data might reflect a self-selection bias. The evaluation did not seek to identify potential Habitat Agenda Partners that chose not to participate in WUF5. The findings from interviews might therefore represent a more positive picture on the functions of WUF than if partners who did not find it worthwhile to participate were interviewed to get their views.

- To fully assess policy impact of WUF, one would need to follow specific cases with in-depth case studies. The outcomes at country level referred to in the report have not been followed-up at country level beyond interviews held at WUF.

- Although participant survey data was representative of demographic variables, this does not eliminate all sources of bias. For instance, some participants who may not have been pleased with the Forum may have chosen not to respond to the survey. Furthermore, participants who were sponsored to attend the Forum might have felt more compelled to provide a positive assessment. Participants from the host country might also have felt inclined to provide a positive assessment to support their Government in hosting a well organized global Forum. These limitations raise questions on the representativeness of the data and, consequently, they should be interpreted with caution.

- During the evaluability assessment it was clear that WUF5 planning documents lacked defined expected accomplishments and indicators of achievement, and areas of accountability with clear roles and responsibilities. What was to be achieved was not clearly specified. This has consequently made it more difficult to determine what WUF5 achieved. In order to still apply a results-based model, a typology of outcomes was used to structure the discussion on results.
4. Analysis and key findings

The key findings for this evaluation are organized in the following areas:

1. Efficiency and effectiveness of the planning processes
2. Programme format and content
3. Efficiency and effectiveness of conference\(^3\) delivery
4. WUF participation and inclusiveness
5. Roles and outcomes of WUF

Where possible, the information provided is attributed to more than one of the lines of evidence.

4.1 Efficiency and effectiveness of planning processes

A key recommendation from previous evaluations (“Reviews of WUFs 2002-2008” and “Participant Evaluation Report” from WUF4) is the need to strengthen the planning mechanism for both the substantive and administrative aspects of WUF, with clear roles and responsibilities within the UN-Habitat Secretariat accompanied by a detailed Action Plan with defined expected accomplishments and indicators of achievement in line with MTSIP and work programme results. Such a systematic approach would facilitate result-based planning, monitoring and evaluation of WUF. During the evaluability assessment it was clear that WUF5 planning documents lacked defined expected accomplishments and indicators of achievement, and areas of accountability with clear roles and responsibilities.

This section will discuss different aspects of the actual planning process despite the lack of a detailed and explicit result-based planning framework.

4.1.1 Leadership, coordination and management

Within UN-Habitat, the WUF Unit within the Governing Council Secretariat, led by the WUF Coordinator supported by a mid-level professional, was responsible for coordination of the day-to-day preparations. A WUF Steering Committee of Division Directors was set up to provide strategic direction and decision-making for WUF5, chaired by the Director of the Monitoring and Research Division. Three Steering Committee meetings were convened during the preparatory process. Each of the six dialogues had a focal point, the overall coordinator of the dialogues was the Chief of the State of the World's Cities Section. The overall coordinator for the twelve Roundtables was the Chief a.i. for the Partners and Youth Branch, with each one having a focal point. The Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean played an important role in liaising with the host country and in preparing administrative elements. A Brazilian staff member was also given an active role as facilitator.

\(^3\) The reference to conference in this report is used interchangeably with the term Forum to signify the relevance of application of good practices for organization of big conferences.
Some informants who attended coordination meetings commented that the meetings were more of brain-storming sessions rather than strategic and action oriented meetings that reviewed strategic issues and status of progress.

Feedback from interviews with regards to the substantive side, points to instances of “vacuum” in leadership. For example, the dialogue coordinator did not have authority to take the lead in ensuring quality throughout the processes of WUF5. The responsibilities of staff members who had been selected to participate in the WUF session were in several cases not clear or sufficient to justify participation. It was evident in Rio, that some staff members had a great time on mission, while others had impossible workloads.

Overall, the WUF5 coordination and management was not articulated well. Roles and responsibilities were not clearly defined. As regarded a number of substantive and administrative aspects it was often not obvious within and outside UN-Habitat who was responsible. There were overlapping and unclear responsibilities within the Governing Council Secretariat. This led to blurred accountabilities which ultimately affected planning and organizing negatively.

4.1.2 Results-based planning and budgeting

As mentioned in the introduction section to 4.1, a detailed plan for WUF5 in terms of expected outcomes, indicators of achievements and roles and responsibilities was not developed. From interviews, it was evident that the organization did not have a coherent vision for the expected outcomes of WUF. Within UN-Habitat, some sections had more comprehensive plans than others. Overall, planning was done in a partly ad hoc manner.

Linked to the lack of results-based planning, is the lack of planning for evaluation to systematically assess results. No previous WUF has allocated resources for evaluation. Given the magnitude and complexity of WUF, results can not be captured by performance indicators alone, and thus a more systematic assessment of outcomes and possible impact is therefore needed. Evaluation is a core activity of WUF and should have a budget line.

Since WUF has grown in size, there is a need to consider how the budget could be allocated more strategically. The host country contribution to UN-Habitat for WUF5 was US$ 2.9 million. This contribution was complemented by contributions from UN-Habitat and other third parties. For WUF5 budget allocations seemed to have been done partly ad hoc, not based on clarified criteria. Some 59 staff (assumed core) were funded by the host country contribution to travel to Rio de Janeiro. The justification for why such a significant part of the host country contribution should fund travel of UN-Habitat is not evident if WUF is considered a core part of the work programme and MTSIP, and one might assume that UN-Habitat should set aside budgets for WUF in its biennium work programme budgets. The amount used for staff travel from the host country contribution is an opportunity cost, meaning that the amount could have been used for other purposes such as outsourcing of particular functions to make the overall event management and logistics more professional.
4.1.3 Negotiations and planning with the host country

The host country agreement that spells out terms and responsibilities of the host country and those of UN-Habitat is an important instrument to facilitate an effective WUF. Provisions for a budget, substantive documents, accommodation, security, logistics and all important aspects of the Forum are to be included in the agreement. The negotiations started early enough and agreement was signed in good time.

Although UN-Habitat worked closely with the host country following the signing of the agreement, this evaluation was not able to establish the quality of negotiations on important aspects of management, including security, protocol, transportation, media and interpretation. It would have been useful if the agreement had been more detailed on a number of aspects. While there will always be unexpected issues coming up towards the end of the planning phase for an event of this size, a number of aspects could have been negotiated and sorted out with the host country earlier.

There were, however, many positive elements as regards the joint planning between UN-Habitat and the host country for WUF5. Factors that positively contributed to the joint planning for the WUF5 were:

- Early engagement with the host country: Consultations between UN-Habitat and Brazil, the host country regarding plans for the WUF5 commenced as soon as the decision on the host country was made at the end of WUF4.
- Political support: Strong political will and commitment of the host country from the Federal Government to other levels especially the Municipality of Rio de Janeiro.
- Funding: The Government of Brazil provided financial support of US$ 2.9 million which was released to UN-Habitat, early and in one tranche. This would have enabled UN-Habitat to make realistic plans for the WUF in good time based on a budget of assured funding.
- Facilitation of the Permanent Representative of Brazil, Ambassador Ana Maria Sampaio Fernandes: By working closely with UN-Habitat in every step, she provided a link with the host country that expedited decision making and actions.
- UN-Habitat presence in the host country and host city for WUF 5: The presence of UN-Habitat’s Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean in Rio de Janeiro, led by the Regional Director, provided the proximity needed for planning for WUF on the ground. The UN-Habitat team in Rio was an integral part of the local planning team led by the host country planning team.

4.2 Programme content and format

4.2.1 Selection of topics and themes

The theme for WUF, once selected, guide the development of the UN-Habitat flagship report State of the World’s Cities Report. The overall theme for WUF5, “The right to the
city—bridging the urban divide” and its sub-themes (dialogue topics⁴) were chosen by UN-Habitat with input from the host country. The theme of the State of the World’s Cities 2010-2011 report were then identified as “Cities for All: Bridging the Urban Divide.”

Table 1 summarizes results from the participant’s survey regarding satisfaction on different aspects of substance of WUF5. A total of 87% of respondents were either satisfied or very satisfied with relevance to topics and themes; 84% were satisfied or very satisfied the quality of keynote speakers; 75% were satisfied or very satisfied with substantive information on topics and themes, while 63% were satisfied or very satisfied with the showcasing of Brazil’s achievement in urban policies.

Table 1: Satisfaction on different aspects of substance of WUF5, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of topics and themes</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of keynote speakers and presentations</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive information on topics and themes</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcasing Brazil’s achievement in urban policies</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, around 25% were either undecided or unsatisfied with the substantive information on topics and themes. Some key informants also felt that the dialogue and roundtables discussions failed to focus on the overall theme, demonstrating lack of meaningful analysis and engagement in choosing the theme and sub-themes.

While the theme was deemed relevant, feedback from interviews suggested that it would have facilitated planning on the substantive quality of WUF5 if the details around the topics could have been decided upon earlier. Selection of the theme and topics did not go through a rigorous discussion based on their potential for generating new thinking, knowledge and solutions for sustainable urbanization. As will be discussed under section 4.5.1 current public policy concerns could be taken into account when formulating topics to facilitate effective advocacy.

Suggestions from participants through interviews and the survey, indicate that, on the whole, UN-Habitat could be more ambitious in terms of facilitating that the latest thinking is presented at WUF, and that messages are better communicated. This could be done by linking the sessions facilitated by UN-Habitat closer to the State of the World’s Cities report. The overall theme of WUF could then be presented in the context of different topics. It would also be possible for UN-Habitat to partner with a journal which can produce a special issue on the sub-themes of WUF prior to WUF. This could advance

---

⁴ The dialogue topics included: taking forward the right to the city; bridging the urban divide: inclusive cities; equal access to shelter and basic urban services; cultural diversity in cities; governance and participation; sustainable urbanization: cities in a changing climate.
the debate on specific issue and WUF as a “brand” or “product” can be enhanced. If a more ambitious route for WUF7 is decided upon.

4.2.2 Format and session types

The format of WUF5 programme consisted of a variety of events (Table 2) designed to serve different functions. The main theme “The right to the city – bridging the urban divide” unfolded into six dialogues topics and 12 thematic open debates and six concluding sessions. The Forum programme also included 150 networking events, 7 special sessions, 24 training events and seminars, 49 side events and two cross-cutting general assemblies: the Gender Equality Action Assembly and the World Urban Youth Assembly and an exhibition with 110 exhibits.

Prior to the closing ceremony of WUF5 session, the World Urban Campaign “Building Partnerships for a Better City, Better Life”, was launched.

To accommodate the large number of participants, the Forum was divided into plenary sessions delivering key messages, dialogues discussing main themes, open debates, networking events, caucus meetings, special sessions and a wider range of side events.

Table 2: Event types, frequency and description at WUF5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of event</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening and closing ceremonies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Designed to feature high level of representation including Heads of States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dialogue topics are derived from the WUF theme. The dialogues included high profile speakers (panelists) addressing policy issues with respect to WUF5 sub-themes. Each dialogue had a moderator to engage participants from the audience in discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic open debates</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Thematic open debates are sub-themes of the dialogue topics, which narrow down the theme to a specific issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundtables</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Roundtables organized by peers focused on strategies and emerging issues. Groups included the ministers, mayors, parliamentarians, civil society and NGOs, indigenous people; Habitat professionals, universities, gender and women, urban researchers, business, Global land tool network, and youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special sessions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Special sessions on rebuilding in Haiti; sanitation, wastewater and solid waste management; actualizing the right to the city; South-South cooperation; decentralization; integrated slum upgrading in Brazil; and building with energy efficiency and sustainability were held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking events</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Networking events were designed to bring together people with common interests to discuss various aspects of sustainable urban development issues centered on the forum sub-themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition covering 5,000 square meters</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Exhibition was designed to provide opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
exhibitors for a wide range of groups to demonstrate projects, ideas, case studies, experiences, and best practices from around the world on the challenges of sustainable cities.

Training events 24 These were designed to impact professional skills of urban practitioners.

Seminars 2 Organized by the host country: sustainability of water and energy resources in large cities and evaluating results and impact of clusters in sustainable local development.

Side events 49 Independent events, but which were generally related to theme of the forum and the urban agenda including book and programme.

Dialogues are organized by UN-Habitat in consultation with the host country. Roundtables are coordinated by UN-Habitat, but allow peer partner groups to have a significant role. Training events are organized by partners, but overall managed by UN-Habitat. Networking events are largely organized and managed by partners.

An attempt was made to improve opportunities for discussions in WUF5 compared to WUF4, through more interactive professionally facilitated dialogues, roundtables and network events. The perceived usefulness of the Forum sessions according to the participant survey is presented in Table 3. On average 74% of all respondents rated the events either useful or very useful, a drop from the WUF4, which was 86%. Most participants, 87%, found the Dialogues useful or very useful. The other events rated useful were the thematic open debates at 86% networking events at 85%, exhibition at 82%, and training events at 76%.

Table 3: Perceived usefulness of WUF5 events, percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event type</th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>Somewhat useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Forum</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogues</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Open Debates</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundtables</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Events</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Events</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Caucus</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback obtained from interviews show that the Dialogue format is not for everyone, but for those who choose to attend several sessions, it was appreciated. The Roundtables
attracts significant interest, but was the type of session that received the most frequent comments with suggestions for improvement in the survey and interviews, and is as such the format that is in most need of rethinking. While Roundtables are organized by partners and as such outside the detailed demand of UN-Habitat to control, there appears to be a need for UN-Habitat to rethink the format for many of the Roundtables. This is an opportunity to hold partner groups accountable for the urban agenda.  

The Business Caucus was a seven-hours meeting, in two days, gathering people from the business community. Feedback from participant satisfaction survey and interviews indicate that overall, the private sector events had higher profiles during this WUF than previous WUFs. However, it was observed that the Business Caucus meeting room was less than 30% covered. Some suggestions were made by participants how private sector participation could be more effective in the WUF. If the purpose is to reach out beyond the business community, it might make better sense to mainstream events. Some presentations would benefit from a format of the type of networking event. Some of the presentations in the Business Caucus did not get the audience it deserved. A limited number of high quality networking sessions that generate broad interest might be more effective.  

Networking events were generally well received – and many interviewees point to these as the highlight of WUF and the survey show a satisfaction rate of 85%. However, it was noted that the quality was not consistent. While the networking events should be retained as partner events, UN-Habitat can do more to facilitate quality. This includes providing guidelines to partners, and better “plugging” of networking events into the overall theme and topics. This does not mean that UN-Habitat should steer, but that the quality of events can be better facilitated, and that content synergies can be made more evident. Partners that are allowed to hold networking events, should also adhere to certain minimum requirements as regards the provision of information. UN-Habitat should make it a requirement for all convenors of networking event to submit a background/summary paper or text to be posted on the Internet prior to WUF.  

The Youth and Gender assemblies received mixed feedback. For the Gender Assembly not to be seen as just a token event, the substantive aspect needs improvement. There are pros and cons in having separate assemblies versus mainstreaming youth and gender throughout the event.  

Table 4 details suggestions, provided by respondents to the participant’s survey and key informants that should be considered in planning for quality sessions.  

Table 4: Suggestions for consideration in planning and conducting quality sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Present fresh and relevant information, avoid superficial content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be critical of content – ask the question “is it cutting edge?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capitalize on the flagship reports. Statistics and findings in the reports can be used more proactively in roundtables and dialogues to introduce debates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make sure the title of session fit substance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include more critical perspectives in sessions – avoid too much self praise or canvassing. Have some sessions with a more “hard talk” approach of moderator (ref. BBC).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan for integration of practical examples with applications into the sessions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Establish quality assurance procedure for sessions to ensure focus and depth, selection of speakers and facilitators and review of presentations and papers.
- Increase the use of visual and artistic media – exhibitions, films, and drama. Allow partners to organize events outside the venue during day/evening to attract local community, and show the participatory nature of WUF.
- All sessions should be facilitated by skilled facilitators with experience of working with diverse groups.
- Limit the number of panellists to a maximum of four people.
- Do not allow the total panel introductory time for any session to exceed 30 minutes.
- Make sure that speakers and presenters are briefed and prepared.
- Need to facilitate dialogue of people who normally do not talk to each other.
- Give grassroots women networks better inclusion in dialogues and roundtables as panelist.

**Roundtables**

- Roundtables should be organised around themes and to ensure representation of different stakeholders.
- Organize around one or two topics – not more.
- Rethink the whole roundtable format. This is an opportunity to hold partner groups accountable for the urban agenda.
- Avoid too much preaching to the converted. Encourage critique.
- Focus more on getting commitment from the different stakeholders and stories about change.
- Link roundtables to concrete agreements and commitments from partners.
- Ensure much stricter moderation, including clearer themes to guide the discussion. Get moderators who can make substantive sense of chaos.
- Reduce the number of panellists to no more than four.
- There should be better briefing of panellists beforehand and improve coordination among them.
- The Gender roundtable had no men in the panel – this should not happen again.
- English speaking moderators should be standard.

**Dialogues**

- Dialogue sessions should provide adequate time for interactions and for solutions to be identified.
- Dialogues should be more closely controlled with regard to following the set rules. No formal presentation, limited time for interventions and comments, more strict moderation and time control to enable real dialogue to take place with many point specific contributions from both the panel as well the participants.
- The dialogues need to be tightened. The day long dialogues tend to be repetitive on the same information.

**Trainings**

- There is need to develop a training programme for senior government officials (Ministers, deputies, mayors).
- Some training events need more practical cases.

**Business caucus**

- Presentations should be more connected.
- Would make better sense to mainstream events. Some presentations would benefit from a format more of the type of networking event.
- More substantive moderator.
- Private sector visibility should be enhanced. Focus on high quality networking sessions that generate broad interest rather, than talking among themselves in a business caucus.

**Networking events**

- UN-Habitat should develop guidelines and “plug” the networking events into the overall theme and topics better. This does not mean that UN-Habitat should steer, but that the quality of events can be better facilitated, and that synergies in content can be made more evident.
- Make it a requirement for all networking event to submit a background paper to be posted on the Internet.

**Gender Assembly**

- Make a more detailed programme available.
- Reduce the gender Assembly to a one day event.
• Less panelists with shorter speeches, more in-depth on topics. Spice up the plenary with more provocative examples and good statistics.
• One or two overall themes for the whole assembly.
• Seminars to be better facilitated according to themes with shorter introductions and have more specific questions to guide the discussions.
• Better selection of case studies and make them strategic according to pre-defined themes.
• In order to avoid the risk of the Gender Assembly becoming a token event, the substantive aspect needs improvement. There is need for more serious substantive sessions.
• Prepare a networking programme for the evenings.
• Use WUF as an opportunity to report on the GEAP actions taken by partners as a way to hold them accountable and keep them motivated. UN-Habitat to monitor progress during WUF.
• Make particular effort to present good practices and link planners and policy makers with grassroots in seminars.
• Time management must be improved for plenary and seminars.

### Youth Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The structure and timing of the Youth Assembly as a separate event prior to the WUF session did not improve mainstreaming of youth issues as was expected. This approach needs to be revisited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adequate time and venues should be planned for and made available for training sessions for youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Youth delegates should be included in panels and speakers lists for the main WUF events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Youth Round Table should be run by the youth and should cover priority issues and not only one. In WUF5, the Youth Round Table focused only on sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coverage of youth in the daily bulletin should be improved throughout the WUF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2.3 Reporting on WUF sessions

The mandated WUF report prepared by UN-Habitat Secretariat requires significant staff inputs. For WUF5 reporting, 12 staff members were engaged between half and full time in report writing. The report is approved by the Advisory Board on the last day for the Forum adoption. From key informants, including UN-Habitat staff, the report is not widely read.

Although WUF report is mandated, presently engaging such a high number of substantive staff in the report writing does not seem to be justified by the report utility. Feedback from key informants indicate suggests that for the report to be more utilized, it could focus on emerging issues/key substantive developments, not a “cover it all” type of reporting. But as important is the follow-up of issues through debriefings and discussions of key issues after WUF. As such, WUF reporting should not be seen as a one-off report, but rather a secure “stream” of information on deals, commitments, joint programmes/partnerships, pledges, etc during WUF that should be monitored and followed-up on after WUF. Such information could be posted on the website, monitored and reported on; and as such strengthen the accountability function of WUF (refer section 4.5.6).

The “Review of WUF sessions 2002-2008” recommended a system of WUF-to-WUF follow up on policy debate that would summarize and track the key arguments, the recommendations and actions to be taken. Such a system is not yet in place.
4.3 Efficiency and effectiveness of conference delivery

Organizing a conference and exhibition event for 10,000 plus people is a significant undertaking. A number of issues related to conference delivery, affect the way WUF can successfully deliver its potential roles discussed in 4.5. This section presents findings related to pre-WUF arrangements and delivery during WUF.

4.3.1 Pre-WUF arrangements

The overall planning mechanism and its shortcomings are discussed in section 4.1. This section presents issues in more detail. Respondents to the participant survey were mostly positive about pre-conference organization. Table 5 presents satisfaction with information and logistics before the Forum. 72% were satisfied or very satisfied with timeliness of information on the Forum, 71% with the usefulness of the forum content, and 65% with design and content of the WUF5 website. While there is general satisfaction, around 17-18% were unsatisfied or very unsatisfied with the timeliness and type of information prior to the Forum. About 22% were unsatisfied or very unsatisfied with finding accommodation.

Table 5: Satisfaction with organization and logistics before WUF5, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of information on the Forum</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful information on the Forum content</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and content of WUF5 website</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of registration</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of obtaining a visa5</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding accommodation6</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lack of adequate and timely information, as well as the need for better information on booking for accommodation was also a recurrent comment provided in the completed questionnaire and feedback from interviews from key informants. Table 6 sum up observations and issues related the WUF website and programme prior to WUF5 emerging from interviews, observation and survey comments. Other issues related to detailed pre-WUF planning are discussed in conjunction with the delivery of the actual session in section 4.3.2.

---

5 Residents in Brazil who responded to this question were excluded from the analysis
6 Residents in Brazil who responded to this question were excluded from the analysis
Table 6: Observations and suggestions for the timeliness and quality of information prior to WUF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WUF Website</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-session documents consisted of a Background paper and the Forum Programme. Both were published in English and Portuguese and printed locally. Participants increasingly expect information to be available prior to the Forum, both in terms of the substance of the event and logistical aspects. While 65% considered themselves generally satisfied, a number of elements were considered unsatisfactory. The most recurrent comment was that more information should have been available earlier about the programme in general, and, specific events in particular, most importantly networking events, and that much more information should be made available during and after the Forum. Quality control of content did not always work. Some were also confused by what type of information they could expect from the host country website, and what information from the UN-Habitat website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Get much more on – webcasts, presentations, agreements/deals, pledges etc., on the web real time during the Forum (must do).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Present speakers and presenters with details.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide a smart phone friendly format of key information, with the programme as the first priority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All the events should have well edited summaries available on the web in advance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make presentations from networking events available on website after the Forum if not before (must do). This should be a requirement for holding a networking event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More guidance should be provided to exhibitors and those organizing networking event on the website during the planning period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The programme was made available in print form only in the morning of the first day of the Forum. The programme was available in pdf on the weekend before the Forum. The programme contained unnecessary errors. A general feedback was that the programme was difficult to quickly grasp, and that it did not lend itself to identify thematic areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make the detailed programme available on the web (both in html and pdf) at least four weeks before the Forum (must do).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make it easier for participants to identify themes in the programme (must do). For example, colour code the programme according to themes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make a version of the programme viewable for smartphones (Blackberry, iPhone etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make the full programme visible on boards in the venue so that people who do not have the programme can find events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include more detailed information of speakers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2  Experiences and observations during WUF5

Perceptions of logistics and facilities from respondents to the survey are presented in Table 7. On average 62% of the respondents were either satisfied or very satisfied with logistics and facilities. This was a decline from the WUF4 at 77%. 73% of the respondents were either satisfied or very satisfied with the ease of obtaining the forum badges; 65% of the respondents were either satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of facilities - a decline from the WUF4 at 90%. Around half (53%) of the respondents were satisfied with the communication facilities, with the other half being unsatisfied or
undecided. This was a sharp decline from the WUF4 at 67%. Satisfaction with support and assistance available, transport logistics and ease of obtaining food and beverage also declined from the WUF4.

Table 7: Satisfaction with organization and logistics during WUF5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of obtaining the Forum badge</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of facilities (i.e. rooms, lighting, sound)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication facilities (including internet)</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and assistance available</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation logistics</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of obtaining food and beverages</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More detailed observations and suggestions on aspects of conference management and logistics during WUF were captured by interviews and survey comments. These are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Observations and suggestions for improving the delivery of WUF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening and closing ceremony</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The opening ceremony was long, exceeding the projected timeframe by several hours (the opening ceremony started more than an hour late and ended more than two hours after the projected time). Overall, the opening and closing ceremonies appeared not optimally planned and choreographed with too many speakers. The ceremonies included both cultural and substantive aspects on the one hand, and official and ceremonial aspects on the other, such as naming of the Advisory Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestiosns:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plan for a tighter scripting of the opening and closing ceremonies (must do).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce the opening ceremony to maximum two hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Significantly reduce the number of speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Separate the official functions of the opening ceremony with the other aspects, or at least reduce the official aspect of the opening ceremony to a minimum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrate the arts and culture elements more seamlessly and thematically well into the opening and closing ceremonies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider a key note speaker of international stature to set to tone for the theme/topics of the Forum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration</th>
<th>Observation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registration was mainly managed by UN-Habitat with the support of the host country team. The registration was in two step processes: online pre-registration and on site registration. Photo badge issuance was partly provided at the airport and the venue where 20 badge producing machines were installed. The registration at the airport did not function. On 22 March, both accreditation and security queues were at least 600 meters long. There seemed to be confusion of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
who were entitled to “All Access” pass and who were not, which caused some difficulty of UN-Habitat staff in doing their job.

**Suggestions:**
Consider outsourcing registration. This would involve identifying clearly the information needs UN-Habitat for registration, prior and during the Forum, to be provided for management purposes.

---

**Exhibition**

**Observations:**
Overall the exhibition worked well as a meeting and marketplace. The communication with exhibitors prior to the Forum, and the allocation of space did not go smoothly. A number of exhibitors were unsatisfied with being allocated less space than requested, while there were empty spaces in the venue. It was felt that allocation of space was not made as planned on paper. Microphones and projectors sometimes failed and in some cases technicians were not in the exhibition area thus wasting valuable time for a session.

**Suggestions:**
- Request for proposals and submissions for participation in exhibitions should be made earlier with adequate time after the deadline to process the requests and prepare the details.
- Provide more detailed information available on the web on for example rental equipment than what was contained in the Exhibition Guide.
- When possible, consider placing the exhibition by the entrance so that all participants have to pass it.
- More transparent allocation of space needed.
- Exhibitions should be kept open for longer hours.
- Improve beverage and snacks services needed in exhibition hall.
- Ensure a tech is on duty.
- Consider outsourcing the management of the exhibition space.

---

**Information and Communication**

**Observations:**
A bilingual Forum Journal was produced locally on a daily basis by UN-Habitat contract under the supervision of UN-Habitat Information Service Section. A typical observation from participants was the lack of a system for finding other participants. With more than 10,000 participants, this becomes critical for effective networking. A message board was actually set up, but few were informed about this. Wireless Internet only partially worked in the venue, and the satisfaction with Internet connectivity was relatively low.

**Suggestions:**
- Ensure wireless Internet is working with back-ups if needed.
- Set up an electronic notice/message board system, and announce the system well in advance on the web (**must do**).
- Consider using language volunteers/support groups to assist community groups and minorities.
- Produce live podcast of opening ceremony and popular events – make the videos available after the event on the website and YouTube.
- Consider using films in the break between dialogues.
- Publish the conclusions from the dialogues in an easily accessible format.

---

**Interpretation**

**Observation:**
The WUF is an English meeting. However, the Government of Brazil offered interpretation in English, French, Spanish, Arabic, Chinese and Portuguese for the Opening and Closing ceremonies, the Dialogues, the Thematic Open Debates. Press conference had interpretation in English, Spanish and Portuguese; Interpretation in other events and meetings was provided on a commercial basis, upon demand by event organizers like at 24 of the Networking Events which had
interpretation in English and Portuguese. Many respondents were not satisfied with interpretation and its logistics. One had to handover his/her passport/ID in order to receive sound receiver/headsets. A number of the headsets were not working and as such simultaneous interpretation was challenge for some participants.

| Security | **Observations:** Security for the WUF5 was provided by the Rio Police department outside the venue. At the venue, access control was provided by a contractor under the supervision and coordination of ECLAC’s security team. Many respondents were frustrated with the security procedures to enable access the conference rooms. Given the number of participants, there were long line-ups at the security check points. Given the number of participants, there were long line-ups at the security check points. Too many VIPs complicated matters (see below). |
| Services and local personnel | **Observations:** Overall, participants were satisfied with services on the venue, but the need for healthier, diverse and easily accessible food has been a comment for all the WUFs. During WUF V a number of participants left the venue to eat outside, and some did not come back, leading to a loss of participants. Over 3,000 local personnel, including volunteers were provided by the Government of Brazil. Their functions varied, between event management, technical, sound, IT support, meeting services. All local staff were under the supervision and authority of local event management firm, the SRCOM. This company was the main contact for the coordination of all conference services. Most respondents commended the work of volunteers.  

**Suggestions:**  
- Allow additional food service providers to sell food at the venue, and ensure diversity of offering.  
- Cluster services in the same location, currency exchange, sell of local sim cards, basic pharmaceutical products, etc. and improve signage to this area. |
| Transport | **Observations:** The venue was located outside the city centre and the hotels at which the majority of participants stayed. Transportation to and from the venue was cumbersome for many participants. The subway was a 10-15 minutes walk from the venue, but there was no signage, and the information booths did not have readily available information to guide the participants to the subway. There were shuttle busses from the venue to the subway, but many participants were not aware of this arrangement, and there was no proper signage. From 17:00 until around 19:30 there were long taxi queues at the venue. It appears that the transport issues had not been properly addressed in the planning.  

**Suggestions:**  
- Transportation plans should be addressed early and confirmed in time.  
- Signage at the venue and detailed description in the WUF website of transport options. |
| Protocol matters and handling of VIPs | **Observations:** The reception of VIPs was not handled well. There was no system in place for effectively identifying and processing the reception and handling of VIPs especially on the first day and opening session. The criteria as for who qualifies as a VIP had not been identified in advance. A last minute decision of making UN-Habitat Directors VIPs was not a good sign of planning and management. The handling of VIPs drew energy and resources of senior staff of UN-Habitat. Allocation of responsibilities for VIPs was partly done last minute.  

**Suggestions:** |
- Identify protocol issues early in the planning, and allocate responsibilities accordingly.
- Establish clear criteria on who qualifies as a VIP.
- Decide early what benefits are provided to VIPs – access, car etc.
- Communicate VIP benefits clearly to VIPs and their delegations.
- Allocate VIP liaison responsibilities early.

### Accommodation

**Observation**
UN-Habitat negotiated a special rate at the Rio Othon Palace Hotel and Olinda Othon Hotel in Copacabana and pre-paid rooms for staff. Some sponsored participants were also accommodated in these hotels, yet upon arrival rooms were not always available. This experience was also observed in Nanjing, China. Daily transportation was to be provided to and from the venue at specific times. The host country organization team appointed a travel agency to facilitate room bookings for participants. Room reservations through this agency seemed expensive and cumbersome to many participants. Hotel bookings for staff did not function well, in the sense that many did not have rooms upon arrival as intended.

**Suggestions:**
- It might be better for UN-Habitat not to get involved in the hotel reservations for sponsored participants. UN-Habitat could provide DSA and participants find their own accommodation.

### Venue

**Observations:**
The venue at WUF5 was part of a revitalization project of port warehouses built in the 1870s, with five warehouses and four annexes. While the venue showed some early adjustment issues, the space was pertinent for use for a sustainable urbanization event. The City of Rio seized the opportunity of WUF5 to revitalize a run-down harbour area and renovated it into a modern conference facility, thereby bringing life and a renewed interest in that part of the city.

**Suggestions:**
- Invite architects to make innovative interventions at the venue.
- Display a clear floor plan on site next to a detailed programme.
- Improve the signage of facilities – bank, currency exchange, sim-cards, prayer room etc – as well as conference areas.
- Include more detailed information on venue services in the website.
- Provide lockers for participants – at a cost if needed.
- The names of the speakers should be visible at each session – at the doors and podium.
- To facilitate networking, the venue must have small spaces for side meetings and appointments (recurrent for WUFV). Delegations should be allowed to book, at a cost if needed.

### Tours and social programme

**Observation:**
Favella tour wanted. Organized this themselves. A lost opportunity that this was not offered as part of the programme. Given the important role. Better communication on social programme. – missed opportunity that favella tour was not offered in Rio.

**Suggestions**
- Offer organized tours before, during and after session relevant to the topic of the Forum.
- Organize social events in the evening, preferably more than one each evening so people can choose.
- Better communication on social events.
4.4 WUF5 participation and inclusiveness

As noted in the introduction, WUF as a public platform targets a diverse range of Habitat Agenda Partners. This section explores the degree to which WUF reached out to partners.

The attendance at the WUF5 was high. 22,269 people registered on-line. Given that there is no registration fee for the WUF sessions it was expected that a considerable interested number of people would register with a hope of securing sponsorship to attend the Forum. In the end, the WUF drew 10,634 people, about 60% of them from Brazil (compared to 48% of participants in WUF4 coming from China) and the remainder from 149 countries. These numbers exclude the organizing staff and volunteers, who were 3,161, as well as UN-Habitat staff. Attendance at WUF5 represented a 34% increase from attendance at WUF4 and a slight increase from WUF3. Figure 1 displays the trend of attendance from WUF I to WUF5.

Figure 1: Trend in WUF attendance, WUF1 through WUF5, absolute numbers

UN-Habitat’s activities target developing countries, with priority assigned to LDCs. This was emphasized by the GC resolution 21/2 paragraph 5 on MTSIP, requesting the Executive Director to initiate plans for turning ideas into action at regional and national levels in order to assist the developing countries to achieve their human settlement-related MDGs. Table 9 summarizes participation by country groups for WUF3, WUF4 and WUF5. In this context, WUF4 saw a shift in terms of majority of participants residing in emerging and developing countries, compared WUF3. This trend continued in WUF5, with 80% of the participants coming from emerging and developing countries. The proportion of participation from the least Developed Countries decreased from a reported 8% in WUF4 to 6% in WUF5.
Table 9: Participation by country groups WUF3, WUF4 and WUF5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Groups</th>
<th>WUF3</th>
<th></th>
<th>WUF4</th>
<th></th>
<th>WUF5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Countries</td>
<td>6,073</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging and Developing Countries</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5,846</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>8,558</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Developed Countries</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>10,121</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10,634</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MTSIP identifies strategic partnering as a renewed focus of UN-Habitat. Table 10 provides a profile of participants by organization affiliation, comparing WUF3, WUF4 and WUF5.

Table 10: Participation by organizational affiliation WUF3-WUF5, percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner category</th>
<th>WUF3</th>
<th></th>
<th>WUF4</th>
<th></th>
<th>WUF5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National government</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental organizations</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research institutions</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Governmental organizations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations/international</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If national and local governments representatives are combined, they count for 29% of all participants. NGOs and research institutions are also fairly represented by 15.9% and 15.7% respectively. There has been some variation between WUFs, the most significant being a drop in local government from 23% to 12%; a drop in private sector from 12.8% to 8.8%; a drop in inter-governmental organizations from 2.5% to 1.7%; a drop in United Nations and other international organization from 5.8% to 4.4%; an increase in participation by foundations and the media from 0.8% to 2.3% and 2.3% to 3.3% respectively of all participants in WUF4 and WUF5.

The level of female participation in WUF5 was 43%7. This was an increase from WUF4, where 35% of the participants were female, and a slight drop compared to WUF3 at 48%. Female and male participation is most equal among NGOs and research institutions, and

---

7 The figures include the event staff.
the lowest level of female participants are from national government, local government and the private sector.

In order to understand how UN-Habitat reaches out to potential participants, the survey explored from where participants learned about WUF. Dissemination of information about WUF5 was by a variety of sources. Table 11 shows the source of information about, WUF 3, 4 and 5.

Table 11: Source of information about WUF3-WUF5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of hearing from WUF</th>
<th>WUF3</th>
<th>WUF4</th>
<th>WUF5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I received a formal invite</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From previous Forums</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a network I belong</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29% of the respondents to the participant survey received a formal invitation, a drop from 36% of the previous WUF4. 28% got information from a network they belong and 19% from the Internet.

Some interviewees and key informants noted that although the conference publicity focused on public and key partners of UN-Habitat, there was insufficient targeting and marketing efforts towards some potential participants, to ensure that key players from the civil society, government and the private sector were encouraged to participate in WUF5. The lack of engagement of relevant private sector entities in WUF5 was highlighted.

UN-Habitat has also taken measures to reach out to relevant stakeholders beyond those that could participate in the session itself. The main tool to do so was the e-debates. The aim of the e-debates was to achieve an inclusive, broadened perspectives and engagement in preparation for the substantive sessions of the WUF5 especially the dialogues. These were pre-Forum on-line Internet discussions. Each dialogue topic that was discussed on-line had a respective moderator who prepared a summary report on the most important aspects discussed during the e-debate. The e-debate reports fed into discussions of dialogue topics during the WUF5.

Most key informants reported that the e-debates were effective in engaging people – particularly from developing countries. An internet-based approach to engage the partners in discussions should be encouraged for future WUFs.
4.5 Roles and outcomes of the World Urban Forum

WUF relevance, effectiveness and impact can be described in terms of how well it has performed certain roles. Such outcomes will look at the degree to which the Forum has contributed to benefits for participants, contributed to change, or have potential to effect change.

The typology which was presented in the introduction looked at outcomes related to the following roles: (i) A platform for advocacy; (ii) A platform for inclusive dialogue; (iii) A clearing house for knowledge and best practice; (iv) A platform for policy guidance; (v) A facilitator for networks and partnerships; and (vi) A mechanism for accountability.

Evidence from participant survey and key informant interviews suggest that WUF5 contributed to outcomes on all these roles, but that some of these outcomes were not as strong as they could be. The overall utility from the participant survey is presented in tables 12 and 13 below, which will be used in the discussion of outcomes below.

Table 12: Satisfaction with utility of WUF5, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing practical ideas that you may apply in your work</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to learn from interaction with others</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Likelihood to apply ideas, maintain networks and participate in next WUF, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How likely are you to:</th>
<th>Completely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply ideas learned at the Forum in your work</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain networks and contacts established at WUF5</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in the next World Urban Forum</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Around 70% of the participants were satisfied or very satisfied with the degree to which WUF provided practical ideas that may be applied in participants work, while 80% were either satisfied or very satisfied with the ideas that they had learned from others. An even higher percentage, above 90%, indicated that it was likely or very likely that they would apply ideas from the Forum in their work.
4.5.1 A platform for advocacy

By intent, WUF is a platform for influencing and advancing the urban agenda. For UN-Habitat, advocacy can be targeted at the global community at large. But WUF is also an opportunity for more targeted advocacy for specific issues at the regional, national and city levels.

There are examples of evidence that WUF has been used effectively as a platform for advocacy at the global level. In Barcelona at WUF2, a number of groups and delegations mobilized to put urban culture and heritage issues on international agenda. Key informants credited WUF to being one of the platforms that put cultural heritage issues on the urban agenda.

The evaluation found examples of participants that used WUF as a platform for advocacy towards a certain Ministry or local authority. Exposure to key messages and behind the scene facilitation made such advocacy and sensitization possible. Overall, the evaluation found that WUF performed relatively well in its advocacy role, but that the potential was significantly greater. For the advocacy role to be effective, it must be facilitated. Several key informants pointed to lost opportunities in this regard.

The visibility of youth at the Forum was seen by some as effective advocacy for integration of youth perspectives in policies. The launch of the State of the Urban Youth 2010-2011 report was noted as a mandate for engaging with youth.

Key speakers, chairs, moderators, media outreach must be prepared for advocacy with articulated messages to audiences. It was also raised that if WUFs are to be effective platform for raising profile of urbanization challenges to a broader audience, then current public concerns should be given priority and considerations in selection and formulation of the Forum themes and topics. Some of respondents to the survey and those interviewed indicated that messages, especially in the opening and closing sessions, were not clear, statistics were not effectively utilized and media messages were not “punchy” enough.

4.5.2 A platform for inclusive dialogue

WUF5 was a global partner event that brought together various stakeholders concerned with urban development issues. The urban actors, decision makers, researchers, NGOs, private sector, youth, women, etc., jointly interact and explore how to make urban towns and cities livable. This feature of bringing together diverse stakeholders was also highlighted by a number of participants, who could see WUF as a venue to interact with policy makers from their own country that they normally do not have access to. The Forum enabled UN-Habitat to remain open to new ideas and offered a voice to relevant stakeholders and practitioners who may not necessarily be part of the Governing Council of UN-Habitat, to advise UN-Habitat.

The dialogue and inclusive features of WUF5 were more prominent than in WUF4. The Dialogue sessions received relatively favourable feedback in allowing different groups a voice. For the Roundtables, a frequent feedback was the tendency towards monologues.
Better prepared and facilitated roundtables would allow for better real debate and meeting of different perspectives.

Even though WUF5 featured more inclusive debates than WUF4, many participants felt that WUF had become too focused on VIP treatment and were moving towards becoming a “Ministers” Forum, rather than a partner event of equals.

4.5.3 A clearing house for knowledge and best practice

WUF offers an opportunity to share knowledge and experiences, as well as practical solutions and best practices. Dialogues, open debates, networking events, exhibitions, trainings, special sessions and other events all provided knowledge and best practices to some degree. All types of events received scores above 70% in terms of usefulness, but in terms of presenting practical and concrete information and knowledge for application, the networking events and training events received the most favorable feedback. The exhibition was also highlighted as an interactive space for information and knowledge sharing. Feedback from participants consistently indicated that participants found the networking events to be particularly effective in contributing to WUF objectives. Around 80% of the respondents to the survey rated networking events as either useful or very useful.

Many participants felt that they did not get as much information as they had wanted simply because the printed programme format was difficult to understand and they had difficulty identifying relevant sessions.

Some key interviewed informants also felt that public concerns such as the economic crisis, unemployment, and natural disasters should have been better integrated into the topics and presentations. A positive example mentioned was the presentation of the Mayor of Malmö, Sweden, on his city’s success in reviving its economy and creating jobs by addressing the urban dimension of climate change.

For participants with an already high level of knowledge, the take home value in terms of knowledge may have been limited. However, some participants attend the WUFs with the expectation of learning about “state of the art”. Training events were successful and competition for training events by organizers is high, which underscores an underlying desire for more space for training and learning opportunities. 110 exhibits were interactive and some included demonstrations for sharing knowledge about urban sustainability issues.

Overall, knowledge and best practices were transferred at varying degree of achievement. More than half of the participants reported that they were satisfied with the way WUF provided practical ideas they can apply in their work. However, a recurrent comment provided in completed questionnaire was that many best practices presented were not practical enough for application. WUF appears to be more effective in sensitizing about best practice, but not going in-depth in a particular topic.
4.5.4 A platform for policy guidance

In addition to being a substantive forum, WUF is also a policy direction and political platform to bring together political and policy actors. Whereas the inter-governmental platform provided by the Governing Council allows for formal deliberations on the mandate and programme of work of UN-Habitat, the opportunity for governments to engage with non-governmental actors from their countries and across the world has the potential for shaping policy direction. Through the execution of 12 roundtables of ministerial, parliamentary, mayors, indigenous peoples, Habitat professions, urban researches, business people, youth, women’s groups, NGOs, Universities, the WUF5 was a venue for identifying strong and weak areas of policy.

The evaluation found evidence that policy examples presented at WUF inspired action elsewhere. There was evidence of integration of policy elements in Mexico based on presentations at WUF4. National Habitat Urban Forums that help coordinate an inter-sectoral policy response to urban challenges, have been established in a number of countries as an outcome of the previous WUF sessions (WUF1-WUF4). Even though WUF alone does not contribute to such policy change, it can provide inspiration to decision makers that are open for inputs.

4.5.5 A facilitator for networks and partnerships

With the number of participants and sessions alone, WUF can be a platform for networking and the building of partnerships. WUF5 provided participants and organizations an opportunity to “find” partners to join forces for further collaboration either indirectly through UN-Habitat or directly with each other. The WUFs thus afford a leverage in mobilizing networks of partners committed to the implementation of the Habitat Agenda.

A number of participants reported networking as the most valuable function of WUF. More than 95% of the respondents to the survey reported that they are likely to maintain new contacts they have established at WUF5. Through interviews, there is evidence that WUF helped to strengthen collaboration among and between professional networks (for example the Commonwealth Association of Planners), who used the WUF opportunity to meet and progress on their agenda. Professional networks typically used the opportunity to meet at WUF, saving travel costs for alternative meeting venues. Some national governments used the platform of WUF5 to organize their scheduled programmes with international partners who would otherwise have had to pay to travel to these countries.

Even though many participants found networking the most valuable aspect of WUF, both the survey and interviews pointed to the need for WUFs to better facilitate networking through meeting spaces, participant information and messaging systems.

In line with the Paris Declaration of Aid effectiveness, development partners and UN agencies have joined forces at WUF. A joint programme of UN-Habitat, UNEP and the World Bank (WB) on urban environment was conceived at WUF4 in Nanjing, China, and has become a main mechanism for coordination between the agencies for cities and climate change. The evaluation noted examples of donors who have “found” projects in
WUF, and grass root organizations that have effectively presented projects to partners for funding and collaboration.

Of real concern is the limited participation of the United Nations system in the Forum. The Forum is a UN event, coordinated by UN-Habitat. Except for UNESCO, there is not sufficient evidence to show that other UN agencies are attracted by WUF. For WUF5, only 4.4% of the participants came from the UN. UNESCO has used WUF as a platform based on a strategy focusing on the role of cities in the reduction of urban poverty and the social function of the built environment as cultural heritage. There are examples of units and country offices of UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA and WHO that have used WUF as a platform, but these agencies do not have policies that could facilitate participation.

4.5.6 An accountability mechanism

A potentially important role for WUF which is currently underutilized, is WUF as a platform to hold Habitat Agenda Partners accountable for the advancement of the urban agenda. As such WUF would facilitate the making of “deal” and compacts, pledges, and policy commitments, and then allow a broader set of actors participate in checking and assessing whether such commitments have been met.

A number of deals and commitments have been brokered and signed at WUF, but not all have been effectively communicated.

On partnerships various agreements in the formal of partnerships were signed with UN-Habitat including an agreement with Coca Cola at WUF5 to improve community access to safe drinking water and adequate sanitation in selected countries in Asia, Africa and South America.

Through the execution of the dialogues, the WUF5 identified strong and weak areas of policy and made commitments for actions to address urbanization challenges. A number of deals and commitments were booked and signed at WUF5. The challenge is lack of a system to check back at the next WUF what actually happened.

WUF could also work as accountability mechanism vis-à-vis partnerships. What can key actors do together? Regarding the “One UN” agenda, regarding how the UN/multilateral system can work together for the urban agenda, few concrete country example were presented. It was noted by a number of key informants that a dedicated session for what the UN system beyond UN-Habitat is doing to respond to urbanization could be an effective way of attracting a higher level of interest and participation among UN agencies, and hold the UN accountable for Delivering as One.
5. Conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

The World Urban Forum has become the world’s premier platform for interaction among urban development practitioners, policy makers, national and local governments, non-government actors, researchers, youth etc. to discuss urban issues. WUF5 attracted a large number of participants, 10,634 in total, from 149 countries, 80 percent of whom are from emerging and developing countries and a wide range of organizations. As such, UN-Habitat has developed WUF as a strong and recognized “product” with relatively little resources.

The evaluation has shown that WUF has performed relatively well on a number of expected outcomes. Overall, the evaluation found that WUF served as a platform for advocacy. There were examples of both successful advocacy to get issues on the global agenda, and advocacy of more specific nature. A number of participants reported networking as the most valuable function of WUF. More than 95% of the respondents to the survey reported that they are likely to maintain new contacts they have established at WUF5. There is evidence that WUF helped to strengthen collaboration among and between professional networks. The evaluation also found that WUF has worked fairly well as a clearing house for knowledge and best practice. Above 90% of the respondent to the survey indicated that they would likely or very likely apply ideas from the Forum in their work.

Despite the increase in profile and role of WUF, the evaluation findings show, however, that most of the potential roles of WUF were not fully capitalized on. For this to happen, a number of improvements need to be made. These mostly relate to the need for better planning internally in UN-Habitat – defining expected outcomes, developing indicators and setting targets, and budgeting to increase likelihood of the achievement of expected outcomes. Some issues related to planning and execution of WUFs were identified in the evaluation of previous WUFs and recommendations made are still pertinent for WUF5 and future sessions. Allocation of roles and responsibilities were to a large extent less clear for WUF4 than WUF5. For WUF6, detailed WUF plans with specific budget lines should be developed in a more transparent manner, spelling out core activities for which funding is secured and other activities where funding is needed from other sources, including donors. In the planning phase, the number and type of Habitat Agenda Partners UN-Habitat wish to target for WUF should be made more explicit, and outreach activities prioritized accordingly.

The process of selection of the themes for previous WUFs has not been strategic nor participatory. A critical analysis indicates topics are very similar and therefore tend to be repetitive. Selection of themes and topics for discussion should be given more serious thought on the basis of the degree to which they will generate new thinking, knowledge and solutions for current policy and priority issues affecting sustainable urbanization. Key speakers, chairs, moderators and convenors must be prepared for advocacy with articulated messages to audiences.

The format of WUF5 was an improvement from previous WUF sessions by providing more opportunity for participants to dialogue. Yet, the evaluation has found that a
number of session types need tightening to be more effective in contributing to expected outcomes. Practical suggestions have been made for future WUFs.

WUF has become a strategic opportunity of UN-Habitat, and with its limited resources, UN-Habitat should focus on how the event can contribute to positive outcomes. This would mean outsourcing and letting partners take over functions that has previously been conducted by UN-Habitat staff, allowing staff to focus on strategic functions. For example, arrangement for accommodation should be done by sponsored participants directly and not by UN-Habitat.

Facilities, logistics, and other services were to a large extent enabling. Nevertheless, the report has pointed out a number of shortcomings that can be improved for future sessions – earlier availability of programme and key information on the website, a more user friendly programme, better signage for services within the venue, improvements in the registration process, clearer criteria for the handling of VIPs, functional Internet connectivity at the venue, and improved information on transportation options.

5.2 Lessons learned

A number of lessons can be drawn from the WUF5:

- **The Forum remains host country dependant.** Although WUF is a United Nations conference and UN-Habitat has the mandate to drive this public Forum, WUF remains host country dependant. Most of the resources required to organize the Forum are provided by the host country, and consequently the host country continues to influence the overall flavour of the event.

- **Support to host country critical.** UN-Habitat still needs to plan to compensate for areas where the host country might not have capacity. Those involved in WUF5 planning and organization from the host country side recognized that they had little documentation guidance on planning of the event.

- **Defining a clear role of UN-Habitat in WUF.** If UN-Habitat is to achieve maximum benefits of WUFs and to monitor the results of involvement and how the WUF links with the MTSIP and Work Programmes, clear strategic direction needs to be set, defining the role it plays before and after the Forums.

- **Partners can take WUF a long way.** Cooperation with Habitat Agenda Partners has been successful from a number of aspects. Substantive aspects of the event, such as networking events, training events, special sessions etc., rely to a large extent on partners. The partnership aspect can be further capitalized on. However, this will still require strategic facilitation from UN-Habitat.

- **Plan early what can be planned early.** Some aspects of management and logistics were decided last minute. Critical executors lacked daily information especially on last minute changes. VIP handling and other issues caused unwanted surprises. The last minute insertion of the World Urban Campaign launch in the closing ceremony programme complicated things.
• **Accommodating interested individuals.** There is no conference that will ever be able to accommodate all interested individuals. However, innovative ways to make WUF as inclusive as possible should continue to be explored, including reaching audiences that can not physically participate in the Forum. E-debates were good tools for building awareness and interest in WUF, and sharing of experiences. National Urban Forums could facilitate involvement of a broader range of stakeholders in preparatory processes of WUFs. Other mechanisms for interested people to access the WUF sessions can be explored, for example through live internet broadcasts.

5.3 **Recommendations**

As the planning for WUF6 is already underway, some recommendations are pertinent for consideration during the WUF6 process, while others should be implemented with the view to improve on future WUFs. The following key recommendations have been identified from the WUF5 evaluation:

1. **Decide on the level of ambition for WUF7 and act accordingly**

UN-Habitat needs to take WUF to the next visionary level of effectiveness in delivery and impact. This can only be fully effected during WUF7 since plans for WUF6 are already underway. Adopt a more ambitious approach by considering taking the following decisions and actions: (i) appointment of a “strategist” (ii) outsourcing event organization and management functions to a specialized conference management agency, (iii) UN-Habitat to have a clear accountability function and use partners more strategically in substantive events.

2. **Decide and establish an internal management and coordination structure for the WUF**

The Executive Director should assign responsibilities for WUF to a lead officer and a small team to take responsibility for specific tasks. The lead office must have the authority to negotiate with the host country and take decisions as appropriate. The responsibilities of key officers should be clearly communicated to external parties. If a more ambitious route is followed for WUF7, a WUF “strategist” could be appointed, to lead the substantive aspects, and raise the performance of WUF to achieve its substantive goals.

3. **Define procedures for the selection of WUF themes**

Establish clear procedures for UN-Habitat to take a pro-active role vis-à-vis the host country for identifying strategic themes for WUF. This would involve identifying topics suitable for a public Forum linked to the MTSIP and work programme priorities.
4. Develop a detailed action plan with related budgets for each WUF

A detailed WUF plan should be developed for each WUF with expected accomplishments, indicators and targets, activities, timelines, responsibilities and related budgets. The plan should be developed in a transparent manner with clear links to the MTSIP and work programmes. All details should be included in the Plan, such as membership and support structure for an Advisory Group, security and IT services.

5. Produce a WUF Manual

The WUF Unit should take the lead in producing a Manual/Guidelines for WUF, to improve efficiency and effectiveness in planning, negotiations, and event management.

6. Allow UN-Habitat staff to focus on core and strategic roles

The preparation of the WUF report should be professionalized. Resources permitting, it should be outsourced to give more time to substantive staff to engage with partners. For substantive tasks that can be outsourced, the strategic role UN-Habitat staff should play, such as quality assurance, should be defined in the planning stage.

7. All UN-Habitat staff attending WUF should be assigned specific roles and functions they will be accountable for

Staff who participate in WUF sessions should have specific roles and responsibilities. Each Division, Branch, and unit should clearly link objectives of WUF activities with overall work plans of the unit and staff accountabilities. Delivery of the responsibilities should be defined in staff ePAS.

8. Implement logistical “must dos” for WUF6

- Detailed programme to be available at least 4 weeks before the event;
- Programme to be easier identified according to theme;
- Require all networking event organizers to submit a summary text to be posted on the Internet prior to WUF;
- Set up an electronic messaging system at WUF and communicate the presence of the system through the website and other means;
- Ensure that there is Internet connectivity in public areas in the Forum venue.

9. Plan for and allocate resources for evaluating WUF sessions

Plan for the evaluation of all future WUFs by allocating a budget line for evaluation.

10. Follow up and implement recommendations resulting from WUF evaluations

A management response to the WUF5 evaluation should be prepared, with a detailed action plan indicating the responsible offices/units to coordinate the implementation of the recommendations within specified timeframe.

1. Introduction

The World Urban Forum (WUF) was established in accordance with resolution 18/5 of 16 February 2001 of the Commission on Human Settlements. The resolution requested the Executive Director of UN-HABITAT to promote a merger of the Urban Environment Forum and the International Forum on Urban Poverty into a new urban forum to strengthening the coordination of international support to the implementation of the Habitat Agenda. Through the General Assembly resolution 56/206, it was decided that the Forum would be a "non-legislative technical forum in which experts would exchange views in the years when the Governing Council of UN-Habitat does not meet.

Since 2002, four sessions of WUF have been held. The first session was held in Nairobi, Kenya, in April 2002. The second session was held in Barcelona, Spain, in September 2004. The third session was held in Vancouver, Canada, in June 2006, while the fourth session was held in Nanjing, China, in November 2008. The fifth WUF session is scheduled to take place in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 22-26 March 2010 with the theme “The Right to the City – Bridging the Urban Divide”.

In the context of the Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan (MTSIP) for 2008-2013, WUF is a core global advocacy and normative activity to contribute to mobilizing a broad constituency of support for sustainable urbanization. This is well outlined in Focus Area 1: Advocacy, Monitoring and Partnership. In relation to the Work Programme and Budget, para. 15.10 of the work programme and budget for 2010-2011 highlights WUF as a significant mechanism for global advocacy on human settlements issues and cooperation with Governments and Habitat Agenda partners.

UN-Habitat’s Executive Director submits reports on WUF with recommendations to the biennial sessions of the Governing Council for consideration and appropriate action. In her statement on the outcomes of the WUF 4 to the CPR on 3 December 2008, the Executive Director emphasized that the WUF has evolved to become the World’s premier platform for interaction between policy makers, local government leaders, non-government actors and experts practitioners in the field of human settlements; in a world that has become increasingly urban, and one in which social inequality deepens more easily than it is bridged. She called on the CPR to revisit the structure and future of the World Urban Forum.

2. Background to the evaluation

All previous evaluations of the WUF sessions were assessed using a participant survey to determine satisfaction of the participants with the Forum. While useful, this tool did not provide sufficient information to UN-HABITAT management, governing bodies and other stakeholders on strengths and weaknesses planning, coordination and organizing of WUF processes as well as the usefulness of the different events to the participants.

During its 22nd session of April 2009, the Governing Council, through resolution 22/10, noting the growing interest in WUF, requested the Executive Director, in consultation
with the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR), to carry out a lessons-learned review of the four previous WUF sessions with a view to improving the planning, organization and effectiveness of future WUF sessions.

The review was carried out by an external consultant and resulted in 19 recommendations. The report was discussed in the regular session of the CPR 24 in September 2009. As a follow up, UN-HABITAT has taken several initiatives to better plan and improve coordination and collaboration for WUF 5.

Recommendation 9, on planning future WUF sessions using a results-based management approach, specifically requested expected results and success criteria to be clearly articulated in WUF planning documents, taking into account the MTSIP results-framework and the Work Programme. The report also recommends an early appraisal of WUF plans (evaluability assessments) to be carried out to ensure that WUF sessions can be monitored and evaluated effectively. These TOR, for evaluating WUF 5, have been designed to assess the planning, organizing, as well as results of WUF 5.

3. Purpose and objectives of evaluation

The main purpose of this evaluation is learning and accountability. The evaluation will be forward-looking in assessing UN-HABITAT’s planning, programming and organizing modalities to document experiences, results, and identify factors and lessons learned that will help to improve future WUFs.

4. Specific objectives of the evaluation

(i) Using the results-based management approach as the starting point, an evaluability assessment will be carried out to establish whether the plans and design of WUF 5 allow evaluating the intended achievements of the Forum. This will also include assessing roles and involvement of various stakeholders in planning, coordination, organizing and delivery of WUF 5.

(ii) To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the planning process, in relation to host country negotiations, budgeting, inclusiveness, venue and facility capacity, information to partners, and preparation of sessions with partners.

(iii) To assess the extent to which the internet-based debates (e-debates) have been effective in mobilizing partners for action on sustainable urbanization issues.

(iv) To assess the rationale and relevance of the WUF sessions and their contents, including dialogues, training events, networking events and side events.

(v) To assess the extent to which the organization of the forum in terms of plenary sessions, facilitation, translation, dialogue sessions, training sessions, exhibits hall, were conducive to sharing experiences and practical solutions on urbanization issues.

(vi) To assess the extent to which participants were satisfied with organizational matters and other logistics before and during the forum.
To assess achievements of WUF 5, including identification of best practices, strengthening networks, partnerships and policy direction.

To identify lessons learned and provide recommendations to UN-HABITAT for improving the planning, organizing and effectiveness of future WUFs.

5. **Scope and focus**

WUF is a global event under the auspices of UN-HABITAT. It is primarily a public forum at which participation is encouraged from diverse stakeholders. This evaluation will focus on assessing UN-HABITAT’s planning and coordination of the Forum, as well as some initial post-forum achievements.

6. **Methodology and approach**

The evaluation will apply a mixed method approach for three phases;

a) **Pre-session assessment**

An evaluability study will be conducted to assess UN-HABITAT’s WUF management documents relating to planning and implementation of the forum. This will include review of policy documents, the background documents to dialogues, networking, trainings, etc. Interviews with selected key staff of UN-Habitat will be conducted.

b) **Onsite data collection**

During WUF, a participant survey (see attached questionnaire to be administered in four languages) will be conducted to assess satisfaction and usefulness of WUF from participants’ point of view. Evaluation team members will observe the events and the exhibitions. In session documents will be reviewed. Interviews will be conducted with key informants whose roles place them in varying proximity to core activities relating to the planning, organizing and delivery of the Forum. They will include:

- WUF 5 planners and organizers (UN-HABITAT, and Host Country Secretariat);
- Representatives of governing, advisory and coordinating bodies (CPR, Conference services etc);
- Key stakeholders and organizers of specific events at WUF 5 (organizers of dialogues, networking events, training sessions, media, etc).

The evaluation team will work with the WUF Unit to identify the initial list of possible key informants, that will be supplemented by additional names based on evaluation team’s observations at WUF 5.

In addition to individual interviews, a group discussion with about 30 people is planned.

c) **Post-forum interviews and analysis**
As a follow-up to the Forum, additional interviews will be conducted in person, by telephone and email. Reports from various sessions will be analyzed. Review of UN-HABITAT’s registration and participant databases will be conducted to develop a profile of WUF 5 participants and non-participants.

7. Evaluation Team

WUF 5 evaluation is intended to be more comprehensive than previous WUF evaluations which consisted of participant surveys only. This evaluation will, therefore, require additional resources to support efforts of the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. Services of two consultants are suggested. These consultants should have extensive evaluation experience in programme evaluation. The consultants should also have in-depth knowledge of UN-HABITAT’s global mandate and its operations. They should also have proven expertise in facilitating different types of consultative and evaluative group discussions. In addition, a team of 20 volunteers will be recruited and trained and supervised by the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit to administer the participant survey.

8. Timeline for the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluability assessment, and review of relevant materials</td>
<td>1 - 18 March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer participant survey, observation of sessions and exhibition and conduct interviews during WUF</td>
<td>22-26 March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of UN-Habitat databases, data quality verification</td>
<td>29 March -30 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up interviews and analysis of information, including statistical analysis of survey data</td>
<td>29 March -30 April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of the evaluation report and debriefings</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation findings presented to the CPR as an information document</td>
<td>June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>July 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The purpose of evaluating the Fifth session of the World Urban Forum (WUF5) is to assess relevance, usefulness and organization of the Forum. The findings will also assist in improving planning future World Urban Forums. We would be very grateful if you could take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire.

1. Which country do you normally reside in?

2. Participant’s Gender: Male Female

3. What is your organizational affiliation? (please tick only one)
   - National government
   - Local government / Municipality
   - Parliamentarian
   - Private sector
   - Foundation
   - Non-governmental organization (NGO)
   - Media
   - Intergovernmental organization
   - United Nations
   - Academia / Research
   - Other (please specify):

4. How did you hear about WUF5? (please tick only one)
   - I received a formal invitation
   - From the previous WUF
   - From a network to which I belong
   - The Internet (e.g. UN-Habitat’s website, e-debates)
   - Media coverage (television, print, etc.)
   - I am an organizer of WUF5
   - Other: (please specify)

5. How satisfied were you with WUF5 organization in terms of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before the forum:</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of information on the Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful information on the Forum content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and content of WUF5 website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of obtaining visa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   | During the forum:                         |      |             |             |           |           |                |
   | Ease of obtaining the Forum badge         |      |             |             |           |           |                |
   | Quality of facilities (i.e. rooms, lighting, sound) |      |             |             |           |           |                |
   | Communication facilities (including Internet) |      |             |             |           |           |                |
   | Support and assistance available          |      |             |             |           |           |                |
   | Transportation logistics                   |      |             |             |           |           |                |
   | Ease of obtaining food and beverages      |      |             |             |           |           |                |
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6. How satisfied are you with WUF5 in terms of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance of topics and themes</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Undecide</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of keynote speakers and presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive information on topics and themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcasing Brazil’s achievements in urban policies and strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing practical ideas that you may apply in your work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to learn from interaction with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please rate the Forum sessions in order of their usefulness to you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening of the Forum</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialogues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Open Debates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundtables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Caucus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How likely are you to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apply ideas learned at the Forum in your work</th>
<th>Completely unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain networks and contacts established at WUF5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in the next World Urban Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Kindly tell us how you think the next WUF could be improved:

Please return your completed questionnaire to the designated evaluation booths.

Thank you for your participation!