Expert Group Meeting on Urban Indicators

Secure Tenure, Slums and Global Sample of Cities

Monday 28 to Wednesday 30 October 2002
Nairobi, Kenya

REVISED DRAFT REPORT
(Consolidated comments of Shelter Branch, 28 November 2002)

Organised by

UN-HABITAT

Urban Secretariat &
Shelter Branch
in close collaboration with
United Nations Statistic Division and the
Cities Alliances

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This Report summarizes the proceedings of the Expert Group Meeting on "Urban Indicators: Secure Tenure, Slums and Global Sample of Cities," held from 28 – 30 October 2002, in Nairobi, Kenya. Organized by UN-HABITAT in close collaboration with the United Nations Statistic Division and the Cities Alliance, the EGM assembled 35 international professionals as well as staff members of the Urban Secretariat and the Global Division of UN-HABITAT.

Participants fulfilled the stated objectives of the EGM: to contribute to the development of indicators for the "Cities without Slums" or "Target 11" of the Millennium Development Goal 7, "Ensure Environmental Sustainability." Assembling in small working groups for two days, participants accomplished this objective first by formulating an operational definition for security of tenure and for slums. They produced a series of sub-indicators for the purposes of measuring security of tenure and slums as defined, and establishing composite indices and "meta-indicators." A third working group recommended ways the United Nations report on progress achieved on the Cities without Slums target by specifying a global sample of cities and related methods of data collection and analysis.

Through this process, the EGM adopted 5 indicators to measure "improvement in the lives of 100 million slum dwellers by the year 2020," as specified in the Cities without Slums MDG Target 11. These are:

- Proportion of urban population with sustainable access to an improved water source
- Proportion of urban population with access to improved sanitation
- Proportion of urban population with access to secure tenure
- Proportion of urban population with durable housing units
- Proportion of urban population with adequate living area

UN-HABITAT agreed in future to modify these indicators and to refine the definitions of secure tenure and slums through consultations with EGM participants and their related networks of monitoring professionals. Through its Global Urban Observatory, UN-HABITAT agreed to advance monitoring of MDG targets, and to strengthen the capacity of national statistical and monitoring institutions. Towards this end, UN-HABITAT has subsequent to the EGM, produced a set of guidelines for operational definitions for household surveys and censuses on secure tenure and slums that is included as an appendix to this Report.

While the focus of the EGM was on urban indicators, the meeting also contributed to analysis, advocacy and technical co-operation necessary for Member States to realise the MDG targets. Participants sought clarity on the operational definitions of indicators and by doing so, underscored the political dimension of tenure and slums, and reasserted the need for a rights-based approach improving the lives of 100 million slum dwellers.

1.0   Introduction

1.1   Millennium Development Goals and UN-HABITAT

In the 90s, various UN global conferences set up a number of important global development goals and targets. The list of these goals and targets became known as the International Development Targets. In September 2002, the General Assembly adopted the "Millennium Declaration" signed by 189 countries, including 147 Heads of State. The Declaration outlines peace, security and development concerns including environment, human rights and governance. The Declaration mainstreams a set of inter-connected and mutually reinforcing development goals into a global agenda. Recently, the sets have been merged under the designation of "Millennium Development Goals" (MDG).

In order to assist Member States realise the eight goals of the Millennium Declaration, the United Nations System has set numerical targets for each goal. Further, it has selected appropriate indicators to monitor progress on the goals and attain corresponding targets. A list of 18 targets and more than 40 indicators corresponding to these goals ensure a common assessment and appreciation of the status of MDGs at global, national and local levels.

The United Nations System assigned UN-HABITAT the responsibility to assist Members States monitor and gradually attain the "Cities without Slum" Target, also known as "Target 11." One of the three targets of Goal 7 "Ensure Environmental Sustainability," Target 11 is:

> *"By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of 100 million slum dwellers".*

In an effort to advance the monitoring of this target, UN-HABITAT has undertaken the task of defining and articulating relevant indicators, in consultation with activists, practitioners and policy makers with demonstrated experience reducing urban poverty. The Agency is also keen to collect data globally in order to generate scientific figures and estimates that quantify the magnitude and characteristics of slums as a necessary first step for formulating policy recommendations and actions at the global level. Future steps are envisioned to assist Members States with advocacy instruments, such as the Global Campaigns for Secure Tenure and on Urban Governance, and with technical co-operation on slum upgrading and urban management.

The United Nations system initially assigned two indicators for Target 11. These are 'secure tenure' and 'improved sanitation', indicators 31 and 32 respectively. At its January 2002 meeting in New York, however, the UN-Inter-Agency Development Group (UNDG) on MDGs expressed concern that tenure and sanitation do not adequately constitute a complete response to the target of 'improving the lives of 100 million slum dwellers'. UN-HABITAT has therefore also proposed to develop a definition and an operational measurement of slum improvement in order to respond more directly to Target 11.

The task of defining indicators for Target 11 is particularly important, as there is no internationally recognised operational definition of *slums*. Other notions are used instead to document the existence of slums: percentage of population living in informal settlements, the durability, quality and size of housing units, the level of basic services, etc. The same applies for *security of tenure*, indicator 31. Hence the need for global definition of the 'slum' and its underlying concepts, as well as a global definition of secure tenure.

1.2   Purpose and Objectives of the Expert Group Meeting

The purpose of the Expert Group Meeting (EGM) was to make operational the process of monitoring the Millennium Development Goal 7, Target 11 by developing internationally recognized definitions of indicators, and outlining a strategy for their application.

The stated objectives of the Expert Group Meeting were to:

▪ Develop a network of experts on the issue of secure tenure and slums which can be consulted by UN-HABITAT for expert advise;

▪ Develop operational definitions and composite indicators of the terms 'secure tenure' and 'slum' which can be used at the city and intra-city level for monitoring slums and tenure conditions worldwide;

▪ Engage countries in monitoring slums and secure tenure in order to generate policy actions for improving the lives of slum dwellers, as recommended in the "Cities Without Slums" Millennium Development Goal, through the generation of international definitions, sub-indicators and guidelines.

More specifically, the objectives of the EGM were to:

▪ Review and recommend a global definition of secure tenure;

▪ Review and recommend a global definition of slums;

▪ Review and recommend a sampling method for a global representative sample of cities and a sub-sample of cities;

▪ Review the definitions of urban areas used for global comparisons.

1.3 Organization of this Report

The Report is organized into three parts. The following section, Section 2, summarizes the two plenary presentations and includes highlights of the ensuing discussions. These include the introductory presentations in plenary by the host institution – UN-HABITAT – and subsequent presentations in plenary by participating scholars and practitioners.

Section 3 captures the recommendations and debates that took place in the three working groups on security of tenure (group 1), slums and informal settlements (group 2), and global city sampling (group 3) respectively. An effort is made in this section to present first the key recommendations, and thereafter to elaborate on seminal points of debate that brought about these outcomes.

The final section of the Report, Section 4, provides the key points raised in the concluding remarks presented in plenary. It also outlines the follow up actions agreed to by participants of the EGM. These include the development of guidelines for monitoring Goal 7, Target 11, that have subsequent to the meeting been prepared in draft form by UN-HABITAT and are provided here as an Appendix to the Report.

2.0 Main Discussions in Plenary

2.1 Plenary: Background and proposed directions

Eduardo Moreno and **Marjolein Benschop** presented a paper on *"Defining 'secure tenure': background and proposed definition."* The paper deals with existing and proposed definitions for secure tenure and proposes an index to measure secure tenure.

In her presentation on *"Defining 'slums': background and proposed definition",* **Christine Auclair** suggested that there was a need to develop a generic definition of slums that encompasses local variations. Two different indices for the monitoring of slum population were presented, including a proposed slum index, which is a composite index consisting of four indicators (secure tenure, access to water, access to sanitation, permanency of structure).

Harvey Herr illustrated the need to generate a statistically representative sample of cities for global monitoring. The sample frame contained all cities over 100,000 inhabitants[1]. The final sample would consist of over 400 cities and allow regional breakdowns for 10 regions.

2.2   Summary of questions and clarifications

Participants raised a number of issues in response to the paper presentations, generating rejoinders from the panelists. Some highlights of the debate were as follows.

Slums are an urban phenomenon, which explains the emphasis given to urban areas when monitoring slums. The attempts to define slums moved from defining area to defining slum dwellers at the household level. It is still necessary to define slums in terms of geographical areas for sampling purposes. It was suggested that there should be an effort to include the views of the communities who live in slums into the definition.

The paper prepared for the EGM do not adequately include the housing rights approach and process indicators. However, UN-HABITAT in collaboration with the OHCHR, have recently prepared a draft report on housing rights indicators that was distributed to all participants in advance. The point system introduced to measure secure tenure did not convince everyone. It was suggested to use direct indicators instead of indices, to avoid subjective measures, and to establish a link to existing databases. The secure tenure index and the slum index are not complementary. The secure tenure index was rather a first attempt in response to the MDG monitoring requirement, the slum index an enhancement.

Concerning the Millennium Declaration, it was clarified that the exact placement of the slum target has been a source of contention, as have other targets. The slum target originally featured under Goal 1, "Development and Poverty Eradication," yet attempts were made afterwards to eliminate it. Subsequently, a new list of 8 goals and 18 targets was devised (the Millennium Development Goals), with the slum target featuring under Goal 7, "Environmental Sustainability." There is a constituency of Member States behind the slum goal, despite bureaucratic resistance and attempts to reduce its significance or eliminate it.

For the data collection, UN-HABITAT should consider precisely what institutions and organizations at the country level are ultimately responsible for collecting the data. Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) are good instruments, whereas National Statistical Offices (NSO) are often weak on housing issues. A gender perspective should be developed for the data collection, as women and men often have different housing rights. More research should be done on this issue in collaboration with OHCHR, UNIFEM and others.

2.3   Plenary: Participants presentations[2]

In his panel presentation, **Robert Johnston** outlined his paper *on "The overall context of MDG measurement."* He emphasized that the Millennium Development Goals were not a straitjacket for country level monitoring. Rather, the short list of goals provides the basic framework for countries to set their own priorities. He remarked that the international indicators are designed for international monitoring.

Alain Durand-Lasserve in his presentation amplified key aspects of his paper entitled *"Designing a security of tenure indicator: methodological and conceptual issues."* The approach integrates information on eight major areas collected at four different levels (settlement, city, national, global). The major areas are tenure status, tenure status associated rights, compliance with local norms and standards, peoples perception of tenure insecurity, legal framework, land records, public policies towards eviction, and market pressure.

---

[1] Are we saying that all cities (in the world) over 100,000 inhabitants are in the sample frame or do we mean that: all cities in the sample frame are over 100,000 inhabitants?
[2] The presentation by Joe Flood on "Operationalising Slum Measurement" was cancelled for logistical reasons.

Harvey Herr presented the *Slum Index as a methodology for slum assessment*. The Slum Index is based on categorical principal component analysis and optimal scaling. It allows for the determination of the main deciding factors for households to qualify as slum households using household level data.

2.4   Summary of questions and clarifications

The key discussion points raised by participants were varied. It was acknowledged that, since "informality" and "urban poverty" overlap to a large extent, there is need to develop a typology of tenure status. Participants warned, however, that the typology should not be regarded as a continuum since different tenure types can co-exist at the same time.

Several clarifications where presented and there was active debate on the issue of evictions. There are fewer forced evictions now compared to the early 1990s but recently evictions have been on the rise again. In Latin America, evictions are not so much directed against dwellings but are work related (e.g. street vendors who are evicted from their places of work). In some cases, people engaged in urban agriculture have been evicted, in other cases people were encouraged to undertake urban agriculture on vacant land in order to prevent occupation by squatters. Perceived threat of evictions is an important issue as people who feel less threatened by eviction experience a real improvement in their quality of life. Besides being threatened by evictions, even more people are affected by a gradual deterioration of their living conditions.

Participants expressed concerns over the practicalities of monitoring at country level. It was asked how CBOs, local governments and NGOs could be integrated into efforts to monitor slums, rather than relying exclusively on national statistical organisations (NSO). Participants suggested that local organisations focus on information that they have the capacity to collect, and urged for strategies to build the capacity of local actors collect data at the national level.

Some people may not want improved security of tenure, as this often leads to rising rents or displacement through forces of gentrification associated with rapid regularisation and slum upgrading. On the other hand, it was questioned whether displacement of this kind, also known as "market evictions" should always be seen as something negative. A solution could be to introduce a time span before land allocated to squatters can be sold, instead of giving a freehold title, immediately, and or agreements about sale/purchase through land trusts.

Participants discussed the emerging institutional infrastructure of the MDG. The Millennium Campaign has a strong advocacy function, with a focus on implementation. The Millennium Project is largely organised by UNDP. It comprises 10 task forces, among them one is dedicated to housing and settlement issues. There is also a Millennium Communication Programme responsible for the dissemination. MDG country reports bring together different actors at the national level to report on development issues in a specific country. The main objective is to achieve a wide distribution for advocacy purposes. UNDP, through UN country teams, assists countries in that effort. General capacity building at the national level is necessary to help NSO to undertake MDG monitoring. Besides NSOs, the different statistical services could be partners (e.g. statistical services within ministries of education or health).

Several questions concerned the Categorical Principal Component Analysis (CPCA) used for the slum index. The results did not conform to the previously used tenure status as a determining variable for the definition of slums, which forms part of secure tenure.

The CPCA is particularly strong in sifting of variables, which are meaningful for slums, and finding the distances between values. The slum index, however, is not a slum definition but rather a methodology, the result of which can be used to arrive at a definition, among other purposes. The key issue is to which variables and categories this methodology is applied, as this determines part of the outcome. Doubts were raised about which cities could afford such detailed data collection efforts, whether such data at the household level was available and accessible, and whether policy makers

would be able to use the results. A similar methodology has already been used by Colombia to determine welfare recipients.

3.0   Main Recommendations

Over the course of two days, the participants assembled in three working groups. They succeeded in generating recommendations for the purpose of advancing monitoring of MD Goal 7, Target 11, "Cities Without Slums." The main recommendations are presented in this Section. The more detailed discussions within the working groups that brought about these decisions are captured in Section 4 below.

3.1   Security of Tenure (Working Group 1)

The working group recommended the following operational definition:

> **Secure Tenure is the right of all individuals and groups to effective protection by the State against unlawful evictions.**

The working group recommended that the indicator "security of tenure" should be a composite indicator comprising five sub-indicators. These sub-indicators should attempt to measure five corresponding aspects of tenure security.

- **National provisions against forced evictions**
- **Effective protection against forced evictions**
- **women's equal right to secure tenure**
- **Perception (at settlement/slum level) on secure tenure**
- **People affected by forced evictions in the past 5 years (national and city level)**

Building on the above operational definition and component sub-indicators, the working group called for the development of questions that will enable enumerators of sample surveys (city and settlement level) gather data on security of tenure. The questions should spell out clearly what the sub-indicators will measure in practical terms (see draft below section 4.1). The working group recommended criteria to select and narrow down questions/sub-indicators for the composite indicator/index on security of tenure.

3.2   Slums and (Working Group 2)

The generic definition or concept of slums recommended by the working group is.

> **A slum is a contiguous settlement where the inhabitants are characterized as having inadequate housing and basic services. A slum is often not recognised and addressed by the public authorities as an integral or equal part of the city.**

The working group recommended that the adequate monitoring of Target 11 required the development of a slum index or meta-indicator. Like the secure tenure composite indicator, the slum

index consists of component parts or sub-indicators. The working group recommended five components, reflecting conditions that characterize slums:

- **Insecure residential status**

- **Inadequate access to safe water**

- **Inadequate access to sanitation and other infrastructure**

- **Poor structural quality of housing**

- **Overcrowding**

The working group recommended a draft outline for the slum index. It includes a series of indicators and corresponding descriptors (defining questions) for each of the five components of the slum index. The working group recommends that this index be developed further through networks of activists, policy makers, scholars and practitioners.

3.3   Global City Sample (Working Group 3)

The working group provided several recommendations for global monitoring for the UN reporting system. These are:
- Global monitoring should include reporting at global and regional levels, the latter in accordance with the United Nations Statistical Division list of regions.
- The sampling method to be used should be Probability Proportional to Size (PPS), with further testing to determine the effects on regional representation.
- Cities reporting to the Urban Indicator Program of UN-HABITAT be included in UN reporting to make use of time-series data.

Three additional recommendations of the working group were:

- Use the boundaries of urban agglomerations where they exist and where not use "city proper" boundaries for data collection
- Establish in-depth analysis of intra-city differentials using the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) and other household level surveys for advocacy, policy and technical cooperation – as well as monitoring
- Strengthen capacity of institutions to collect data building on LIF and GUO networks, especially in cities with operational DHS.

4.0 Working Group Discussions and Elaboration

4.1 Working Group on Security of Tenure

The Working Group two "Secure Tenure" was composed of around 16 participants from 10 countries coming from different sectors: academic and research centres, development agencies, government institutions at central and local level, human rights institutions and private consultancy firms.[3]

Based on the overall objectives of the EGM, the **Secure Tenure Group** pursued four main specific objectives:

- Develop a network of experts on secure tenure, which can be consulted by UN-HABITAT for expert advice.

- Develop a global operational definition of the term 'secure tenure' that can be used as a meta-indicator for monitoring slums and tenure conditions world-wide.

- Propose a set of sub-indicators for the development of a composite index on secure tenure at city and intra-city levels, establishing global parameters and integrating some of the local variations.

- Prepare a list of questions (units of enumeration) for data collection purposes as per the selected sub-indicators.

The participants of the group appreciated the background paper prepared by UN-HABITAT and observed that this document is a good basis to initiate discussions on this issue.

The opening statements[4] and first presentations in the plenary[5] emphasized the complex and elusive nature of the secure tenure concept. The experts' opinion was that due to its political dimension and regional diversity, the definition should be as generic as possible. This would allow global acceptance and comparisons, using indicators that reflect local variations, specific trends and dynamics.

This dialectical relationship between the global and the local context should guide the work of the experts. One should bear in mind that the main objective is to create an operational definition (a meta-indicator) with simple measurement tools (sub-indicators) that allow to track progress in the achievement of the Millennium Development Goal for Cities Without Slums.

The experts agreed that within the framework of MDGs, secure tenure is characterized by the following key features:

- To-date, no operational definition for secure tenure has been agreed-on or recognized internationally, making difficult to report on the MDG (Goal 7, Target 11);
- Existing definitions fail to distinguish between the various tenure types (or categories), and they do not provide a satisfactory response to the need for operational measurement of secure tenure.
- Security of tenure is influenced by the conditions and perceptions of tenure that vary according to actors (inhabitants, public institutions, decision-makers, etc.) and different contexts, and also over time.
- Security of tenure is very relative concept, therefore it is extremely difficult to provide a clear-cut response on whether a particular tenure status is safe or not.
- Measurement and analysis of tenure types and the respective degrees of security have not yet been incorporated in mainstream monitoring instruments.

---

[3] Refer to Annex 1, List of Participants.
[4] Opening address by the UN-HABITAT Deputy Executive Director and presentations by the Chief of the Shelter Branch (Global Campaign on Secure Tenure), the representative of the Cities Alliance Secretariat (Monitoring the 'Cities without Slums' Initiative) and the Chief of the Urban Secretariat (EGM Objectives in the Context of the Millennium Development Goals). .
[5] In this Plenary the Secure Tenure Background Paper was presented by GUO and the proposed directions of the EGM were discussed.

The expert-group concluded that this is due basically to the fact that secure tenure is a concept that relates to a wide range of national and local scenarios defined by very diverse legal, social and economic contexts.

4.1.1 Summary of discussions

<u>Towards an operational definition of Secure Tenure</u>

There was a relative wide variation of opinions in the discussion on the definition of secure tenure, which followed the proposed definition in the background paper prepared by Habitat. The chairperson suggested to have a round of comments and proposed definitions by the experts, in order to arrive at a definition agreed-on through an interactive and a participatory mechanism.

Along with the proposed definitions, the participants raised several issues supporting their arguments and positions. The major points discussed were the following:

- The secure tenure measurement/definition should be based on a human rights approach, as stated in the Habitat Agenda and ratified in several international Covenants.
- There was a general agreement that secure tenure should not be understood narrowly as a question of access to land and one roof. Rather, it should be seen as a platform of development, with long-term implications in terms of security, housing investments, possibility of planning and other social and economic effects.[6]
- In this sense, the group underlined the availability of basic services, materials, facilities and infrastructure as a key element of secure tenure and adequate housing.
- The question of "access" to secure tenure and permanence was raised by the group, and whether this notion should be considered at the individual or household levels
- It was also indicated that the concept of secure tenure encompasses protection from unhealthy locations due to different forms of environmental hazards that increase vulnerability of inhabitants.

Despite these fundamental considerations, majority of the experts agreed that in order to be simple and operational, the selection of sub-indicators should neither be based on the long-term aspect of the concept, nor on the more integral approach to secure tenure. This group suggested that the definition and the measurement should focus on "**evictions**", which is the extreme version of the general harassment of probably the majority of people who are currently involved in providing themselves with one of the most basic necessities of life.[7]

The most prominent violation of housing rights facing the urban poor today is the practice of eviction without legal process.[8]

This position was supported by a large number of participants, who argued that the sub-indicators should be designed along this line. Albeit other opinions that recommended a wider approach to secure tenure, a tentative consensus emerged to construct sub-indicators based on this legal aspect of security (or more precisely insecurity). The group pointed out that the legal aspect of security refers to the possibility of everyone enjoying legal protection from forced evictions, harassment and other similar threats.

This aspect, which is directly connected to the right to adequate housing, was used by some experts to elaborate further the idea that the States should be responsible for granting security of tenure to the

---

[6] The concept paper of the Campaign on ST defines security of tenure, highlighting its elements and strategic values as an entry point to shelter policy, urban upgrading and participatory urban governance (UN-HABITAT? 2002).

[7] According to the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE), some 14 million people are currently threatened by planned forced evictions.

[8] Forced evictions have the effect of destroying social and survival networks, impacting negative or destroying the assets and life savings of those evicted,, increasing their cost of living. UN-HABITAT, concept paper Global Campaign on Secure Tenure, 2002.

inhabitants. This means that they need to take the necessary steps to prohibit the practice of arbitrary forced evictions, implementing in parallel other measures that confer or increase security of tenure, especially the tenure rights of the poor.

Along this line, it was emphasized that the States must ensure that all forms of housing discriminations are prohibited and women's rights (i. e. inheritance, access to property, etc.) are respected.

Tentative conclusion at this stage of the discussions

The Chairperson categorized the definitions proposed by the group, assembling them into various key clusters: a) individual rights versus households, b) basic service delivery; c) the question of forced evictions; d) the protection of the State, etc.

One of the experts proposed a consolidated definition that was revised and slightly reformulated by the group. The debate was not fully resolved during this meeting, but a consensus appeared to accept it as a working definition:

> **Secure Tenure is the right of all individuals and groups to effective protection by the State against unlawful evictions.**

It was decided that a preamble placing this definition within the context of international human rights law be drafted. In addition, a footnote on the definition will be added that will specify relevant instruments and legal interpretations given by UN-bodies.

There was no consensus on the use of the world "***unlawful***". Some members of the working group argued that "***forced evictions***" was more appropriate.[9]

Discussions on the proposed Sub-indicators on Secure Tenure

The experts noted that presently secure tenure information is gathered through the collection and analysis of broad indicators (i. e. shelter indicators), which provide complementary measures for a summary diagnostic of the sector, but not on the secure tenure concept itself.

In the absence of an operational definition and related mechanism to measure secure tenure, UN-HABITAT proposed an index (as a proxy measure) to quantify the phenomenon of slums. This constitutes an intermediate response and a temporary substitute to the measurement of secure tenure.[10] However, the expert group pointed out that it does not provide a direct quantification of this concept.

The EGM agreed that a clear linkage should be established between the meta-indicator and its related sub-indicators, that is, between the definition and the mechanisms for its measurement. For that purpose, it was proposed that the notion of "unlawful/forced evictions" should be the basis for the elaboration of the proposed sub-indicators.

The group suggested that the information should be gathered both at national and settlement levels, including the possibility to measure the perception of households and individuals. It was also recommended that among the proposed sub-indicators a provision should be made to measure women's equal right to secure tenure.

---

[9] Although this is a direct reporting of the debate, I disagree with this view that opposes any forced eviction: Forced evictions may be sometimes carried out for the benefit of slum dwellers (in case of imminent risk for example) without being unlawful! In this case we should not oppose it (considering of course that we need to elaborate more on the need for information, dialogue, relocation, etc.)
[10] refer to Background Paper 1 and the report on Slums.

A consensus was reached and an outline was proposed along the lines described above. A first document was presented in the Plenary by the Rapporteur (refer to Box 1, page 8).

PROPOSED SUB-INDICATORS TO BE USED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPOSITE INDICATOR/INDEX

1.   National provisions against forced evictions
- Have the relevant international human rights instruments been complied to?
- What constitutional and other legal provisions against forced evictions exist?
- What instruments/mechanisms (incl. alternative tenure systems favorable to urban poor) are in place for the implementation of such provisions?
- How are issues of compensation, restitution, consultation etc. (in case of eviction) safeguarded in constitutional/legal provisions?
- What relevant policy frameworks exist?

2.   Indicator to measure "effective protection" against forced evictions
- Number of Legal Aid Centres assisting victims of evictions and costs per court case;
- Number of victims of evictions, % of processed cases, % of cases won and % of cases in appeal; number of victims of evictions who could not access court and reasons they could not access;
- If Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms exist, how many slum dwellers have turned to ADR as opposed to formal court system? In how many cases were they successful?
- Number of mass actions and advocacy against forced evictions by civil society groups

3.   Indicator measuring women's equal right to secure tenure
- existing legislation recognizing women's equal right to secure tenure, incl. the right to inherit;
- do customs/customary laws exist that deny women's equal right to secure tenure?
- does the Constitution or another law prohibit the application of customs/customary laws if they discriminate against women?;
- number/percentage of women co-sharing tenure (e.g. joint ownership);

4.   Perception (at settlement/slum level) on secure tenure
- Do you feel you have secure tenure?
- Do you feel a treat of eviction in the following … years?
- Who is/are the primary agent(s) of eviction?
- Do women enjoy secure tenure (question to be asked to both men and women)?

5.   Number of people affected by forced evictions in the past 5 years (national and city level)
- Number of individuals (disaggregated by gender and age) that have been affected by evictions;
- Number of evictions that have occurred in the past 5 years;
- What procedures were used in the eviction process?

4.1.2   Recommendations on Defining Secure Tenure and Formulating Indicators

An agreed definition on Secure Tenure as meta-indicator

During the Plenary the definition that was initially retained and presented above[11] was contested by a group of experts, who argued that:

- Being limited to the question of evictions, the definition does not permit a complete diagnosis on the nature of secure tenure. Consequently, the data collection systems will tend to underestimate the phenomenon.
- The agreed definition should include language that combines measures to stop eviction with measure to promote secure tenure.

Some of the experts pointed out that the definition of the Secure Tenure Campaign was internationally recognized and accepted by Member States and different Habitat's partners. They emphasized that there was no need for a new definition, since the existing one could be used for the elaboration of a first draft on an authoritative document on this issue.

The debate was not fully resolved during this meeting, but a consensus appeared to emerge that the definition in the background paper (Secure Tenure Campaign) as specified below should be considered in the formulation of the components of the indicator.

> "Security of tenure describes an agreement between an individual or group on land and residential property which is governed and regulated by a legal and administrative framework. The security derives from the fact that the right of access to and use of the land and property is underwritten by a known set of rules, and that this right is justiciable. The tenure can be effected in a variety of ways, depending on constitutional and legal frameworks, social norms, cultural values and, to some extent, individual preference." (UNCHS 1999).[12]

Finally, during the plenary, a large number of participants **recommended** to maintain the shorter definition, as agreed before which not only addresses critical issues like property rights, tenure types and cultural specificity, but also it makes reference to the fundamental aspect of insecurity (exclusion) due to its right-based approach. They supported this position with the following arguments:

- A definition including other key issues (i. e. property rights, legal system) will contribute to mobilize a wide range of actors such as civil society, communities the general public and the media in debating national and local progress towards this target.
- The participants agreed that appropriate indicators should follow the agreed definition, translating them into operational mechanism of measurement.
- The construction of these sub-indicators should combine quantitative and qualitative data (the present definition/measurement is basically based on qualitative data), integrating different levels of data collection.

It was therefore agreed in general by the group to present the definition of secure tenure as follows:

---

[11] Secure Tenure is the right of all individuals and groups to effective protection by the State against unlawful evictions.

[12] A person or household can be said to have secure tenure when they are protected from voluntary removal from their land or residence, except in exception circumstance, and then only by means of known and agreed legal procedure, which must itself be objective, equally applicable, contestable and independent. UN-HABITAT, concept paper Global Campaign on Secure Tenure, 2002.

> **Secure Tenure is the right of all individuals and groups to effective protection by the State against unlawful evictions.**

Proposed Sub-indicators to be used for the development of a composite Indicator Index

The experts agreed that lack of data on cities in developing countries and slum dwellers in particular, poses constraints on the type of analysis, which could be carried out. Sub-indicators should therefore be as simple as possible, with different alternative mechanisms to approximate such data, using country-wide and households surveys and other collecting strategies.

Based on the fact that different individuals in the same household may have different levels of security of tenure (i. e. co-owners, spouses, etc.), the Working Group recommended that as much as possible the information should be desegregated (collected and analyzed) at individual level and not at household level.

The expert group agreed that the methodology or criteria for the preparation of indicators should be based on the following indicative table:

Criteria ⟶	*Political/policy*	*Measurable*	*Consistency with Census*
Indicator 1			
Indicator 2			
Indicator 3			
Indicator n.			

*The meta-indicator "Secure Tenure" could be therefore calculated on the basis of a **composite Index** as follows:*

Indicator ⟶	*Factor*	*Weight*
Indicator 1	*.33*	
Indicator 2		
Indicator 3		
Indicator n.		

Composite Index

Qualitative data (i. e. institutional analysis) and supplementary indicators should be collected at the country level in order to get a complete diagnosis on the nature of laws relating to tenure rights, inheritance and eviction. The national and city level information should be enriched through households surveys and other collecting tools to measure the perception of inhabitants.

The EGM commended to have a limited number of quantitative sub-indicators, referred to the "*proportion of urban population with access to…. ",* which could be combined with qualitative information collected at local and neighborhood levels.

Countries and cities should adapt and operationalise these sub-indicators for tracking achievements in improving secure of tenure practices. The **sample** should be designed in such a manner that it measures **intra-city differentials** that need to be as stratified as possible.

The EGM recommended that National and Local Governments and their partners take the task of selecting which of the types proposed above are prevalent, relevant and most suitable to the local and

national situations. While objective criteria should be followed for such assessment, in-depth practical knowledge and perceptions should be taken into account.

The expert-group recommended inclusion of the proportion of urban population who have documents as **evidence of secure tenure**, without specifically referring to the tenure type of land/residence occupation.[13] This indicator is being considered as part of the strategy for monitoring implementation of the Habitat Agenda. Such evidence for secure tenure could vary per countries and cities and include, among others, the following: legal ownership that can be proved by an official tittle deed; a written agreement, which can be defended in court; other tenancy agreements such as temporary occupancy license, certificates, permits issued by non-official authorities (traditional chiefs), and; any other document such as municipal taxes, water bills, etc.[14]

Finally, the proposed indicators to be used for the development of a composite indicators/index are presented in the following table, which was presented during the plenary (refer to Box 2, page 12):

---

[13] This position is in line with the Global Campaign on ST, indeed UN-HABITAT focuses primarily on the strength of the security, rather on the precise nature and form in which the tenure is applied.

[14] The different tenure types (summarized in the background paper and proposed in the methodology to design a security of tenure indicator[14]) and their relative level of security of tenure (including the risk of eviction) were neither analyzed, nor quantified (using an index value, ranking from secure to insecure tenure), as it was suggested at the beginning of the EGM.

To be collected at City/Settlement Level
(Outcome Indicator) = Quantitative Information
% of households(*) in the city without:

Indicator 1:

- Proof of Security of Tenure
- % of households with formal titles deeds
- % of households with enforceable agreements/proofs documents for tenure
- % of households with other documents considered as proof (tax payment documents, water bills, etc)
- % of households with women co-sharing tenure (e.g. joint ownership)

Indicator 2:

- Perception (at settlement/slum level) on secure tenure
  - % of households that perceive tenure secure
  - % of households anticipating eviction within the next 5 years
  - % of households with women who enjoy secure tenure (question to be asked to both men and women)?

Indicator 3:

- Actual Evictions within the past 5 years (national and city level)
  - % of households evicted within the past 5 years
  - % of households (desegregated by gender and age) that have been affected by evictions
  - What procedures were used in the eviction process?

Indicator 4:

- Indicator measuring women's equal right to secure tenure (Household level)
  - number/percentage of women co-sharing tenure (e.g. joint ownership);

To be collected at national/city level
(process indicator) = qualitative/quantitative information

Indicator 5:

- **Existence of National/Municipal Provisions, Mechanisms and Instruments Against Forced Evictions**
  - Have the relevant international human rights instruments been ratified?
  - What constitutional/legal provisions against forced evictions exist?
    - What instruments/mechanisms (incl. alternative tenure systems favorable to urban poor) are in place for the implementation of such provisions?
    - How are issues of compensation, restitution, consultation etc. (in case of eviction) safeguarded in constitutional/legal provisions?
  - What relevant policy frameworks exist?

- Existing legislation recognizing women's equal right to secure tenure, incl. the right to inherit;
- do customs/customary laws exist that deny women's equal right to secure tenure?
- does the Constitution or another law prohibit the application of customs/customary laws if they discriminate against women?.

While some experts in the group supported the idea to treat separately the sub-indicator gender, others, including the chair person, were of the opinion that this sub-indicator should be integrated to the other proposed sub-indicators. At the end of the Plenary a consensus was reached and the expert-group recommended that **"Gender"** should not remain a distinct sub-indicator but it should be integrated to the others. The experts indicated that the challenge will therefore be to study how this fundamental issue could be well integrated into the different sub-indicators, rather than being developed as a stand-alone sub-indicator.

Sampling units and survey design

Detailed description of the Sub-Indicators presented below as well as some of the collecting methods were also discussed. However, the EGM could not map-out the overall questions and format for the elaboration of the **survey design.** An outline was agreed upon in the Plenary and final presentation, which requires further elaboration and analysis.

The experts stressed that there is a need to link the Target with the chosen sampling unit and prepare as soon as possible a list of questions (units of enumeration) for data collection purposes linking sub-indicators with ranking parameters and households questionnaires. The network of monitoring experts will continue to contribute to the development of this tools, led by the Global Urban Observatory (US) at UN-HABITAT.

4.2   Working Group 2 on Slums and Informal Settlements

The working group was composed of 15 participants of diverse profession and geographical backgrounds.[15]

Discussions included the following topics agreed by the participants:
1. The generic definition or concept of slums
2. The pertinence of the proposed key slum parameters
3. The value of the meta indicators approach with open local variations
4. The Slum Index

4.2.1   Summary of discussions

Experts discussed the validity of the proposed definition (background paper). A number of experts brought up the issue of recognition of slums, argued as the main causal element in what slums are.

A tentative definition was given as:
 an urban area that is not recognised by the authorities (and by the rest of the population) as an integral (or equal) part of the city.

It was argued that, in order to define slums, it would be necessary to look at the processes rather than focussing on the outcomes, as proposed in the first definition (background paper).

However, focussing on the processes, was not recognised as an operational/viable option for measurement purpose over time. Outcome indicators provide a more precise measure in order to monitor the improvement of slums over time, as prescribed in MDG7 Target 11.

Experts agreed that the definition should include key physical of what slums are. Participants reviewed the existing definitions, going back to the first definitions of the word such as*: A house materially unfit for human habitation (XIXth)*, and up to the latest definition used by UN-HABITAT at the World Urban Forum: *Slums describe a <u>wide range of low-income settlements and/or poor human living conditions</u> and note that these <u>inadequate housing conditions</u> exemplify the variety of manifestations of poverty (...).The term slum includes the <u>traditional meaning</u>, that is, housing areas*

that were once respectable or even desirable, but which have since deteriorated, as the original dwellers have moved to new and better areas of cities. (...) The term slum has, however, come to include also the vast <u>informal settlements</u> *that are quickly becoming the most visual expression of urban poverty. The quality of dwellings in such settlements varies from the simplest shack to permanent structures, while access to water, electricity, sanitation and other basic services and infrastructure tends to be limited. Such settlements are referred to by a wide range of names and include a variety of tenurial arrangements.*

Experts agreed that the three basic dimensions of slums should include:

- Security of occupation which provides the basis for the households development and security against forced eviction;

- Adequate shelter structure which provide the basis for a safe protection against weather elements;

- Decent access to basic services which provide the basis for a healthy life

Some additional considerations were also discussed in order to come up with a definition:

- The geographic delineation of a slum (i.e. minimum size to qualify for a slum) as a slum is a settlement which needs to be delimited geographically. It was finally agreed that this should not be a slum attribute but should be included in the concept of the slum itself;

- The non-integration of slums in the planning process: slums are by definition excluded from the formal planning process. This goes back to the issue of recognition in a large sense of the term. It was agreed that the issue of recognition should be included in the concept itself;

- The participatory assessment dimension in naming slums. It was noted that one needs to take into account the views of the communities in order to define slums. However, it was argued that when communities name certain areas of the cities as slums, they have different concepts in mind since ther is no uniform definition. There is therefore an urgent need to agree on a universal concept which does not exist yet.

The four components proposed by UN-HABITAT were agreed upon by the participants providing that they allow the inclusion of local variations:
- *Security of tenure;*
- *Structural quality/durability of dwellings;*
- *Access to safe water;*
- *Access to sanitation facilities.*

Density or overcrowding was considered as another key component as it is very often quoted in slum definitions. Although many non-slum areas worldwide are also highly densely populated, density it is still often a key characteristic of slums. Another important parameter discussed was also the location of the slum that may be hazardous. It was considered as an inherent component of the structural quality of housing, a permanent structure being defined as a dwelling units, which is likely to last fifteen years or more given normal maintenance and repair, and *locational and environmental hazards*.

Another component considered important is the level of violent crimes in slum areas. However, it was felt that, given the difficulties of data collection in the area of crimes (often not reported at their real level), it should not be a core component of the definition. Another argument was that slums are not necessarily areas of crime and this remained to be proven.

Two sub-groups were *established* to discuss the actual definitions of the different slum indicators/ components:
1. Water and sanitation
2. Quality of housing and overcrowding.

<u>**Water and Sanitation**</u>

It was proposed by the expert to adopt the recent UNICEF/WHO definitions on improved water supply and *improved* sanitation for the water and sanitation components. The advantage of these definitions is that they rely on a long experience of data collection in countries. These definitions, being part of the MDG indicators, were also approved by the Heads of States and enjoy a good level of agreement and understanding. However, they tend to depict more the rural context and do provide a real picture of the urban areas.

It was recommended by the experts to adopt those definitions with slight variations:

Access to water: **Slums are areas with *less than 50% of households[16]* with Improved Water Supply, i.e:**
(a) Household connection
(b) Public stand pipe shared by a maximum of two
(c) Bore dug well
(d) Protected spring
(e) Rain water collection

With at least available 20 liters/pers *within an acceptable span time* (to be defined, variation from the original UNICEF/WHO definition which says within one kilometer, consider to high for urban areas).

It was also recommended that water affordability be considered as an additional criterion to be defined in local contexts.

Access to sanitation: Slums are areas with less than 50% of households[17] with Improved Sanitation, i.e having:
▪ a direct connection to public sewer
▪ a direct connection to septic tank
▪ a poor flush latrine
▪ a ventilated improved pit latrine

The excreta disposal system is considered adequate if it is private or shared by a *maximum of two households* (not public) (variation from the original UNICEF/WHO definition which does not specify what *shared* means – in urban areas, shared can mean shared by more than 100 persons in some areas). Not improved sanitation include service or bucket latrines, public latrines, latrine with an open pit.

The sub-group recommended that the level of *domestic waste collection* also be considered in some context as a core slum indicator when access to water and sanitation are not seen as problems. However, the level of waste collection is difficult to measure. The number of days per month that households see their wastes removed could be one measure, to be collected at the household level.

Another last important slum services component is *energy*, to be considered if water and sanitation are not a problem. Energy is a main essential for adequate conditions in cold countries whch could be considered as an important local slum component. Fuelwood is sometimes a main hazard in some cities as a main cause of indoor pollution, a high cause of acute respoiratory diseases leading to high mortality rates.

Quality of housing and overcrowding

The experts in the sub-group stressed the importance of national/local definitions of adequacy, with respect to each of the sub-indicators and descriptors, e.g. specific questions to be used in the field. It was noted that this is in line with General Comment No. 3 of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

---

[16] The treshold should be confirmed through case studies and testing.
[17] *Ibidem*

It was agreed by the experts to adopt the following indicators and descriptors:

Structural quality of housing: **Slums are characterized by a relatively high proportion of households residing a) near a hazardous site and b) in temporary and/or dilapidated structures**. The meaning of relative to be defined locally

It was agreed that the following locations should be considered:

- Housing settled in geologically hazardous zones (landslide/earthquake and flood areas);
- Housing settled on garbage-mountains;
- Housing around high-industrial pollution areas;
- Housing around other high-risk zones, e.g. railroads, airports, energy transmission lines.

Furthermore, it was decided that the following factors should be considered when categorising a housing unit with respect to being temporary or dilapidated:

- Quality of construction (e.g. materials used for wall, floor and roof)
- Compliance with local building codes, standards and bye-laws

Overcrowding: **Slums are characterized by a relatively high proportion of households with more than two persons per room** (subject to empirical testing, internationally, nationally and locally).

4.2.2   Defining Slums and Formulating and Index

Concept / Definition:

A slum is a contiguous settlement where the inhabitants are characterised as having inadequate housing[18] and basic services. A slum is often not recognised and addressed by the public authorities as an integral or equal part of the city.
It is an area which combines to various extent the following characteristics:

- insecure residential status;
- inadequate access to safe water;
- inadequate access to sanitation and other infrastructure;
- poor structural quality of housing;
- overcrowding.

Recommended INDICATORS:

META-INDICATOR	INDICATOR	"DESCRIPTOR"
1. SECURE TENURE	TO BE DEFINED BY GROUP 1	
2. ACCESS TO WATER	Inadequate drinking supply: *(adjusted Indicator 30 (Target 10), UNICEF-WHO Definition, 2000)*	A settlement has inadequate drinking supply if less than 50% (subject to testing/ local variations) of hhlds have improved water supply: ▪ Has a hhld connection ▪ Access to public stand pipe ▪ Bore dug well ▪ Protected spring ▪ Rain water collection With at least available 20 liters/pers *within an acceptable span time* (covering gender issue).

---

[18] Adequacy is defined in the General Comment No 4 of the UN Committee on Economic, Cultural and Social Rights

		It is recommended that affordability may be considered as an additional criteria to be defined in local contexts.
3. ACCESS TO SANITATION	Inadequate sanitation: *(Indicator 31 (Target 11), UNICEF-WHO Definition, 2000)*	A settlement has inadequate sanitation if less than 50% (subject to testing/ local variations) of hhlds have improved sanitation: ▪ To a public sewer ▪ To a septic tank ▪ Poor flush latrine ▪ Ventilated improved pit latrine The excreta disposal system is considered adequate if it is private or shared by a *maximum of two households* (not public). (not improved: service or bucket latrines, public latrines, latrine with an open pit).
4. Structural quality of housing	a. Location	Proportion of households residing near a hazardous site. The following locations should be considered: • Housing settled in geologically hazardous zones (landslide/earthquake and flood areas); • Housing settled on garbage-mountains; • Housing around high-industrial pollution areas; • Housing around other high-risk zones, e.g. railroads, airports, energy transmission lines.
	b. Permanency of structure	Proportion of households living in temporary and/or dilapidated structures, subject to local variations. The following factors should be considered when categorising a housing unit in the above categories: • Quality of construction (e.g. materials used for wall, floor and roof) • Compliance with local building codes, standards and bye-laws
5. Overcrowding	Overcrowding	Proportion of households with more than two persons per room.

When cities have census or households surveys data at their disposal, they should use the data to locate clusters households who do not meet certain adequacy standards and which can be identified on the city maps as slum settlements.

When cities do not have census or households surveys data at their disposal, they should use expert judgement and public perception in conjunction with the above criteria laid down.

Indicators need to be monitored both for slums and non-slum controlled areas.

A glossary of terms described above will be necessary to guide countries in defining local variations.

4.3 Working Group on Global City Sampling

The composition of the working group was 14 persons.[19] UN-HABITAT has the responsibility to monitor the Habitat Agenda. This entails global collection of information and data on progress made in attaining the twin goals of the Habitat Agenda as well as reporting of the monitoring and evaluation results to the General Assembly. The main objectives of these monitoring efforts are

- to measure conditions and trends and progress in implementing the Habitat Agenda based on urban monitoring systems at the local and national levels

- to improve global system for reporting on the implementation of the Habitat Agenda and on human settlements conditions and trends in general.

The Millennium Declaration brought along additional monitoring responsibilities, especially the monitoring of the implementation of Target 11 on slums.

Group 3 on Global City Sampling had the task to find feasible ways to respond to these requirements.

4.3.1 Summary of Discussions

Global monitoring with city aggregate data

Previous monitoring efforts reported city aggregate data using a limited number of indicators. The current reporting requirements ask for city aggregate data on the global and regional level. Originally, UN-HABITAT expected to have a regional breakdown for all 21 regions of the M49 standard for regions, set by UNSD. This was not seen as feasible due to the large sample size required. The 21 regions were therefore collapsed into 10 regions. During the meeting, UN-HABITAT was informed that only 6 to 7 major areas have to be monitored for the MDG reporting. It was understood that the monitoring efforts for the Habitat Agenda and the MDG are compatible and can be combined. The list of indicators has to be revised accordingly.

Several participants were of the opinion that the collection of city aggregate data with global and regional breakdowns was not useful for advocacy, policy and programming purposes, and recommended the collection of sub-city level data for these purposes. However, they understood that the UN reporting system required the collection of city aggregate data, even if not all partners benefit equally from that information.

Sampling methods and sample designs

For global monitoring purposes, a probability sample was regarded as the only way to get reliable data about the global urban situation. Other sample designs such as samples containing partly randomly, partly purposeful selected cities, were discussed but rejected as statistically not valid given the objective of the monitoring exercise. However, not all participants perceived global data collection of city aggregate data as a high priority area.

The original sample size of a statistically representative probability sample of around 400 cities based on 10 regions for the regional breakdown was consequently adjusted to the new requirements for regional breakdowns, i.e. 6 to 7 major areas as estimation domains. Using the same significance level and adjustment for non-response, the sample would contain around 240 to 280 cities. The reduction in the sample size would allow for increase in the significance level of the sample, which would result in a small increase in the sample size.

City proper or urban agglomeration

The group discusses whether city proper (administrative unit) or urban agglomeration (geographical definition) should be used as base unit for data collection. Advantages mentioned for using city proper was that local authorities are partners of UN-HABITAT. Data on city proper can be collected more

---

[19] Aman MehtaDinesh Mehta (partly) , Erlinda Go, Harvey Herr, Jay Moor, Joseph Maseland (partly), Martin Raithelhuber (Rapporteur), Nefise Bazoglu (partly), Shea Rutstein, Stephanie Wilcock, Tanzib Chowdhury, Tim Harris, Ulrik Westman, Yves Cabanne

easily, as data is available for these administrative units and the respective institutions can be addressed to cooperative. However, many census bureaus have defined urban agglomerations and report on them. The group regarded data collection on urban agglomerations as more meaningful than collecting data on the individual cities forming an agglomeration. The group concluded that wherever possible, urban agglomeration should be used as a base unit. In many cases, institutions representing a large part of the agglomeration or representing an even larger metropolitan area exist, and can be contacted. The sample frame should therefore contain all available urban agglomerations plus all cities over 100 k, which are not part of an urban agglomeration. The frame has to be cleared from double entries, i.e. city entries that form part of an agglomeration at the same time. This was regarded feasible, and a collaborative effort between GUO and UNSD was proposed for this purpose.

Data quality

Low data quality has been an area of concern in previous data collection efforts, such as the Urban Indicators Programme. However, experiences from Latin America show that through the triangulation of data the quality can be improved considerably. Triangulation involves several stakeholders at the level where the data are collected who check and countercheck the data provided. Ideally, such a triangulation process involves government authorities as well as civil society actors.

Selection of indicators and indices

The experts did not extensively discuss the selection of indicators to be monitored. However, some comments were made. Can the City Development Index (CDI), which includes 10 to 11 indicators answer the same questions the current design tries to answer with about 40 indicators? Another idea was to use the HDI (Human Development Index) together with the CDI.

Integration of existing databases

The group discussed the question how the existing databases for the years 1993 and 1998 could be used to form a timeline together with the planned results of the new global monitoring activities.

One of the two existing urban indicator databases was used for the MDG reporting. Cities in both databases do overlap only partly. This is also true for overlaps between the GUO network members and the cities in both samples. None of these samples of cities are statistically representative, neither globally, nor regionally, nor by city size. For global calculations, the weightings had to be adjusted and missing values had to be replaced. Moreover, different sets of indicators were collected. On a global level, a timeline could be created but restrictions would apply when interpreting the data. There seems to be no compelling argument to put a strong emphasis on continuing with the same set of cities. However, some cities that do report will be considered for regular updates of the existing databases.

Cost of data collection

Some members of the group contributed rough estimates for the cost of collection of city aggregate data, based on previous experiences with the Urban Indicators Programme. The cost for the current set of indicators was estimated at USD 2000 to 3000 per city. Additional costs may occur through contracts with regional coordinating institutions. Partnerships with regional institutions can considerably lower the costs, as these institutions have their partners in the region and can plan travel and training cost effectively.

Monitoring intra-city differentials with sub-city level data

A majority of the group members strongly supported the collection of sub-city level data through household surveys. Analysis of intra-city differentials through such surveys was regarded as very valuable for advocacy, policy and programming purposes both for UN-HABITAT and its partners. On the other hand, city aggregated data were not seen as carrying a strong message. The sub-city level surveys should be representative on the city level and include a slum stratum. It was understood that a limited number of sub-city level surveys done in different cities around the world will not constitute a globally representative sample.

The group supported the proposal by UN-HABITAT to work through existing and planned surveys such as the DHS (Demographic and Health Survey,), PAPFAM, MICS and others. Where possible, national censuses should also be used. This strategy implies that UN-HABITAT's data collection has

to follow the schedule of these survey instruments. Data will be collected for different years in different locations.

The proposal to use DHS for slum monitoring was discussed in more detailed. The DHS is a well know and accepted survey instrument mainly sponsored by USAID and implemented by a consultancy, ORC Macro. DHS is designed as a national level survey on demography and health issues. However, it covers the capital city in each country by default, as well as a limited number of human settlement related issues. DHS have a modular structure, composed of a cover questionnaire plus optional modules, which are selected by the respective stakeholders in the countries. So far, the sample structure of DHS does not have a slum stratum. It will be possible to add a maximum of three to four questions related to human settlement issues to the DHS questionnaire as the stakeholders of the DHS want to keep its focus on demographic and health issues. Introducing a slum stratum in one city requires about 1000 additional households to be included.

Theoretically, it would possible to choose a city different from the capital city, if deemed appropriate. However, this has to be discussed with the stakeholders of the DHS in that respective country.

Capacity building and GUO network

Several group members stressed the importance of capacity building. Several options to link monitoring activities and capacity building activities were discussed by the group.

Previously, the strategy was to do global monitoring of city aggregate data through a network of Local and National Urban Observatories (LUO, NUO). The LUOs and NUOs got support through training and toolkits. Theoretically, the LUOs would coincide with cities for which data were collected through the Urban Indicators Programme. In reality, however, in many cases the data was collected through consultants with very little or no reference to the GUO network or other UN-HABITAT activities. Latin America was an exception, where UMP was contracted for the data collection.

One suggestion was to include all cities of the global sample into the GUO network as a framework for cooperation. However, the integration of around 300 new partners in an existing network is a very time consuming task. The data collected through the global sample (city aggregate data) are not very interesting for most cities, which want sub-city level data, and the indicators used for global monitoring are often not useful for the specific needs of cities.

The inclusion of the sub-city survey cities into the network seemed to be more feasible both with respect to the total number (around 35) and the interest of the cities in the results of the analysis. The DHS does not have a structure to integrate cities, neither in the fieldwork nor in the data analysis. One idea, therefore, was to share the analysis with the city, and use this exercise to initiate the building of an Urban Observatory in that city. This activity could be closely linked to the LIF (Local Indicators Facility), a GUO programme, which assists cities in developing and using local urban indicators. The city could help in identifying slum areas, which is a pre-requisite for forming a slum stratum, and directly benefit from an in-depth survey. The role of the GUO would be to provide tools for slum identification, share the analysis of the data with the city, offer assistance to use this exercise to develop locally specific indicators, e.g. for a performance monitoring system.

Capturing cities below 100 K

The sample frame presented to the group contained presumably all cities over 100,000 inhabitants for the year 2000. Several data sources were used to compile the sample frame, including UN-HABITAT databases, UNSD list of cities, and the world gazetteer of cities. Cities below 100 k are not represented by the sample.

Several members of the group commented that the highest urban growth rates and accompanying problems do and will happen in cities below the current threshold of 100k. A high proportion of urban dwellers will live is such small and intermediate cities. It was strongly argued that UN-HABITAT should find a way to generate knowledge about urban problems in such cities.

Two options were discussed. The first suggestion was to define a broader sample frame for the global sample of cities that would include cities below 100 k. Several suggestions were made for a lower limit (20 k, 50 k) with no consensus reached. It became clear that settlements below 100 k are a somewhat fuzzy area, with blurred boundaries between city, town, large rural settlements, and many

varying definitions in different countries. Besides the definition problems, compiling a sample frame that includes cities below 100 k would be a technical problem as there are no known authoritative source.

The second suggestion was to cover a number of cities below 100 k with the sub-city level surveys of the DHS or other appropriate surveys. The group considered this to be a feasible option. Generally it was understood that data collection in cities below 100 k is more difficult and involves more inputs than in larger cities.

For further discussion

Several issues had to be left for further discussion.

- How will the PPS as a sampling method affect the sample, for example the regional distribution?

- Which six or seven regions will finally be the estimation domains?

- A list of urban agglomerations has to be devised and integrated into the sample frame. UN-HABITAT and UNSD will have to work out a mechanism to regularly update that list and the sample frame.

4.3.2 Operationalising a Global City Sampling

Global monitoring for the UN reporting system

The UN reporting system includes the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and the Habitat agenda and requires a certain reporting format. Global monitoring should therefore report on global level as well as on regional level. The regions should be in accordance with the UNSD (United Nations Statistical Division) list of regions. The number of regions to be used is 6-7. To get a satisfactory result from each region the sample size must not be less than 40 cities per region. In total the global sample will comprise about 240-350 cities.

The sampling method to be used should be PPS (Probability Proportional to Size) to ensure that the cities selected in each region represent the areas where most of the urban population lives. Further testing is necessary to determine the effects of PPS on regional representation and other issues.

Budget estimations should be made on regional as well as on global level. The estimations ought to be carried out at an early stage to enable adjustments of the monitoring. The cities reporting to the Urban Indicator Programme should be maintained to enable the usage of a time-series database. To ensure that the responses from the local level are of high quality the data should be triangulated if possible. Relevant stakeholders at the local level ought to contribute to this quality control.

Urban agglomerations or city proper

The boundaries of the urban agglomeration should be used for data collection wherever urban agglomerations exists. Otherwise city proper boundaries should be used. The sampling frame ought to be revised accordingly, i.e containing all urban agglomerations plus the remaining cities over 100 K. The existing urban indicators questionnaire should be reviewed taking into account that urban agglomeration have to be covered as some questions are directed to municipalities.

UN-Habitat strategy for in-depth analysis of intra-city differentials and capacity building

The Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) and other existing and planned household level surveys (e.g. FAFO, MICS) should be used for in-depth analysis of intra-city differentials. The analysis from the in-depth analysis of intra-city differentials should be able to be used for advocacy, policy and programming at global, regional and local level. Initiatives should be taken for capacity building within DHS cities, LIF (Local Indicators Facility) and the GUO network. This can be achieved by establishing links between cities to share data analysis. The analyses should include the use of census data on a city level. It is essential to build long term relationship with the city, NSO and other stakeholders within the GUO network. In the in-depth analysis of intra-city differentials, cities below 100,000 inhabitants should be included, e.g. by covering some of these cities with the DHS survey.

5.0   Conclusions and Next Steps

The EGM was brought to closure in a final panel session. The facilitators of the three working groups presented their findings as presented in Section 3 of this Report. The ensuing discussions were brief and largely confined to questions of clarification.

In its closing comments, UN-HABITAT noted that the participants fulfilled the stated objectives of the EGM: to contribute to the development of indicators for the "Cities without Slums" or "Target 11" of the Millennium Development Goal 7, "Ensure Environmental Sustainability." This was achieved first through the successful formulating an operational definition for security of tenure and for slums. And secondly by production of a series of sub-indicators for the purposes of measuring security of tenure and slums as defined, and the establishment of composite indices and "meta-indicators." And third through concrete recommendations about ways the United Nations report on progress achieved on the Cities without Slums target, including the specification of a global sample of cities and related methods of data collection and analysis.

It was noted further that the EGM adopt 5 indicators to measure "improvement in the lives of 100 million slum dwellers by the year 2020," as specified in the Cities without Slums MDG Target 11. These are:

- Proportion of urban population with sustainable access to an improved water source
- Proportion of urban population with access to improved sanitation
- Proportion of urban population with access to secure tenure
- Proportion of urban population with durable housing units
- Proportion of urban population with adequate living area

It was further agreed that in future UN-HABITAT in collaboration with the United Nations Statistic Division, the Cities Alliance to modify the above indicators and to refine the definitions of secure tenure and slums through consultations with EGM participants and their related networks of monitoring professionals. Through its Global Urban Observatory, UN-HABITAT agreed to advance monitoring of MDG targets, and to strengthen the capacity of national statistical and monitoring institutions. Towards this end, UN-HABITAT has subsequent to the EGM, produced a set of guidelines for operational definitions for household surveys and censuses on secure tenure and slums that is included as an appendix to this Report.

Annex 1: List of Participants

William Cobbett
Senior Urban Upgrading Advisor
Cities Alliance
1818 H Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20433, USA
Tel: 1 202 4589695
Fax: 1 202 5223224
Email: cobbett@citiesalliance.org

Alain Durand-Lasserve
Directeur de Recherche
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique
(CNRS)
7, rue Sante Garibaldi,
33000 Bordeaux, France
Tel: 33 5 56961736
Fax: 33 5 56 99 15 85
Email: a.durand-lasserve@wanadoo.fr

Dr. Joe Flood
Urban Resources
37 Horne St.
Elsternwick 3185, Australia
Tel: 61 3 95328492
Fax: 61 3 95324325
Email: joeflood@bigpond.com.au

Aman Mehta
Senior Project Officer
Urban Management Centre
Asian Institute of Technology
P.O. box 4, Klong Luang,
Pathumthani 12120
Thailand
Tel: 66 2 5245699
Fax: 66 2 5246132
Email: amehta@ait.ac.th

Robin Rajack,
Manager, Research, Development and
Communication
Land Settlement Agency
Ministry of Housing,
Republic of Trnidad & Tobago
44-46 South Quay
Port of Spain, Trinidad, West Indies
Tel/Fax: 1 868 6278420
Email: rmrcoco1@hotmail.com

Yap Kioe Sheng,
Chief, Human Settlements Section
UN-ESCAP
Room 7A23, UN Building
Rajadamnern Avenue
Bangkok 10200
Thailand
Tel: 66 2 2881600
Fax: 66 2 2881097
Email: yap.unescap@un.org

Couglan Pather
Director Metro Housing
Ethekwini Municipality (Durban)
P.O .Box 828
Durban 4000, South Africa
Mobile: + 27832878433 or +27313111429
Fax: +2731311467
patherc@durban.gov.za

Daniela Simioni
Human Settlements Officer
UN-ECLAC
Av. Dag Hammerskjöld s/n
Vitacura
Santiago de Chile, Chile
daniela.simioni@eclac.cl

Diana Meirelles Da Motta
Coordenadora Geral de Política Urbana
Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicadam
(IPEA)
Setor Bancário Sul - Quadra 1 Edifício BNDES -
Bloco "J" 3º andar sala 322.
Brasília – DF CEP: 70 076 900, Brazil
Tel.: 55 - 61 - 3155299 / 3155430 / 3155028
Fax: 55 - 61 - 322 36 41
diana@ipea.gov.br

Elisa Lustosa Caillaux
Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística
(IBGE)
Departamento de População e Indicadores Sociais
Av. República do Chile, 500   8o andar
Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil
Tel.: 55 (21)2514-0351
Fax: 55 (21) 25140033
caillaux@ibge.gov.br

Erlinda Go
United Nations Statistics Division
New York, NY 10017, USA
Fax: +1 212/963 4116
go@un.org

Fernando Cavallieri
Head of Socio-Demography
Rio de Janeiro City Hall/IPP
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Tel 55 (21) 255-8053
fcavalli@pcrj.rj.gov.br

Jean Du Plessis
Deputy Director
Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE)
83 rue de Montbrillant
CH-1202 Geneva, Switzerland

Tel +41.22.7341028
Fax +41.22.7338336
jean@cohre.org

John Barreh
City Planning Department
Nairobi City Council
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: +254-2-230640
barrehk@yahoo.com

Mark Hildebrand
Manager, Cities Alliance
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433, USA
Tel: (+1 202) 473-0575
Fax: (+1 202) 522-3224
mhildebrand@worldbank.org

Miloon kothari
Special Rapporteur on Adequate Housing
Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human
Rights Palais des Nations (PW 4-010)
1211 Geneva, Switzerland
miloonkothari@vsnl.net

Pierre Ngom
African Population and Health Research Centre
(APHRC), Shelter Afrique Building
POB 10787
Nairobi 00100, Kenya
Tel.: +254-2-2720400
Fax: +254-2-2720380
pngom@aphrc.org

Rajeev Malhotra
Development Economist
Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human
Rights
Palais des Nations (PW 4-010)
1211 Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: + 41 22 917 9173
Fax: + 41 22 917 9010
rmalhotra@ohchr.org

Robert Johnston
United Nations Statistics Division
New York, NY 10017, USA
Fax: +1 212/963 4116
johnstonr@un.org

S. Onsare
Central Bureau of Statistics
Herufi House, P.O. Box 30266
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: +254-2-340929
0722-362848
shemonsare@yahoo.com

Jane Weru

Pamoja Trust
Nairobi
Kenya
landrite@wananchi.com

Pr. Saad Yahya
Saad Yahya and Associates
University of Nairobi
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: 254-2-214633
sya@nbi.ispkenya.com

Shea Rutstein
ORC Macro
11785 Beltsville Drive
Calverton, MD 20705, USA
Tel.: +1-301-572-0200
Fax: +1-301-572-0999
rutstein@macroint.com,
shea.o.rutstein@orcmacro.com

Stephanie Wilcock
USAID
Ronald Reagan Building
Washington, D.C. 20523-1000, USA
Tel: 202-712-4810
Fax: 202-216-3524
SWilcock@usaid.gov

Tim Harris
Statistics Advisor
Department for International Development (DFID)
1 Palace Street
SW1E 5HE London, United Kingdom
Tel: (+44) 207 023 0825
Fax: (+44) 207 023 0719
t-harris@dfid.gov.uk

Tony Lloyd Jones
Urban and Physical Planning Advisor
Department for International Development (DFID)
1 Palace Street
SW1E 5HE London, United Kingdom
Tel: (+44) 207 023 0829
Fax: (+44) 207 023 0072
t-lloyd-jones@dfid.gov.uk

Tumsifu Jonas Nnkya
Director
Institute of Human Settlement Studies (IHSS)
P.O. Box 35124
Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania
Tel.: 2775481
Fax: 2775479/2775391
Mobile: 0744263994
ihsbr@uclas.ac.tz
tumsifu6654@yahoo.com

UN-HABITAT
P.O. Box 30030
Nairobi, Kenya
Fax: 254 2 624266

Daniel Biau
Ag. Deputy Executive Director
Daniel.Biau@unhabitat.org

Nefise Bazoglu
Head, Urban Secretariat,
Nefise.Bazoglu@unhabitat.org

Farouk Tebbal
Chief,
Shelter Branch
farouk.tebbal@unhabitat.org

Joseph Guiebo
Senior Human Settlements Officer
Regional Office for Africa
and the Arab States (ROAAS)
Alioune.Badiane@unhabitat.org

Alberto Paranhos
Regional Office for LAC
Alberto.Paranhos@habitat-lac.org

Eduardo Moreno
Chief, Global Urban Observatory
Eduardo.Moreno@unhabitat.org

Marjolein Benschop
Human Settlements Officer
Shelter Branch
Marjolein.benschop@unhabitat.org

Dinesh Mehta
Global Coordinator, Urban Management Programme
Dinesh.Mehta@unhabitat.org

Yves Cabannes,
Coordinator, UMP LAC Office,
Quito, Ecuador
pgu@pgu-ecu.org

Raf Tuts,
Ag. Coordinator, Global Campaign on Urban Governance
Raf.Tuts@unhabitat.org

Christine Auclair
Human Settlements Officer
Global Urban Observatory
Christine.Auclair@unhabitat.org

Tanzib Chowdhury,
Human Settlements Officer
Global Urban Observatory
Tanzib.Chowdhury@unhabitat.org

Martin Raithelhuber
Associate Expert
Global Urban Observatory
Martin.Raithelhuber@unhabitat.org

Nick Bain,
Special Advisor, OED
Nick.Bain@unhabitat.org

Anne Comolet
Intern
Urban Secretariat

Chris Williams
Human Settlements Officer
Shelter Branch
chris.williams@unhabitat.org

Dinesh Mehta
Urban Development Branch
dinesh.mehta@unhabitat.org

Harvey Herr
Consultant
Urban Secretariat
harvey.herr@unhabitat.org

Selman Erguden
Chief, Housing Policy Section
Shelter Branch
inge.jensen@unhabitat.org

Inge Jensen
Human Settlements Officer
Shelter Branch
inge.jensen@unhabitat.org

Iouri Moisseev
Human Settlements Officer
Urban Secretariat
iouri.moisseev@unhabitat.org

Annex 2: Expert Group Meeting Agenda

Monday 28 October	
09:00-10:15	**Opening Session** *(room M310)* ▪ Welcome message (Daniel Biau, Deputy Executive Director) ▪ EGM Objectives in the Context of the Millennium Development Goals (Nefise Bazoglu, Chief, Urban Secretariat) (30 min) ▪ Monitoring the 'Cities without Slums' Initiative (Bill Cobbett, Cities Alliance) (15 min) ▪ The Global Campaign on Secure Tenure (Farouk Tebbal, Chief, Shelter Branch) (15 min)
10:15 – 10:35	*Coffee Break*
10:35 – 12:30	**Plenary: Background and proposed directions** *(room M310)* ▪ *Defining 'secure tenure': background and proposed definition (Eduardo Moreno, Marjolein Benschop) (30 min)* ▪ *Defining 'slums': background and proposed definition (Christine Auclair) (30 min)* ▪ Global City Sampling (Harvey Herr) (30 min) ▪ Discussion
12:30 – 14:00	*Lunch*
14:00 – 15:30	Plenary: Participants presentations ***(room M310)*** ▪ The overall context of MDG measurement (Robert Johnston) (20 min) ▪ Designing a security of tenure indicator: methodological and conceptual issues (Alain Durand Lasserve) (30 min) ▪ Discussion
15:30 – 16:00	*Coffee Break*
16:00 – 17:30	▪ The Slum Index (Harvey Herr) (30 min) ▪ *Operationalising slum measurement (Joe Flood, cancelled) (40 min)* ▪ *Discussion*

Tuesday 29 October	

09:00-10:30	**Introduction to the Group Discussions** *(M310)*
	 Group discussions
	      ▪ Group 1: Defining Secure Tenure *(CR 7)*
	      ▪ Group 2: Defining Slums *(M310)*
	      ▪ Group 3: Global City Sampling *(Press Room)*

10:30 – 11.00	*Coffee Break*

10:30 – 12:30	**Group discussions** (1h15 min)
	      ▪ Group 1: Defining Secure Tenure *(CR 7)*
	      ▪ Group 2: Defining Slums *(M310)*
	      ▪ Group 3: Global City Sampling *(Press Room)*
	 Conclusions of group discussions and way forward (plenary, *M310*) (40 min)

12:30 – 14:00	*Lunch*

14:00 – 15:30	**Group discussions**
	      ▪ Group 1: Defining Secure Tenure *(CR 7)*
	      ▪ Group 2: Defining Slums *(M310)*
	      ▪ Group 3: Global City Sampling *(Press Room)*

15:30 – 16:00	*Coffee Break*
16:00 – 17:00	**Conclusions of group discussions** (plenary, *M310*)

Wednesday 30 October	
09:00-10:30	**Towards recommendations** (plenary, *M310*) ▪ Summary of group discussions and suggestions on way forward

	▪ Agreement on global definition on secure tenure, slum and methodology for city sampling
10:30 – 11.00	*Coffee Break*

10:30 – 12:30	**Drafting recommendations**
	  ▪ <u>Group 1</u>: Defining Secure Tenure *(CR 7)*
	  ▪ <u>Group 2</u>: Defining Slums *(M310)*
	  ▪ <u>Group 3</u>: Global City Sampling *(Press Room)*

12:30 – 14:00	*Lunch*
14:00 – 16:30	▪ **Presentation of final recommendations** ▪ **Way Forward**
17:30	***Cocktail 'Dinatoire' at L'Ile de France, Gigiri***