

Second Urban Sustainable Development Goal Campaign Consultation on Targets and Indicators:

Bangalore Outcome Document

Authors

Andrew Rudd (UN-Habitat), **Eugenie Birch** (University of Pennsylvania), **Aromar Revi** (Indian Institute of Human Settlements), **Cynthia Rosenzweig** (Columbia University), **Yunus Arikian** (ICLEI), **Jit Bajpai** (Columbia University Earth Institute), **Samantha Barthelemy** (Pereira Passos Institute), **Gautam Bhan** (IIHS), **Edgardo Bilsky** (UCLG), **Maruxa Cardama** (Communitas), **William Cobbett** (Cities Alliance Secretariat), **Jessica Espey** (SDSN), **Martha Chen** (Harvard/WIEGO), **James Goldstein** (Tellus/Communitas), **Peter Head** (Ecosequestration Trust), **Garima Jain** (IIHS), **Holger Kuhle** (SDSN), **Shagun Mehrotra** (The New School University), **Martin Oteng-Ababio** (University of Ghana, Legon), **Susan Parnell** (African Centre for Cities), **Debra Roberts** (eThekweni Municipality), **David Satterthwaite** (International Institute for Environment and Development), **Somnath Sen** (IIHS), **David Simon** (Royal Holloway/Mistra Urban Futures), **Shalini Sinha** (WEIGO), **José Siri** (UNU-IIGH), **Caroline Skinner** (WEIGO), **William Solecki** (CUNY Institute for Sustainable Cities), **Shiv Someshwar** (SDSN), **Rafael Tuts** (UN-Habitat)



Indian Institute for Human Settlements (IIHS)

Bangalore City campus

12-14th January 2015

SUMMARY

This document presents a summary of the 12-14th January 2014 Bangalore Consultation on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Targets and Indicators of the global Urban SDG Campaign, as a culmination of a 15-month process of consultation.

The document focuses primarily on Goal 11 “**Make Cities and Human Settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable**” and provides suggestions on improvements in the SDG framework, other SDGs, and a way forward towards SDG implementation.

Target 11.1: By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services, *including the¹ upgrading of slums.*

Indicator 11.1: Percentage of urban population living in slums or informal settlements

Target 11.2: By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, *energy-efficient* and accessible transport systems for all *people and goods*, improving road safety *and* expanding public *and non-motorized* transport, with attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations.

Indicator 11.2: Percentage of people within 0.5 km of public transit running at least every 20 minutes

Target 11.3: By 2030, *achieve more equitable and efficient land use through participatory urban and regional* planning and management.

Indicator 11.3: Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate at comparable scale

Target 11.4: Strengthen *cities’* efforts to protect and *promote* cultural and natural heritage

Indicator 11.4: Secondary indicators only.

Target 11.5: By 2030, significantly reduce the *social, health, economic and ecological risks and impacts of disasters, environmental change and disease outbreaks by better designing and managing cities*, protecting people in vulnerable situations.

Indicator 11.5: Percent of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies informed by accepted international frameworks (such as forthcoming Hyogo-2 Framework).

Target 11.6: By 2030, reduce the adverse environmental impacts of cities, paying special attention to *biodiversity loss, air quality, construction materials, and waste management*

Indicator 11.6: Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and well managed

Target 11.7: By 2030, provide, *maintain and encourage* access to safe, inclusive and *multipurpose* public space

Indicator 11.7: Area of public space as a proportion of total city space

Target 11.a: Prepare and implement a national urban and human settlements policy framework.

Indicator 11.a: Presence of a national urban and human settlements policy framework.

Target 11.b: By 2020, increase by x% the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, develop and implement in line with the forthcoming Hyogo Framework holistic disaster risk management at all levels.

Indicator 11.b: Covered under Indicator 11.5 above.

Target 11.c: Support national, regional and local governments through financial and technical assistance to strengthen revenue streams, regulatory and institutional capacity

Indicator 11.c: Sub-national government revenues and expenditures as a percentage of general government revenues and expenditures

Second Urban Sustainable Development Goal Campaign Consultation

¹ Italics indicate text added at the Bangalore Workshop.

on Targets and Indicators: Bangalore Outcome Document 12-14th January 2015

Introduction

Today, half the world's seven billion people live in cities. By 2030 there will be over one billion more urban residents. Between 2010 and 2050, the urban population will grow significantly, by 2.5 to 3 billion people, increasing the urban share to two-thirds of the world's population. Roughly three-quarters of global economic activity is urban, and as the urban population grows, so will the urban share of global GDP and investments. Cities are responsible for the bulk of production and consumption, and are the primary engines of economic growth and development. Yet, they are home to extreme deprivation and environmental degradation with one billion people living in slums – requiring an immediate, concrete and direct response.

The dynamism of cities is a major sustainable development opportunity. By getting urban development right, cities can create jobs and offer better livelihoods; increase economic growth; improve social inclusion; promote the decoupling of living standards and economic growth from environmental resource use; protect local and regional ecosystems; reduce both urban and rural poverty; and drastically reduce pollution. Sound sustainable urban and regional development will accelerate progress towards achieving the SDGs.

Recognizing this, the UN Open Working Group (OWG), which completed its work in New York on 19th June 2014, proposed a stand-alone urban Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) as part of a set of 17 SDGs. An intergovernmental negotiation process is examining this SDG formulation before making recommendations to the Sustainable Development Goals Summit to be held in New York in September 2014.

The global Urban SDG Campaign² (urbansdg.org) supported by over 400 cities, major urban networks and institutions³ played a major role in the inclusion of SDG 11: **“Make Cities and Human Settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable”**.

Goal 11: revised Targets and suggested Indicators

The revisions of the Goal 11 Targets and Indicators suggested in this document seek to build on the agreed Member State consensus recorded by the OWG and the subsequent guidance⁴ provided by the UN Secretary General (SG). Care has been taken to maintain the integrity and structure of Goal 11 and the associated Targets, except in response to a significant gap or development opportunity. This has been based on in-depth consultation between Urban SDG Campaign members and their constituents, especially in major convenings in London (August 2014) and Bangalore (January 2015).

There is considerable concern within the global urban and larger development community that parity be maintained among SDGs both in terms of number and substance of Targets and Indicators. This will enable synergy between complementary and integrative Goals (such as Goal 11) and strengthen the focus on implementability.

² Initiated in September 2013.

³ Including UN-Habitat, UCLG, ICLEI, C-40, SDSN, Communitas, WIEGO, SDI.

⁴ UN SGs Synthesis Report December 2014: The Road to Dignity by 2030.

This concern extends to the apparent delinking from Goal 11 of the productive role of cities in adding economic value and creating informal and formal livelihoods that provide the basis for the implementation and financing of key SDGs, especially poverty, food security, health, education, water and sanitation, and energy. It is expected that this will be suitably addressed in forthcoming intergovernmental negotiations. The redefinition of Goal 1 poverty targets and indicators to reflect the reality of urban and national poverty lines, is also a matter of critical concern.

The need to keep the spatial balance of economic, social and ecological SDG targets across the rural-urban continuum is an important theme debated during the OWG. Ending extreme rural poverty, enabling prosperity and sustainable agriculture would be difficult to achieve without sustainable urban areas and regions, led by empowered local and regional governments in partnership with other key stakeholders.

The integrative nature of Goal 11, especially around implementation, implies considerable synergy with at least 11 other SDGs⁵ and their Targets and Indicators. First, this presents an opportunity to condense the overall SDG Indicator set to enable parsimony that would facilitate effective national, regional and local implementation. Second, the urbanization of indicator sets of other SDGs strengthens universal coverage, especially aiding those countries in the middle of the urban transition.

Taken together, this could imply by 2030 the end of urban poverty, hunger, and slums; the creation of over hundreds of millions of new incremental jobs across the world; and universal provision of health, education, housing, water, energy, waste and transport services for 5 billion urban residents.

Achieving Goal 11 will require tremendous focus on implementation and monitoring. While there is an ongoing debate on the value of Goal-linked Means of Implementation (MoI) Targets and Indicators, the #urbanSDG Campaign suggests modification of the OWG Goal 11 MoIs in the light of revised Targets, Indicators, and feedback from its wide constituent base.

Next Steps

Goal 11 has brought to the fore the operational challenge of building a multi-scalar metric framework to enable monitoring of the SDGs at the appropriate level of action. To this end, this document suggests a minimal set of 'universal' national Indicators that will be reported globally; a set of supplementary indicators that could be reported at national, regional, and city level as considered appropriate by the member state (in consultation with its National Statistical Office and Regional and Local Governments); and a wider set of Indicators to support local and regional action and monitoring for the SDGs.

This is the first attempt at building a multi-scalar Goal, Target and Indicator framework for sustainable cities and human settlements. It will require regular review and fine-tuning, especially since the operational challenge of innovating around an appropriate suite of Targets and Indicators at city, regional and national levels is far from trivial.

The Urban SDG Campaign has taken upon itself the responsibility of building and testing this framework in 2015 in a set of cities across major geographies of the world. This work in

⁵ SDGs on Poverty (#1), Food (#2), Health (#3), Education (#4), Gender (#5), Water and Sanitation (#6), Energy (#7), Growth and Employment (#8), Infrastructure (#9), Inequality (#10) and Climate Change (#13)

progress is intended to support the further refinement of monitoring and statistical processes and innovation that will be needed to enable successful SDG implementation.

RECOMMENDED REVISIONS OF GOAL 11 TARGET AND INDICATORS

Target 11.1: By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services, *including the upgrading of slums.*

Indicator 11.1: Percentage of urban population living in slums or informal settlements

Rationale and definition: This indicator measures the percentage of the urban population living in slums or informal settlements, as defined by UN-Habitat. The indicator is calculated by taking the number of people living in slums of a city divided by the total population of this city, expressed as a percentage. At the country level, this percentage is calculated by taking the total number of people living in slums of all the cities of a country divided by the total population living in all the cities of the given country.⁶

UN-Habitat has developed a household level definition of a slum household in order to be able to use existing household-level survey and census data to identify slum dwellers among the urban population. A slum household is a household that lacks any one of the following five elements:

- Access to improved water (access to sufficient amount of water for family use, at an affordable price, available to household members without being subject to extreme effort)
- Access to improved sanitation (access to an excreta disposal system, either in the form of a private toilet or a public toilet shared with a reasonable number of people)
- Security of tenure (evidence of documentation to prove secure tenure status or de facto or perceived protection from evictions)
- Durability of housing (permanent and adequate structure in non-hazardous location)
- Sufficient living area (not more than two people sharing the same room)

Disaggregation: By sex of head of household and age.

Comments and limitations: Not all slums are the same and not all slum dwellers suffer from the same degree of deprivation. The degree of deprivation depends on how many of the five conditions that define slums are prevalent within a slum household. Approximately one-fifth of slum households live in extremely poor conditions, defined by UN-Habitat as lacking more than three basic shelter needs.⁷ The definition of the water and sanitation component of the index may need to be reviewed to ensure full consistency with the water supply and sanitation indicators currently under development by the WHO/UNICEF JMP (Indicators 57 and 58). In line with the relative universality of the SDGs, and to ensure that this target is universally applicable and pursued in both developing and developed cities, Habitat for Humanity and others have proposed expanding the definition of a slum household to include a sixth element related to affordability. Most analysts measure affordability as a household spending no more than 30% of household income on accommodations as the baseline.

⁶ Global City Indicators Facility. See: <http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/seriesdetail.aspx?srid=710>

⁷ UN-Habitat, (2006), State of the World's Cities 2006/7. See: http://www.unhabitat.org/documents/media_centre/sowcr2006/sowcr%205.pdf

Preliminary assessment of current data availability by Friends of the Chair: A

Primary data source: Household surveys.

Potential lead agency or agencies: UN-Habitat and the Global City Indicators Facility (GCIF).

Secondary Indicator: (1) Proportion of population that spends more than 30% of its income on accommodation (as an alternative to incorporating affordability as a sixth element into the definition of a slum household, described above)

Indicator 11.2: Percentage of people within 0.5 km of public transit running at least every 20 minutes

Rationale and definition: This indicator measures access to reliable public transportation, using a proxy of percentage of population within [0.5] kilometers of public transit running at least every [20] minutes. Public transportation is defined as a shared passenger transport service that is available to the general public. It includes buses, trolleys, trams, trains, subways, and ferries. It excludes taxis, car pools, hired buses not shared by strangers without prior arrangement.

Effective and low-cost transportation for mobility is critical for urban poverty reduction and economic development because it provides access to jobs, health care, education services, and more. The Partnership on Sustainable Low-Carbon Transport (SLoCaT)⁸ and others propose indicators for urban access to sustainable transport that include: mean daily travel time, percentage of income spent by urban families on transport, and percentage of households within 500 meters of good quality, affordable public transportation.

Disaggregation: Households should be disaggregated spatially and in terms of potential disadvantage (such as gender, age, disability) to ensure access for all.

Comments and limitations: Open Transport is a new approach to data collection promoted by the World Bank and others, with open data standards, open source software, and open data enabling the next generation of managing and planning transport systems in resource-constrained environments. The General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS), for example, has now been demonstrated across the world as a way to cheaply collect, disseminate, and allow analysis of public transport service data by multiple software platforms, generating spatial data on service frequency. A growing body of data exists for measuring service provision and frequency of public transportation, though data often do not exist or are of poor quality in lower income countries. There is a lack of international data standards or reporting, and data harmonization is a challenge. To obtain this data requires going down to municipal/city level, as urban transport is most often not under direct responsibility of national governments. There is a need for better global efforts to assemble, integrate, harmonize, and report on national and global data on the number of people with access to mass transit, transport infrastructure, and transport services.⁹

Preliminary assessment of current data availability by Friends of the Chair: B

⁸ Global City Indicators Facility. See: <http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/seriesdetail.aspx?srid=710>

⁹ UN-Habitat, (2006), State of the World's Cities 2006/7. See: http://www.unhabitat.org/documents/media_centre/sowcr2006/sowcr%205.pdf

Primary data source: Administrative data. Potential lead agency or agencies: UN-Habitat.

Comments and limitations: Secondary indicator on goods – refer London Doc pp. 15. Also – associate with Indicator 14 under Goal 2 on food security.

Secondary Indicators: (1) Share of trips by walking, by bicycling, and by public transport; (2) share of income spent by urban households on transport (by income quintile)

Target 11.3: By 2030, *achieve more equitable and efficient land use through participatory urban and regional planning and management.*

Indicator 11.3: Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate at comparable scale

Rationale and Definition:

Cities are expected to absorb between two and three billion additional people by the year 2050. Whether they manage to do so sustainably depends strongly on whether they harness the efficiency advantages of agglomeration. Agglomeration provides the compactness, concentration, and connectivity that lead to prosperity and sustainability. More than half of the area expected to be urban in 2030 remains to be built.¹⁰ Therein lies an extraordinary opportunity to make the future city more productive and sustainable. However, most cities are forfeiting these advantages, becoming more expansive, growing spatially faster than their population, and haphazardly absorbing land needed for agriculture and ecosystem services. With impending resource limits and twin climate change and food crises, we have little time to reverse this trend.

As this indicator, a measure of land-use efficiency, benchmarks and monitors the relationship between land consumption and population growth, it informs and enables decision-makers to track and manage urban growth at multiple scales and enhances their ability to promote land use efficiency. In sum, it ensures that the SDGs address the wider dimensions of space and land adequately and provides the frame for the implementation of several other goals, notably health, food security, energy and climate change.

This land use efficiency indicator not only uniquely highlights the *form* of urban development but also illuminates human settlement patterns. It can be employed to capture the three dimensions of land use efficiency: economic (e.g., proximity of factors of production) environmental (e.g., lower per capita rates of resource use and GHG emissions,) and social (e.g., avoidance of settlement of on vulnerable land, promotion of reduced travel times/distances). Finally, urban configuration largely predetermines the technologies and behavioral patterns within a city. Once built, cities are expensive and difficult to reconfigure. Fast-growing cities in the developing world must ‘get it right’ before they are beset by infrastructural lock-in. Though density is typically measured in units of inhabitants per hectare, and its inverse, land consumption, in hectares per inhabitant, this Indicator is ultimately measuring a unitless ratio (i.e., rate to rate).

Disaggregation:

City, region (functional metropolitan area), nation

Comments and Limitations:

¹⁰ Elmqvist et al (2013): *Urbanization, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services: Challenges and Opportunities*. Springer.

Technical capacity is a basic requirement but the data are free and publically accessible. Need to encourage national statistical agencies to provide spatially continuous demographic data (not bounded by jurisdiction) in digital form and to integrate mapping into their official census data.

Preliminary Assessment of Current Data Availability by Friends of the Chair

Primary Data Source

Satellite imagery and census data.

For more than five decades, the US Geological Survey/NASA Landsat data have been freely available and frequently updated, with continually improving resolution. The European Community's Joint Research Center has developed the Global Human Settlement Layer, an even higher-resolution land cover dataset with similar frequency and distribution practices as Landsat. Many researchers have used these technologies to measure land cover and urban expansion.¹¹ Both measure built-up area as buildings and compacted soils and impervious surfaces. WorldPop overlays demographic data on GIS maps.¹²

Potential Lead Agency: UN-Habitat, World Bank

Secondary Indicator: (1) Proportion of cities with legislation that promotes participatory mechanisms related to urban planning and local decision-making that ensure a fair representation of the urban population, including slum dwellers and informal workers.

Target 11.4: Strengthen *cities'* efforts to protect and *promote* cultural and natural heritage.

Indicator 11.4: See secondary indicators

Secondary Indicators: (1) Percentage of budget provided for maintaining cultural and natural heritage; (2) Number of public libraries per 100,000 people.

Target 11.5: By 2030, significantly reduce the *social, health, economic and ecological risks and impacts of disasters, environmental change and disease outbreaks by better designing and managing cities*, protecting people in vulnerable situations.

Indicator 11.5: Percent of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies informed by accepted international frameworks (such as forthcoming Hyogo-2 Framework).

Rationale and definition¹³: Disasters are increasing in frequency and intensity, and those exacerbated by climate change are significantly impeding progress toward sustainable development. Evidence indicates that exposure of people and assets in all countries has increased faster than vulnerability has decreased, thus generating new risk and a steady rise in disasters losses with significant socio-economic impact, especially at the local and community

¹¹ Angel et al (2011): *Making Room for a Planet of Cities*. Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy; Seto et al (2011): *A Meta-analysis of Global Urban Land Expansion*. PLoS ONE.

¹² Gaughan AE, Stevens FR, Linard C, Jia P and Tatem AJ, 2013, High resolution population distribution maps for Southeast Asia in 2010 and 2015, *PLoS ONE*, 8(2): e55882.

¹³ Based on draft Preamble, Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

level. Due to the concentration of population, infrastructure and built environment, and economic activity, the risks for urban areas are particularly high.

The development and implementation of such plans should address underlying risk factors and should engage all stakeholders, especially poor and vulnerable populations. The plans should focus not only on acute disasters, but also address recurring small-scale, slow-onset, and extensive disasters that particularly affect communities and households. The plans aim at minimizing disaster risks, improving preparedness, building capacity, strengthening response and recovery efforts, and enhancing resilience to current and emerging risks at all levels.

This indicator builds on the progress achieved since the adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) in 2005, by using a multi-scalar approach to reduce disaster risk at neighborhood, local, national, regional, and global levels by countries and other stakeholders. It takes a preventative approach that recognizes the benefits of advanced planning in reducing disaster losses – in lives and in the social, economic, and environmental assets of persons, communities, and countries.

Disaggregation: This indicator can be disaggregated spatially at the national, regional, and city levels. At sub-national levels, the indicator would read as follows: “Development and implementation of risk reduction and resilience plans/strategies in line with the forthcoming Hyogo Framework. [Yes/No]”

Comments and limitations: The fifth goal of the draft outcome document the Post 2015 Hyogo Framework meeting in Sendai, “increase number of countries with national and local strategies by [a given percentage] by 20[xx]”. Indicator 1.6 for proposed SDG 1 addresses the losses and includes a potential complementary national indicator for a Disaster Risk reduction Index, which can be used alongside this suggested indicator.

Preliminary assessment of current data availability by Friends of the Chair:

Primary data source: HFA reporting

Potential lead agency or agencies: UNISDR

Secondary Indicators: (1) Economic losses related to GDP caused by disasters; (2) Proportion of population living in high-risk zones; (3) Number of deaths, injuries, and displaced people caused by natural disasters annually per 100,000 population.

Target 11.6: By 2030, reduce the adverse environmental impacts of cities, paying special attention to *biodiversity loss*, air quality, *construction materials*, and waste management

Indicator 11.6: Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and well managed

Rationale and definition: Urban households and businesses produce substantial amounts of solid waste (not including industrial, construction, and hazardous waste) that must be collected regularly and disposed of properly in order to maintain healthy and sanitary living conditions. Such collection can be through formal or informal means. Uncollected and improperly managed solid waste can end up in drains and dumps, and may result in blocked drains and other unsanitary conditions. Mosquitos that spread disease can breed in blocked drains and dumps. In addition, some constituents of solid waste, such as organic matter, can attract flies and rodents that spread gastrointestinal and parasitic diseases.

Sustainable solid waste management is essential. This implies waste reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, incineration, and disposal in landfills. Waste reduction, recycling, reuse and composting are preferred methods and should be promoted, as they reduce demand on scarce environmental resources, decrease energy use, and minimize the quantity of waste that must eventually be incinerated or disposed in landfills.

UN-Habitat (2009) has specified that solid waste collection can include (formal or informal) collection from individual households and regular dumpster collection, but not local dumps to which households must carry garbage. Solid waste collection should be considered regular and adequate if it occurs at least once a week.

Disaggregation: This indicator can be disaggregated at the city and town level.

Comments and limitations: In many countries and sub-national governments, solid waste collection and management data are currently incomplete or not available. The development of adequate data collection systems may require a significant effort in some jurisdictions. Indicator #74 (under proposed SDG 12) in the proposed SDSN framework addresses global food loss and waste, which could be used alongside this suggested indicator; alternatively, this broader formulation under SDG 11 could serve as a proxy for measuring food waste under SDG 12.

Preliminary assessment of current data availability by Friends of the Chair: A

Primary data source: Data on formal solid waste collection and management may be available from municipal bodies and/or private contractors. Informal collection data may be available from NGOs and community organizations.

Potential lead agency or agencies: UN-Habitat and WHO at the city or national urban level.

Secondary Indicators: (1) Fine particulate matter (PM 2.5 concentration); (2) Percentage of wastewater treated within an urban agglomeration; (3) GHG emissions tons/capita; (4) Proportion of recycled from municipal waste.

Target 11.7: By 2030, provide, *maintain, and encourage* access to safe, inclusive and *multipurpose* public space

Indicator 11.7: Area of public space as a proportion of total city space

Rationale and Definition

Having sufficient public space allows cities and regions to function efficiently and equitably.¹⁴ Reduced amounts of public space impacts negatively on quality of life, social inclusion, infrastructure development, environmental sustainability, and productivity. For example, well-designed and maintained streets and public spaces result in lower crime and violence. Making space for formal and informal economic activities, recovering and maintaining public spaces for a diversity of users in a positive way, and making services and opportunities available to marginalized residents enhance social cohesion and economic security.

¹⁴ Public space is publicly owned land and available for public use. Public spaces encompass a range of environments including streets, sidewalks, squares, gardens, parks, conservation areas. Each public space has its own spatial, historic, environmental, social, and economic features.

Uncontrolled rapid urbanization generally yields settlement patterns with dangerously low proportions of public space. As a result, these places are unable to accommodate safe pedestrian and vehicular rights of way, land for critical infrastructure like water, sewerage, and waste collection, recreational spaces and parks that contribute to social cohesion and protected ecological hotspots and corridors. As new cities emerge they often have reduced allocations of land for public space, especially streets. On average, the 15% of the land allocated to streets in new planned areas is substantially less than the standard; in unplanned areas the situation is considerably worse with an average of 2%.¹⁵

The generally accepted minimum standard for public space in higher density places (150 inhabitants or more per/hectare) is 45% (30% for streets and sidewalks and 15% for green space).¹⁶ Total city space refers to the administrative/jurisdictional spatial extent of a municipality.

Disaggregation

Neighborhood, city, region

Comments and Limitations.

With sufficient data, this indicator allows for comparing and aggregating progress across cities towards the achievement of an optimal quantity of land allocated to public space.

Preliminary Assessment of Current Data Availability by Friends of the Chair

Primary Data Source

Satellite imagery and local Official Maps (most municipalities have legal documents delineating publicly owned land); US Geological Survey/NASA Landsat data; European Community's Joint Research Center Global Human Settlement Layer.

Potential lead agency or agencies: UN-Habitat, World Bank

Secondary Indicators: (1) Proportion of total public space in a city that is assigned to support livelihoods of the poor; (2) Urban green space per capita; (3) Proportion of urban areas located fewer than 300 meters away from an open public space; (4) Number of reported crimes (homicides, injuries and theft rates) committed annually in urban areas, per 100,000 population.

Proposed Alternative MOI Targets

Target 11.a: *Prepare and implement a national urban and human settlements policy framework.*

Indicator 11.a: **Presence of a national urban and human settlements policy framework.**

Rationale and definition

For many national governments, the scale and pace of the urban transformation is a relatively recent reality. A combination of rural-urban migration, natural population growth and structural changes in the economy has initiated processes that result in long-term changes in the demographic and spatial balance in the country. Throughout the world, most countries

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ UN-Habitat 2013. *Streets as Public Spaces and Drivers of Urban Prosperity*. Nairobi.

have struggled to recognize, understand, and adequately respond to these changes, which are generally visible through rapid growth (and decline) of both primary and secondary cities, the rapid expansion of informal settlements and slums, and increased demands for services and economic opportunities. Responding to these changes is greatly facilitated by a proactive response to this urban transition, while simultaneously strengthening the interdependence between urban and rural populations. A well-prepared and comprehensive national urban policy provides an institutional, fiscal, and regulatory framework for the long-term management of cities and human settlements of all sizes. Well-managed national urban policies can:

- facilitate national economic growth,
- contribute to the reduction of both urban and rural poverty,
- improve the management of natural resources and
- improve co-ordination within and between tiers and sectors of government.

Disaggregation

While such a policy framework needs to encompass the entire country, it should ideally be developed with reference to regional and local imperatives. In so doing, it would recognize the fact that growth and development should recognize local and regional conditions. International experience has shown that national urban policies are best developed in partnership with local and regional governments, as well as private and public stakeholders.

Comments and limitations

Demographic changes are often in advance of legal, fiscal and institutional realities. A key role for national urban policy, therefore, is to provide both a framework and a timeframe for the programmatic empowerment of different tiers of government, and building the necessary human and institutional capacity.

Primary data source: UN-DESA

Potential lead agency or agencies: World Bank, UN-Habitat, Cities Alliance

Target 11.b. By 2020, increase by x% the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, develop and implement in line with the forthcoming Hyogo Framework holistic disaster risk management at all levels.

Indicator: Covered under Indicator 11.5 above.

Target 11.c: *Support national, regional and local governments through financial and technical assistance to strengthen revenue streams, regulatory and institutional capacity.*

Indicator 11.c: Sub-national government revenues and expenditures as a percentage of general government revenues and expenditures

Rationale and definition: This indicator measures (i) the percentage of revenues that are either raised by, or allocated to, sub-national governments (regional and local governments) as a proportion of general government revenue; and (ii) the percentage of total public expenditure undertaken by sub-national levels of government as a proportion of general government spending (excluding social security funds and public corporations).

As recognized by the UN Secretary General, “...many of the investments to achieve the SDGs will take place at the sub-national level and led by local authorities (Synthesis Report § 94). For the purposes of this MOI and indicator, the respective revenue and expenditure of each tier of government is a very tangible indicator of the authority and capacity of each level of government to mobilize resources, promote, and invest in the essential elements of urban and local development, particularly bulk and connector infrastructure, and the provision and maintenance of basic/essential services. The ability to transfer funds to, and spend funds at, the local level presupposes appropriate regulatory and institutional capacity at the sub-national scale. The fiscal indicator is thus a proxy for the cluster of financial, legal, and institutional capabilities on which sustainable development in cities depends. While there has been some expansion of the roles and responsibilities of sub-national government over the past two to three decades, their further involvement and empowerment will be essential to the overall success of implementing the SDGs. The overall institutional framework, and institutional capacities at each tier of government, is a vital but often neglected component of overall governance.

Disaggregation: The IMF Government Finance Statistics (GFS) framework distinguishes three levels of government: central, regional (regions, states or provinces) and local governments, although many countries may have two tiers, typically national and local governments, and municipalities. At all times, the roles of two or three tiers of government should be seen as complementary levels of an overall system of governance, typically bound together through an intergovernmental fiscal framework, clearly defined and complementary roles and jurisdiction, and co-operation between the different spheres of governance.

Comments and limitations: Standardization of the fiscal variables is the most important strength of the IMF's GFS. This standardization does, however, inevitably lead to a loss of detail and data richness that will need to be addressed. The GFS covers 149 countries on a yearly basis and is the only data source with such comprehensive coverage, although the number of countries with sub-national data is reduced by about two thirds. GFS generally do not report non-financial public enterprises and public financial institutions, which can lead to misinterpretations if some governments have devolved significant authority to such entities while other governments have not.

Primary data source: International Monetary Fund Government Finance Statistics (GFS)

Potential lead agency or agencies: International Monetary Fund, World Bank, UN-Habitat, OECD