Sustainable Development Goals- IAEG-SDG

UN-Habitat responses to summary of comments by IAEG-SDG members
(25 September 2015)

SDG Goal 11 Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

Target 11.1 By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums.

Proposed Indicator: Proportion of urban population living in slums

I.   Suggestions for Modifications and Replacement Indicators

African Member States comment that "informal settlement" is added to the indicator.
The slums definition includes poor informal settlements that are normally lacking services. UN-Habitat has not a real opposition to add the suggestion from the African Member States.

II.   Suggestions for Additional Indicators

Canada proposes considering additional indicators such as, "demand for subsidized housing (where applicable)", "number of households per dwelling" and "share of income dedicated to housing and utilities."
These suggestions refer to the second proposed indicator related to the affordability of housing.

UN-Habitat has not a real opposition to add the suggestion from Canada to the second priority indicator adopting the third option proposed by Canada. The proposed 3 indicators have the following limitations:

1. Demand for subsidized housing. This indicator is very contextual depending on the local/national definition of subsidized housing that can change in locations and overtime. Besides, it only refers to the demand of housing, and not to the supply (government and other responses to cover deficits). It is clear that in countries with poor housing delivery, households may be discouraged to be registered as a demand and therefore, it would appear much lower. This indicator can be covered by the proportion of the population that expends more than 30% in housing.

2. Number of households per dwelling. This indicator is redundant and is covered by the overcrowding component of the slums.

3. Share of income dedicated to housing and utilities. Utilities should be separated from this suggested indicator, since they can vary a lot per countries. Un-habitat has no objection with this indicator as a second option or priority.

United Kingdom proposes an additional indicator, "Percentage of population in urban areas with secure rights to land, measured by (i) percentage with documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and (ii) percentage who perceive their rights to land are recognized and protected."
The proposed indicator is originally covered by the slums five components. Efforts have been deployed to integrate security of tenure in the measurement. UN-Habitat and partners have made a lot of progress on the measurement of security of tenure.

III.   Additional Comments

Tanzania criticizes this indicator, claiming that most of the data required are not nationally available but rather modelled.

Information for this indicator on slums is not modelled, but taken from various sources: census, household surveys, DHS and MICS from respective countries. The data is statistically produced at country urban level. This indicator strongly promotes national country data.

France comments that the indicator only covers slums and should be more universal.

Slums are considered as 'shelter deprivations' measurements, and as such apply to the majority of countries in the world, particularly to migrants and other minorities. It is also possible to use 'inadequate housing' instead of slums that have a more universal connotation.

Ecuador, Brazil and Turkey comment that a statistical definition of "slum" is fundamental.

This definition exists since it was extensively used for a Target on the MDGs. The approved definition of slums in the UN Statistical commission (2002) is as follows: 'A slum household is defined as one or a group of individuals living under the same roof/household in an urban area, lacking one or more of the following five amenities: 1) Durable housing (a permanent structure providing protection from extreme climatic conditions); 2) Sufficient living area (no more than three people sharing a room); 3) Access to improved water (water that is sufficient, affordable and can be obtained without extreme effort); 4) Access to improved sanitation facilities (a private toilet, or a public one shared with a reasonable number of people); and 5) Secure tenure (de facto or de jure secure tenure status and protection against forced eviction).

Canada comments that the indicator does not fully measure the target.

The target is multidimensional and the proposed indicator focuses one of the key dimensions of the target. Houses that are not 'adequate' and 'safe' qualify in most countries as slums. The 'affordability' should be covered by the second proposed indicator.

United States comments that this indicator only captures a portion of the target and implies certain conditions about "slum housing" and "non-slum housing" that might not be completely accurate.

Broad comment and difficult to respond, still the previous response to Canada applies.

UN-HABITAT responded to Tanzania stating that the indicator uses nationally produced data.

> **UN-Habitat revised proposal for indicator 11.1.1**
>
> **Proportion of urban population living in slums or informal settlements with inadequate housing**

Target 11.2 By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons.

Suggested Indicator: Proportion of the population that has a public transit stop within 0.5 km

I.   Suggestions for Modifications and Replacement Indicators

Poland proposes modifying the indicator to read: "Transport of passengers per one inhabitant."
This proposed indicator by Poland is in general acceptable. However, it eliminates a fundamental component of the proposed indicator, which is the spatial distribution of the transport infrastructure/service, and the capacity to disaggregate the indicator by population and location in the city that is a key component of 'not leaving any one behind". Any proposed indicator of transport should be sensitive to spatial considerations to allow for disaggregation and to integrate equity aspects.

Brazil proposes an alternative indicator, "Average commute time to work or school."
This indicator proposed by Brazil entails the risk of promoting motorized private solutions, since it focuses on 'time' without consideration of the different modes of transport. Eventually adding Average commute time to work or school *by public transport* could be acceptable. Still as the previous comment on Poland it is an indicator that is spatially blind and does not allow for disaggregation.

UNCDF proposes modifying the indicator to read, "Percentage of people within 0.5 KM of public transit running at least every 20 minutes.
As previously commented by UN-Habitat, this indicator is extremely difficult to collect the data when including time considerations; mainly because the notion of '20 minutes' can change according to time of the day (pick hours) and weekends.

II.   Suggestions for Additional Indicators

Canada proposes additional indicators on transportation affordability and accessibility.
In order to respond to the different dimensions of the target (access, safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable, and disaggregated for vulnerable populations) there is a need of having several indicators. The current proposed indicator focuses on the fundamental aspect of access, which is a critical condition for the other dimension to happen.

The UN Statistical System Organisations propose an additional indicator, "Proportion of income spent by families on transport (to reach services such as employment, health, education, and community services."
This proposal may have the negative effect of promoting motorized private transport, since it does not specify the modes of transport (similar comment to Brazil suggestion to modify the indicator). Perhaps it will be good to refer to monthly expenditures in general, regardless of which services are reached). In this sense, it is an acceptable second priority indicator that still has not spatial considerations.

III.   Additional Comments

Japan expressed doubt that data would be regularly available.
Data can be collected in a regular basis if the proposed indicator is maintained. Conventional and innovative ways of data collection are available already in developing countries/cities, and they are regularly used.

Colombia states that the suggested indicator does not completely cover the target as it does not include a measure on "special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations."

Same comment as the response to Canada. In order to respond to the different dimensions of the target (access, safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable, and disaggregated for vulnerable populations); there is a need of several indicators. The current proposed indicator focuses on the fundamental aspect of access, which is a critical condition for the other dimension to happen.

Cabo Verde comments that if the source of the data is a survey, it is preferable to use time rather than distance as the metric.

The data sources for the proposed indicator are multiple, and not necessarily surveys. Specialized agencies and local authorities collect data on public transport stops (general infrastructure of transport); the additional estimation of population coverage can be derived from various exiting sources, including population and spatial indicators from city maps.

United States comments that this is only a partial indicator as it does not address whether the transportation is safe, affordable, accessible, sustainable nor whether there is improved road

Same comment as the response to Canada. In order to respond to the different dimensions of the target (access, safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable, and disaggregated for vulnerable populations); there is a need of several indicators. The current proposed indicator focuses on the fundamental aspect of access, which is a critical condition for the other dimension to happen.

Canada comments that the indicator does not fully measure the target.

Same comment as the previous response to Canada. In order to respond to the different dimensions of the target (access, safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable, and disaggregated for vulnerable populations); there is a need of several indicators. The current proposed indicator focuses on the fundamental aspect of access, which is a critical condition for the other dimension to happen.

World Bank suggested an alternate indicator on "Share of jobs accessible within 60 minutes without private car."

This indicator proposed by the WB measures the location and distribution of jobs in the city, but not necessarily the transport infrastructure provision, which is the objective of the target.

UNFPA suggested an indicator on "percentage of population within X travel time of vital service delivery points."

This indicator proposed by UNFPA measures the location and distribution of vital service delivery points in the city and therefore some form of good urban planning, but not necessarily the transport infrastructure provision, which is the objective of the target.

DESA proposes 'percentage of public transport vehicles meeting the minimum national standards for accessibility by persons with disabilities'

The need to respond to vulnerable population is very important; however in many cities a fundamental precondition for this indicator proposed by DESA is the existence of public transport, which is a serious problem in many cities. The need to disaggregate to persons with disabilities is welcome and can be integrated in the proposed indicator and explained in the metadata.

UN-Habitat revised proposal for indicator 11.2.1

Proportion of the population that has a public transit stop within 0.5 km

> **Target 11.3 By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries.**

Suggested Indicator: Efficient land use

I.   Suggestions for Modifications and Replacement Indicators

Canada proposes an alternative indicator, "Land-cover change in and around urban areas."
This proposed indicator by Canada does not take into account population dynamics that is clearly associated to changes in land uses. Besides, the notion of 'in and around' is ambiguous and difficult to measure and compare across cities in the world. Defining city boundaries for the estimation of land coverage demands clear criteria and precise definitions (refer to metadata for this indicator and City Prosperity Initiative of UN-Habitat).

Switzerland supports a previous WB proposal as an alternative indicator, ""ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate"
Accepted. In fact the proposed indicator always contemplated this explanation, as suggested by Switzerland and the African Member States. The revised indicator proposed by UN-Habitat is drafted in these terms (refer to box at the end of this target).

France proposes an alternative indicator, "number of cities which implemented local urban planning schemes and/or urban mobility plans".
The proposal of France has various limitations: 1) it entails only national reporting and not real city interventions; 2) cities that already have a local urban plan scheme either good or bad have nothing else to do in the next 15 years. UN-Habitat Urban Indicators Programme has shown that nearly 95 per cent of cities routinely respond that they have these kinds of schemes; 3) this indicator is a process oriented indicator and not on output indicator, as intended by the SDGs framework for the first 7 targets of this Goal; 4) urban mobility plans do not address by any means the main components of this target.

African member states propose an alternative indicator, "Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate."
Accepted. In fact the proposed indicator always contemplated this explanation, as suggested by Switzerland and the African Member States. The revised indicator proposed by UN-Habitat is drafted in these terms (refer to box at the end of this target).

UNFPA proposes modifying the indicator to read, "Percent of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement participatory urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs."
This indicator is already covered in 11.a.

II.   Suggestions for Additional Indicators

United Kingdom proposes an additional indicator, "km of high capacity (BRT, light rail, metro) public transport per person for cities with more than 500,000 inhabitants."
This comment corresponds to Target 2 and by mistake it was recorded in Target 3. Still, UN-Habitat response to this proposal is that it is acceptable. However, it losses the spatial dimension that the current proposed indicator has.

Switzerland proposes an additional indicator, "number of cities whose major urban infrastructure projects follow master plans"
Master plans are completely outdated as planning tools because they are unstainable and tend to generate divided cities. The world is discussing a new urban agenda in which other forms of participatory flexible plans will be

certainly adopted in Habitat III (2016). The proposal of Switzerland has various limitations: 1) it entails only national reporting and not real city interventions; 2) cities whose infrastructure provision follow 'master plans' may do so only in some projects and not others. Besides, assessing a city performance only by major urban infrastructure projects tend to be very sectoral in the approach; 3) major urban infrastructure projects are more often than not top-down decisions that are not at all 'participatory' as the Target indicates; 3) this indicator is a process-oriented indicator and not on output indicator, as intended by the SDGs framework for the first 7 targets of this Goal.

The UN Statistical System Organisations propose an additional indicator, "Percentage of cities with direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management, which operate regularly and democratically."
This proposal from UN Statistical System Organisations responds to the target. However, it has some limitations: 1) it eliminates the innovative approach of integrating a spatial analysis that has a strong connection to disaggregation of information both for population and locations, as the proposed indicator does; 2) it is a process oriented indicator, whereas the proposed indicator is an outcome indicator, following the desire SDGs indicators framework; 3) the notion of 'direct participation' is ambiguous and contextual in the measurement according to political contexts, it is not comparable across cultural differences; 4) likewise, the notion of 'operates regularly and democratically" is also quite ambiguous, and difficult to measure and compare across cities and countries; 5) '*percentage of cities*' entails a national reporting that reduces the role of cities; 6) the indicator tends to measure the nature and frequency of the participation process, but not necessarily the transformative outcomes of this participation. UN-Habitat recommends using this indicator as a second priority to address the notion of participation. Still, some technical modification should be considered.

UNECE proposes an additional indicator similar to the previous one, "Measure to what extent inhabitants of a city/local authority are enabled to access information and to actively participate in decision-making, through also e.g. number of Parties to the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention)."
As the previous indicator, the notion of participation and access to justice and information is extremely positive and welcome. However, the indicator has a serious methodological problem. It measures simultaneously various aspects that are not possible to aggregate or compare (i.e. either access to information and/or access to participation, and/or access to justice) making extremely difficult or impossible to compare across cities. The indicator tends to measure the nature and frequency of the participation process, but not necessarily the transformative outcomes of this participation due to the process oriented nature of the indicator. In case UNECE proposal includes the Aarhus Convention, Member States and eventually cities will need to ratify it, which will entail perhaps a lengthy process. UN-Habitat recommends using this indicator as a second priority adapted to the proposal of the UN Statistical Organisations, taking into account the need for some technical adjustments.

UNCDF proposes a new indicator, "Resources per capita invested in human settlement per sq. km."
The proposed indicator from UNCDF is impossible to be collected. Data is not even available in various developed countries. Besides, it has problems of computation. For instance, the notion of investments does not clarify by whom (public, private, social, communities). The indicator does not respond to the target. For instance, investments in some areas of the city could be high, but not necessarily sustainable, participatory or inclusive.

UNFPA suggests an alternate indicator 'ratio of land consumption rate to urban population growth rate at comparable scale.'
Accepted. In fact the proposed indicator always contemplated this explanation, as suggested by Switzerland and the African Member States. The revised indicator proposed by UN-Habitat is drafted in these terms (refer to box at the end of this target).

III.   Additional Comments

Cuba, Canada, Ecuador, India, Tanzania, Turkey, United States and Germany comment that a definition of what is considered "efficient land use" is necessary.

Efficient land use is estimated as the ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate. It qualifies as efficient when the ratio is equal to 1, meaning that the urban expansion (measured by land consumption growth rate) is equal or below the population growth rate. In these cases, efficient land use translated into stable or increased population densities that are associated to less consumption of land and energy per capita, and a more sustainable model of urbanization that tend to reduce energy consumption cost, minimize the depletion of the physical environment and biodiversity and reduce inequalities.

Mexico comments that the indicator can be interpreted in many ways and therefore the results could quite diverse and non- comparable.
The proposed indicators use a similar method, indicators and benchmarks, as specified in the metadata produced by UN-Habitat. In this manner it is possible to obtain uniformity and comparable results. In fact, the Mexican Government has produced an excellent study on efficient land use (expansion of cities) conducted by SEDESOL with technical support and data from INEGI.
(2011, http://ciczac.org/sistema/docpdf/capacitacion/foro%20sedatu/02.-
%20LA%20EXPANSION%20DE%20LAS%20CIUDADES%201980-2010.pdf).

Cabo Verde comments that they are unsure of the feasibility of this indicator as it is only currently available for 300 cities.
UN-Habitat indicated that data is currently available for at least 300 cities that the Agency has computed as part of the City Prosperity Initiative. However, the method is more and more used by different governments in the developing world. The EC produced similar data in various cities and countries. Recently the Joint Research Centre from the EC has produced a database for most cities in the world to calculate this indicator. UN-Habitat is creating tools, training manuals and metadata to support governments to estimate and report on this indicator with a unified methodology.

UN-HABITAT comments that this indicator is connected to many other indicators of the SDGs and that it ensures that the SDGs integrate the wider dimensions of space, population and land adequately, providing the framework for the implementation of other goals such as poverty, health, education, energy, inequalities and climate change.

UN-Habitat revised proposal for indicator 11.3.1

Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate – Efficient land use

22 October, 2015
* UN-Habitat responses to all comments are in blue colour
7 | P a g e

Target 11.4 Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage.

Proposed Indicator: Share of national (or municipal) budget which is dedicated to preservation, protection and conservation of national cultural heritage including World Heritage sites

I.   Suggestions for Modifications and Replacement Indicators

Brazil proposes an alternative indicator, "Relation between expenditures with preservation, protection and conservation of safeguarded cultural and natural heritage and the amount of protected goods."
UN-Habitat has not objection of the proposal made by Brazil. However, as the indicator is drafted, methodological problems may arise as it actually proposing a ratio of two or more components ('expenditures' on preservation, or on protection, or on conservation and the 'amount of protected goods'). Besides, there is a high level of ambiguity in notions such as 'preservation' that is difficult to define and measure. The indicator can be adopted with some level of refinement that will help to simplify the data collection process and its overall feasibility. The cultural heritage element, as important as it is, may have problem in the measurement of intangible assets.

II.   Suggestions for Additional Indicators

The UN Statistical System Organisations propose an additional indicator, "Number and percentage of labour force that holds a heritage occupation or is employed in the heritage sector."
This indicator is very important since it connects heritage preservation with local economy and employment and the sense of place and ownership. However, it has a methodological problem since some cities and countries historically may have more heritage and therefore more labour force related to heritage, thus these cities may report higher values than a city or country historically with less heritage, even if this particular city may be doing important efforts of preservation. In addition to this, the indicator does not define if intangible heritage like gastronomy, music, arts, etc., will enter in the category of heritage occupation and therefore all related jobs in the city would necessarily be included.

III.   Additional Comments

France states that the indicator needs to be defined more precisely and is not sure if the indicator is actually relevant to the target as some countries use more private money to safeguard cultural and natural heritage while others rely more on public funds.
UN-Habitat agrees with comments made by the Government of France since in many cities and countries founds may come from various other sources and actors that are not necessarily municipal or national. However, the proposed indicator limits the sources of funding to the government as responsible for the protection and preservation of the heritage and the protection of the 'commons'. The indicator, as proposed, enables for a higher level of comparability and feasibility of measurement.

Mexico comments that it would be necessary to define what "cultural" means in this context.
Agreed

Italy agrees to maintain this indicator even though they suggest it would be better to split Natural capital and Cultural Heritage into two separate indicators.
UN-Habitat agrees with the suggestion made by Italy

United States and Canada comment that this indicator is limited in its ability to measure the target.
The indicator is a good proxy to measure the target. Budgetary efforts are essential for the protection and safeguard of the heritage

Estonia comments that higher expenditure levels should not be the goal.
The definition of a benchmark and clear standardization of an optimal share of budget dedicated to preservation will avoid the distortion of overspending in the target. In this way 'more' would not necessarily be better, but it will be good to define a minimum base.

UN-Habitat revised proposal for indicator 11.4.1

Share of national (or municipal) budget which is dedicated to preservation, protection and conservation of national cultural heritage including World Heritage sites

Target 11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations.

Proposed Indicator: Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people

I.   Suggestions for Modifications and Replacement Indicators

Japan and Switzerland propose an alternate indicator, "'direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product'.
UN-Habitat agrees with the proposal of Japan and Switzerland, as a second priority indicator. However the suggested indicator should eliminate the reference to 'global' since each country needs to compute according to its own realities and potential.

France proposes adding "economic losses relative to gross domestic product caused by disasters" as an additional indicator and disaggregating by social status.
UN-Habitat agrees with the proposal of France, as a second priority indicator.

Brazil proposes an alternative indicator, "Percentage of cities with a direct participation of civil society in the urban planning and management, with a regular functioning structure and members who were democratically elected."
This suggested indicator does not respond to the Target 11.5.

African member states request that "displaced" be added to the indicator.
UN-Habitat agrees with the proposal of African Member States and suggests coordinating with OCHA for an agreed language.

OCHA suggests using "displaced (including evacuated and relocated)" or "forced to leave their homes or places of habitual residence (including evacuated and relocated)" among the elements collectively comprising "affected."
UN-Habitat agrees with the proposal of OCHA with regards to 'displaced'.

The UN Statistical System Organisations propose a modification that reads, "Number of deaths, missing and affected people due to hazardous events (per 100,000 people)."
UN-Habitat agrees with the proposal of the UN Statistical System Organisations. 'Hazardous events' is a broader category that includes disasters, among various other calamities that affect urban populations. Some of them include 'slow motion' hazardous events that are not necessarily recorded as 'disasters'.

UNECE calls for 'number of deaths per year resulting from each disaster type', then disaggregating by six types
The proposed indicator by UNECE refers only to deaths without taking into account the affected or displaced populations. The suggested disaggregation by six types of disasters, when data is available, can help to reduce vulnerabilities over time and better connect to policy responses.

II.   Suggestions for Additional Indicators

Korea, Colombia and UNISDR propose including an additional indicator on economic losses due to disaster.
UN-Habitat agrees to the proposal by Korea, Colombia and UNISDR as an additional indicator

The UN Statistical Systems Organisations propose an additional indicator, "Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic product."

UN-Habitat agrees with the proposal of the UN Statistical Systems Organisations, as a second priority indicator. However the suggested indicator should eliminate the reference to 'global' since each country needs to compute according to its own realities and potential.

UNCDF proposes a new indicator, "Proportion of housing units built on hazardous locations (per 100,000 housing units)." They state that the indicator has linkages with targets 1.5, 11.b and 11.1.
UN-Habitat has attempted to include hazardous locations in the slum indicator for the MDGs. This concept (hazardous location) proved to be difficult to define, measure and compare. In this sense the proposed indicator by UNCDF has already limits that contest its feasibility.

III. Additional Comments

Korea comments that it is important to determine the scope of 'disaster' and also to different between natural disasters (that should be approached as activities for reducing disaster) and social disaster (that should be approached from safety and management perspectives).
The metadata prepared by UN-Habitat, UNISDR and other organizations needs to define the scope and nature of 'disasters' within the Sendai Framework in order to respond to the comment made by Korea and ensure comparability and feasibility in the measurement.

United States and Canada comment that this indicator does not measure "economic loss."
Agreed. To respond to comment by United States and Canada, UN-Habitat, as suggested by various member states, proposes adding a secondary indicator on 'economic loss'.

Cabo Verde comments that it is difficult to have an accurate measure of "injured."
The metadata prepared by UN-Habitat, UNISDR and other organizations needs to define the scope and nature of 'injured' within the Sendai Framework in order to respond to the comment made by Cabo Verde and ensure comparability and feasibility in the measurement.

Denmark comments that merging "death" and "evacuation" numbers can be misleading and seems inappropriate. They suggest having an indicator with more focus on the impact on livelihoods.
Methodologically, it is not possible to merge 'death' and 'evacuation'. The proposed indicator suggests one or the other by using the word 'or'. This conjunction is not misleading, although it does increase the level of complexity in the collection, measurement and reporting, as indicated by Denmark. Measuring the impact on livelihoods is methodologically difficult due to the problems of attribution and causality, particularly in the context of complex situations.

Turkey comments that the vulnerability factors that contribute to the occurrence of disasters should be taken into account and some indicators to measure this vulnerability should be constructed.
The notion of 'vulnerability' is embedded in the policy response to reduce the number of 'deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated' monitored by the proposed indicator. In other words, a city or a country that is effectively reducing the population affected by disaster is supposed to be simultaneously reducing the levels of vulnerability.

The UN Mine Action Service suggests that landmines/ERW should be one of the causes that are disaggregated.
The metadata prepared by UN-Habitat, UNISDR and other organizations needs to define the scope and nature of 'disasters' within the Sendai Framework in order to cater to the different types of disasters: natural vs man-made (landmines) as suggested by the UN Mine Action Service. This will ensure comparability and feasibility in the measurement.

UNISDR comments that the suggested indicator is important because it is multipurpose and interlinked with several other targets.

UN-Habitat revised proposal for indicator 11.5.1

Number of deaths, missing people, injured or displaced (including evacuated and relocated) due to hazardous events per 100,000 people

Target 11.6 By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management.

Proposed Indicator: Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and well managed (disaggregated by type of waste)

I.   Suggestions for Modifications and Replacement Indicators

Cabo Verde and African member states suggest removing "well managed" from the indicator.
UN-Habitat supports the suggestion made by Cabo Verde and African Member States concerning the ambiguity of 'well managed'. However, instead of removing these words, UN-Habitat proposes as per the suggestion of Brazil to replace it by 'adequate final discharge'.

Canada proposes an alternative indicator, "Percent of waste recovered (recycling, compost etc.)."
More than 10 years of experience in the collection of the data from Urban Indicators Programme by UN-Habitat has shown the extreme difficulties in the collection and disaggregation of data related to recycling and compost. However, UN-Habitat is sensitive to the importance of the Canadian suggestion and recommends that this information should be collected when possible.

Brazil proposes a modified indicator, "Percentage of the urban solid waste regularly collected and adequate final discharge."
UN-Habitat fully agrees with the proposal of Brazil as indicated in the response to Cabo Verde and African Member States suggestion. The revised indicator proposed by UN-Habitat is drafted in these terms (refer to box at the end of this target).

II.   Suggestions for Additional Indicators

Turkey proposes an additional indicator on expenditure for waste management.
More than 10 years of experience in the collection of the data from Urban Indicators Programme by UN-Habitat has shown the extreme difficulties in the collection and disaggregation of data related to the expenditure for waste management. UN-Habitat is sensitive to the importance of the suggestion by Turkey and recommends that this information should be collected when possible.

III.   Additional Comments

Tanzania questions whether data on the indicator is readily available.
As commented by Tanzania, data on this indicator has historically being scant. However, important progress has been recorded in last years both by developed and developing countries. Today more and more countries integrate waste collection information in household surveys and in the records of local administrations and private service providers. International efforts are assisting in the collection of waste management data. Refer for instance to the Waste Atlas (www.atlas.d-waste.com).

Korea comments that it has a different standard for 'urban solid waste' and is thus unable to come up with this estimate. It comments that an estimate may be possible using Solid Waste Accounts in SEEA.
The metadata prepared by UN-Habitat, WHO and other organizations needs to define the scope and nature of 'urban solid waste' in order to respond to the comment made by Korea and ensure comparability and feasibility in the measurement.

Portugal agrees with the suggested indicator.

22 October, 2015
* UN-Habitat responses to all comments are in blue colour
13 | P a g e

France, Canada and United States ask for clarification on what "regularly collected and well managed" means.
UN-Habitat is sensitive to the comment made by France, Canada and United States concerning the ambiguity of 'regularly collected and well managed'. UN-Habitat proposes as per the suggestion of Brazil to replace 'well managed' by 'regularly connected and adequate final discharge'. The revised indicator proposed by UN-Habitat is drafted in these terms (refer to box at the end of this target).

France also suggests an additional indicator: "quantity and share of landfill waste."
The proposal by France is missing denominator. In order to calculate the share of landfill waste, there is a need to know the total waste produced by the city, information that although is not always available, it is recommended to collect as suggested by the Government of Estonia.

Tanzania asks for how many countries UN-Habitat and WHO have data and whether they are actual country data or estimates.
UN-Habitat, WHO and other organizations compile information on this proposed indicator. UN-Habitat City Prosperity Initiative collects the data for more than 500 cities. The Agency has also produced the method and metadata to assist cities and national governments in the collection of this data for the SDGs reporting.

Japan questions the feasibility of defining 'urban' as well as disaggregating by type of waste, proposing instead 'final disposal amount per capita',
The UN System has agreed that each country defines what is 'urban' in their national context. The implementation and the reporting of the Goal 11 of the SDGs give to 'urban' and cities a prominent role in the sustainability agenda. The comment by Japan regarding the feasibility of disaggregating by type of waste is valid. UN-Habitat has recommended eliminating this level of disaggregation from the proposed indicator. However, those cities and countries that are in a position to collect and analyze data at this level of disaggregation are encouraged to do so. Finally, the suggestion to integrate 'final disposal amount per capita' would, in fact, measure the individual generation of waste, rather than the capacity of local authorities to deal with this issue.

Turkey and Switzerland comment that the definition of "well managed" should be clarified.
UN-Habitat supports the suggestion made by Turkey and Switzerland concerning the ambiguity of 'well managed'. UN-Habitat proposes as per the suggestion of Brazil to replace it by 'adequate final discharge'. The revised indicator proposed by UN-Habitat is drafted in these terms (refer to box at the end of this target).

Estonia comments that the denominator of the indicator has not been defined.
The comment by Estonia is correct. The denominator should be the 'total waste generated by the city'.

Switzerland suggests "recycling rate" could be used as the definition for "well-managed"
UN-Habitat acknowledges the comment by Switzerland concerning the ambiguity of 'well managed', but recognizes that 'recycling rate' is not always comparable by cities and countries. UN-Habitat proposes as per the suggestion of Brazil to replace 'well managed' by 'adequate final discharge'. The revised indicator proposed by UN-Habitat is drafted in these terms (refer to box at the end of this target).

UN-Habitat revised proposal for indicator 11.6.1

Percentage of (urban) solid waste regularly collected and with adequate final discharge with regards to the total waste generated by the city.

Proposed Indicator: Level of ambient particulate matter (PM 10 and PM 2.5)

I.   Suggestions for Modifications and Replacement Indicators

Brazil proposes a modified indicator, "Level of ambient particulate matter in the environment (PM 10 and PM 2.5) for urban agglomerations with more than 100,000 residents."

Every country should decide on the size of the cities to include in their national reporting mechanism. To ensure comparability in this and other indicators, data should refer to the notion of 'urban', which needs to be nationally defined. UN-Habitat recommends that governments create a national sample of cities to report on Goal 11 indicators. An appropriate methodology, training and capacity development can be provided for that purpose. WHO proposal to weight the measurement by population makes unnecessary to refer to a specific threshold of city size.

II.   Suggestions for Additional Indicators

Germany proposes an additional indicator, "Annual average NO2-equivalents in ug/m3 air in cities.
Although the proposal of Germany is valid, UN-Habitat City Prosperity Initiative has shown that the particulate matter concentration (PM10 or even better PM2.5 as suggested by WHO-population weighted) is an appropriate indicator for this target. Creating an additional indicator may increase the burden of reporting without necessarily bringing an added value to decision making. In cases that some countries and cities are in capacity to produce additional data to monitor and report on air quality, UN-Habitat recommends to do so.

Canada proposes several complementary/additional indicators, "Ambient level of other air pollutant (O3, VOCs, NO2, and SO2). Population exposure to PM2.5. "
Although the proposal of Canada is valid, UN-Habitat City Prosperity Initiative has shown that the particulate matter concentration (PM10 or even better PM2.5 as suggested by WHO-population weighted) is an appropriate indicator for this target. Creating an additional indicator may increase the burden of reporting without necessarily bringing an added value to decision making. In cases that some countries and cities are in capacity to produce additional data to monitor and report on air quality, UN-Habitat recommends to do so.

WHO proposes 'annual mean levels of fine particulate matter (i.e. PM2.5) air pollution in cities (population weighted)'
UN-Habitat fully agrees with WHO proposal. UN-Habitat City Prosperity Initiative captures information for PM2.5 using data collected by WHO.

III.   Additional Comments

Germany comments that air quality is a multi-purpose indicator for the quality of life in a city. A disaggregation is not requested by the target and this not required within the indicator.
Agreed.

United Kingdom supports this indicator but comments that it is not very clearly specified.
UN-Habitat agrees that the proposed indicator should be modified as per WHO suggestion.

Singapore comments that we should also take into account the contribution of trans-boundary sources to the level of ambient particulate matter if possible.
Air quality is both a local and a global problem. The measurement should be at city level; and the policies to address air quality problems should contemplate the different sources of pollution, be them national or trans-boundary in nature.

Turkey comments that there should be a target value in the indicator. In other words the lower threshold value should be determined for particulate matter.
At this level of discussion, none of the SDG indicators integrate target values. However, metadata produced by WHO already refer to air quality and benchmarks.

Estonia comments that the indicator has the representativity problems. Quite often only the data for some single measurement points is available. The emission quantities could be considered as alternative.

To avoid representativity problems, cities can be technically advised to establish a well-distributed and representative air quality monitoring system in place. Emission quantities are desirable but they do provide the information to identify localized sources of air pollution and do not help to identify city inequalities in air quality.

WB prefers an indicator on GHG emissions.
Emission quantities are desirable but they do provide the information to identify localized sources of air pollution and do not help to identify city inequalities in air quality.

UN-Habitat revised proposal for indicator 11.6.2

Annual mean levels of fine particulate matter (i.e. PM2.5) air pollution in cities (population weighted)

Target 11.7 By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities.

Proposed Indicator: The average share of the built-up areas of cities in open space in public ownership and use.

I.   Suggestions for Modifications and Replacement Indicators

Cuba proposes a new indicator, "Area of urban green space per capita."
More than 100 organizations have expressed their willingness to have a strong indicator that responds to the 'public spaces' notion of the target. The suggestion of Cuba to include a new indicator 'area of urban green space per capita' is part and parcel of public spaces, as long as they are in public use, as mentioned in the proposed indicator. It has been widely documented that green spaces such as golf courses and green areas in gated communities increase the ratios per capita, but not necessarily the public use of them. In many cities, urban green spaces are used as 'ornamental' or 'landscaping' elements of cities without the primordial function of public spaces ('not-to-walk' areas). In many other cities, marginal or inaccessible green spaces such as road reserves, roundabouts are counted as 'urban green spaces', artificially increasing the values per capita of the indicator.

As UN-Habitat presented in the EGM for the SDGs in New York (Feb. 2015), cities function in an efficient, equitable, and sustainable manner only when there is a balance between private and public spaces. UN-Habitat has brought to the attention that public spaces are needed to sustain the productivity of cities, their social cohesion and inclusion, their civic identity, and their quality of life. In other words, public spaces – green or not green spaces- are essential for 'making cities inclusive, safe and sustainable'.

By measuring only 'green areas per capita', the proposed indicator by Cuba would leave out the vital role of public spaces as elements that contribute to civic empowerment, social integration – especially of minorities, and crime reduction.

Finally, the measurement of 'urban green space per capita' would leave out the possibility of integrating spatial analysis, fundamental for assessing unequal access of public space in cities. The current proposed SDG 11.7 indicator is innovative and allows for the spatial disaggregation of information to respond to the particular needs of women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities.

Canada suggests modifying the indicator to include an accessibility element.
The notion of accessibility refers to various connotations: distance/distribution, affordability, and universal accessibility for physically-challenged populations. The current definition indirectly covers the first two dimensions. In line with the suggestion from the UN Statistical System Organisations, UN-Habitat proposes to add to the current indicator 'public use for all' to respond to the third possible meaning of the Canadian proposal.

Switzerland supports a previous World Bank proposal, "proportion of population with 0.5 km access to (…)" as publically accessible green spaces are many times unevenly distributed geographically in developing countries.
In the initial discussions, UN-Habitat proposed the indicator advanced by the World Bank and supported by Switzerland. The 'proportion of population' has a clear element of social access and distribution of the public space; fully in line with the data revolution principles of not leaving anyone behind. This indicator addresses the challenges of unequal access to public space–both in develop and developing countries. The information gathered by this indicator is more refined and allows for spatial analysis.

In further discussions, UN-Habitat opted for the currently proposed indicator (The average share of the built-up areas of cities in open space in public ownership and use) because partners believed it is easier to collect, increasing its measurability. UN-Habitat has no objection adopting either the proposed indicator or the suggested by World Bank and Switzerland.

Brazil proposes a modified indicator, "Proportion of areas of public use and property over the total built-up urbanized area of the urban agglomerations with more than 100,000 residents."
Every country should decide on the size of the cities to include in their national reporting mechanism. To ensure comparability in this and other indicators, data should refer to the notion of 'urban', which needs to be nationally defined. UN-Habitat recommends that governments create a national sample of cities to report on Goal 11 indicators. An appropriate methodology, training and capacity development can be provided for that purpose.

UN-Habitat has advocated that urban agglomerations below 100,000 residents are also in need and should plan for urban public spaces to sustain the productivity of cities, their social cohesion and inclusion, their civic identity, and their quality of life.

The UN Statistical System Organisations propose deleting "and use" from the indicator.
It is well documented that in many of the world's cities, public spaces can be publicly or privately owned, but the main purpose is that they remain for public use, which is not always the case. UN-Habitat, therefor has no objection to eliminate the 'publicly owned' words of the current proposed indicator, but strongly advice to keep the 'publicly use' concept that is directly connected to the protection of commons and the need for the provision of public goods in cities.

II. Suggestions for Additional Indicators

The UN Statistical System Organisations propose an additional indicator, "The average share of built up areas (of communities) that are accessible and safe for all, including women, children, older persons and those with disabilities."
The suggestion of UN-Habitat to modify the current proposed indicator by adding 'use for all' includes, to large extent, the suggestion from the UN Statistical System Organisations to have an indicator that caters to the 'accessibility and safe for all'. In that sense, there is no need for an additional indicator.

III. Additional Comments

Ecuador comments that the connected between target 11.7 and the proposed indicator is not apparent. They propose using the indicator "Green urban index."
The current proposed indicator fully responds to the core part of the SDG target 11.7, particularly in regard to the 'provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces...' Green areas, as long as they are in public use, are an integral part of the proposed indicator. Besides, the 'Green urban (city) index', as a composite index, is made of 28 indicators within 8 dimensions. The index proposed by Ecuador encompasses nearly three times the number of indicators for the entire SDG Goal 11. In addition, this index has been designed to be adapted to different regions. It is therefor, not universal and neither comparable across countries and cities.

Mexico comments that it is necessary to redefine the proposed indicator since it is not clear to understand its objective or the sources that would be used.
The proposed indicator 11.7 uses a clear and tested method with similar benchmarks and standards, as specified in the metadata produced by UN-Habitat. In this manner it is possible to obtain uniformity and comparable results. Within UN-Habitat City Prosperity Initiative, the Government of Mexico is currently measuring a similar indicator of public space in 130 municipalities.

Italy comments that it is necessary to have a definition of the indicator.
The proposed indicator 11.7 uses a clear and tested method with similar benchmarks and standards, as specified in the metadata produced by UN-Habitat in which a clear definition is provided.

Germany and United Kingdom comment that data availability might be very poor.
Indeed, data availability on public space is rather poor, and as expressed in the response to Cuba, this target has been widely recognized as a priority for the sustainability of cities. UN-Habitat and partners have developed

methodology, tools and metadata for this proposed indicator. Currently, the City Prosperity Initiative is collecting data on public space for cities as diverse as Hanoi, Nairobi, Riyadh, Quito, Johannesburg, etc.

United States comments that the indicator does not measure location and distribution of public space.
Similar as the response to the suggestion by Switzerland, initially, UN-Habitat proposed an indicator that integrates location and distribution (proportion of population with 0.5 km access to an in open public space). UN-Habitat opted for the currently proposed indicator (The average share of the built-up areas of cities in open space in public ownership and use) because partners believed it is easier to collect, increasing its measurability. UN-Habitat has no objection adopting either the proposed indicator or the suggested by World Bank and Switzerland, which echoes United States' comment. The revised indicator proposed by UN-Habitat as a second priority is drafted in these terms (refer to box at the end of this target).

Estonia comments that the definition of the indicator is not clear
The proposed indicator 11.7 uses a clear and tested method with similar benchmarks and standards, as specified in the metadata produced by UN-Habitat in which a clear definition is provided.

UN-Habitat revised proposal for indicator 11.7.1 (first priority)

The average share of the (total) built-up area of cities that is open space in public use for all

UN-Habitat revised proposal for indicator 11.7.2 (second priority)

Proportion of population with 0.5 km access to open space in public use for all

22 October, 2015
* UN-Habitat responses to all comments are in blue colour
19 | P a g e

Target 11.a Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning

Proposed Indicator: Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs

I.   Suggestions for Modifications and Replacement Indicators

Brazil proposes a modified indicator, "Percentage of population living in cities with more than 100,000 residents which implement urban and regional development plans integrating estimates of population and of resources necessity."
The suggestion made by Brazil to replace 'cities with more than 100,000 thousand' with 'percentage of population in cities…' may result in some governments mainly focusing on large cities in order to have higher coverage in the indicator. This would tend to leave behind smaller cities that would not contribute to improve the rating. Considering that smaller and intermediate cities will grow faster than any other city in the world and that they are home of half of the population in the world, it is important that governments pay special attention to cities of this size, taking into account that this group of cities have higher potential to 'support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas'.

The proposed indicator by Brazil has been modified following the suggestion made by the UN Statistical System Organisations, which UN-Habitat endorses (refer to the suggestion made by the UNSSO). As suggested by the UN Statistical System Organisations, the current proposed indicator (Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs) can be considered as a second priority indicator under this target. However, measuring 'implementation' as suggested by the current proposed indicator, has proven to be difficult, ambiguous and not easily linked to policies. UN-Habitat experience in the Urban Indicators Programme has shown that binary responses (yes/no- cities that implement a plan) provide in all cases affirmative responses close to 100 per cent. This is one of the limits of process oriented indicator as the current proposal. The new proposed indicator by the UN Statistical System Organisations has qualifiers that enable to progressively measure (by providing rates for each element) the characteristics of the desired policy. As commented by Mexico, including 'quality thresholds or criteria' is necessary to evaluate the plan's design and implementation to avoid overestimation.

The UN Statistical System Organisations proposed a new priority indicator, "The number of countries that are developing or implementing a National Urban Policy that (a) responds to population dynamics, (b) ensures balanced territorial development, (c) prepares for infrastructure development, (d) promotes urban land-use efficiency, (e) enhances resilience to climate change, (f) protects public space, and (g) develops effective urban governance systems.
UN-Habitat supports the suggestion made by the UN Statistical System Organisations. The suggestion is an all-encompassing indicator well aligned with the Goal 11 to 'make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable'. As a process indicator, it touches the key elements of sound urban policies. As commented by Mexico, including 'quality thresholds or criteria' is necessary to evaluate the plan's design and implementation to avoid overestimation of the indicator.

The UN Statistical System Organisations suggest keeping the proposed indicator as a second priority indicator under this target.
Agreed.

II.   Suggestions for Additional Indicators

Cabo Verde and African member states comment that just existence is insufficient and propose a complimentary indicator, 'Share of land consumption rate to population growth rate at comparable scale.'

The suggested complementary indicator is proposed as current indicator for Target 11.3 (Efficient land use- Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate). UN-Habitat suggests maintaining the proposal by Cabo Verde and African member states as the indicator for Target 11.3

UNCDF proposes a new indicator, "Local Fiscal Space, or % of sub-national governments' revenues and expenditures on general government revenues and expenditures."
As important as the local fiscal space and municipal finance is, the suggestion by UNCDF does not respond to the Target 11.a

UN-Women proposes 'proportion of women subjected to physical or sexual harassment, in the last 12 months (disaggregated by perpetrator and place of occurrence)';
As important as the protection of women is, the suggestion by UN-Women does not respond to the Target 11.a

DESA proposes 'percentage of public buildings meeting the ISO 21542:2011 standards on accessibility and usability of the built environment' and 'percentage of public green spaces (parks and recreational facilities) meeting the minimum national standards for accessibility by persons with disabilities'
As important as the accessibility of public buildings and the built environment by persons with disabilities are, the suggestion by DESA does not respond to the Target 11.a. Besides, the proposed indicator of DESA contains two different components that should be separated in two indicators.

III. Additional Comments

China comments that explanatory notes need to be further clarified and Japan comments that the indicator is not clear.
In order to respond to China and Japan concerns, UN-Habitat in line with the UN Statistical System Organisations, suggests to change the priority indicator to 'The number of countries that are developing or implementing a National Urban Policy that (a) responds to population dynamics, (b) ensures balanced territorial development, (c) prepares for infrastructure development, (d) promotes urban land-use efficiency, (e) enhances resilience to climate change, (f) protects public space, and (g) develops effective urban governance systems'.

Mexico comments that if the indicator is not improved by including quality thresholds or criteria to evaluate the plan's design and implementation, progress could be overestimated.
In order to respond to the concerns of Mexico, UN-Habitat in line with the UN Statistical System Organisations, suggests to change the priority indicator to 'The number of countries that are developing or implementing a National Urban Policy that (a) responds to population dynamics, (b) ensures balanced territorial development, (c) prepares for infrastructure development, (d) promotes urban land-use efficiency, (e) enhances resilience to climate change, (f) protects public space, and (g) develops effective urban governance systems'.

Germany comments that data availability might be very poor.
In recent years, important progress has been made to improve data availability regarding national and regional development planning. In search for a stronger indicator that better addresses the target, UN-Habitat in line with the UN Statistical System Organisations, suggests to change the priority indicator to 'The number of countries that are developing or implementing a National Urban Policy that (a) responds to population dynamics, (b) ensures balanced territorial development, (c) prepares for infrastructure development, (d) promotes urban land-use efficiency, (e) enhances resilience to climate change, (f) protects public space, and (g) develops effective urban governance systems'.

UNFPA proposes deletion of both indicators under this target and is working on a more concrete indicator proposal.

WB prefers an indicator on density of street intersections
The indicator proposed by the WB on density of street intersections is a good indicator to measure urban form and connectivity in cities. UN-Habitat is extensively using it within the framework of the City Prosperity Initiative. Still, UN-Habitat considers that WB proposal does not address the core of Target 11.a

UN-Habitat revised proposal for indicator 11.a.1 (first priority)

The number of countries that are developing or implementing a National Urban Policy that (a) responds to population dynamics, (b) ensures balanced territorial development, (c) prepares for infrastructure development, (d) promotes urban land-use efficiency, (e) enhances resilience to climate change, (f) protects public space, and (g) develops effective urban governance systems.

UN-Habitat revised proposal for indicator 11.a.2 (second priority)

Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs

Target 11.b By 2020, substantially increase 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, and develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels.

Proposed Indicator: Percentage of cities implementing risk reduction and resilience policies that include vulnerable and marginalized groups

I.   Suggestions for Modifications and Replacement Indicators

The Philippines proposes a modified indicator, " Percent of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies aligned with accepted international frameworks (such as the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Reduction) that include vulnerable and marginalized groups in their design, implementation and monitoring."
UN-Habitat agrees with the suggestion by The Philippines. Still there is a clear need to refer to Sendai Framework 2015-2030 instead of continuously referring to 'the successor to the Hyogo Framework'.

Brazil proposes a modified indicator, "Percentage of the population living in cities which implement resilience and risk reduction policies including marginalized and vulnerable groups."
The suggestion made by Brazil may result in some governments mainly focusing on large cities in order to have higher coverage on the 'percentage of the population living in cities'. This would tend to leave behind smaller cities that would not contribute to improve the rating. Considering that smaller and intermediate cities will grow faster than any other city in the world and that they home of half of the population in the world, it is important that governments pay special attention to cities of this size, especially taking into account that this group of cities have higher potential to implement resilience risk reduction policies.

UN-Habitat welcomes the reiteration of Brazil to include 'marginalized and vulnerable groups' in the suggested indicator.

The UN Statistical System Organisations propose the following modification to the suggested indicator, "Percent of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies aligned with accepted international frameworks (such as the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Reduction) that include vulnerable and marginalized groups in their design, implementation and monitoring."
UN-Habitat agrees with the suggestion by the UN Statistical System Organisations and The Philippines. Still there is a clear need to refer to Sendai Framework 2015-2030 instead of continuously referring to 'the successor to the Hyogo Framework'.

UNECE proposes the indicator, "Measure to what extent inhabitants of a city/local authority are enabled to access information and to actively participate in decision-making, though also e.g. number of Parties to the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention)."
As important as the access information and active participation in decision-making are, the suggestion by UNECE does not respond to the Target 11.a.

II.   Suggestions for Additional Indicators

The Philippines proposes an additional indicator for the target, "Population density measured over continuous urban footprint."
The additional indicator proposed by The Philippines on population density is a good indicator to measure 'ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate- efficient land use'. In fact this indicator (11.3) measures urban

population density changes over time. UN-Habitat is extensively using it within the framework of the City Prosperity Initiative. Still, UN-Habitat considers that the proposal by the Philippines does not address the core of target 11.b.

Mexico proposes an additional indicator, "percentage of zones of risk in the urban areas."
UN-Habitat experience through the Urban Indicators Programme showed that some countries and cities reported that 100 per cent of their urban areas were zones of risks (i.e. cities below 10 metres above the sea level, or in high seismic areas). The importance attached to the Target 11.b and the proposed indicator 11.b.1 resides on the response by governments to implement 'risk reduction and resilience policies' and not necessarily the percentage of zones of risk.

Canada proposes the following set of indicators to measure the target, "Percentage of cities actively developing or implementing climate adaptation plans", "Percentage of cities with risk reduction and resilience policies," and "Percentage of cities who specifically address vulnerable and marginalized groups in their policies and plans."
The set of indicators proposed by Canada are contained in the proposal by the UN Statistical System Organisations and The Philippines. The Sendai Framework establishes a critical connection between the policy areas of disaster, climate change adaptation and vulnerability. Therefore, the current proposed indicator responds to the suggestion made by Canada.

The UN Statistical System Organisations propose an additional indicator, "Percentage of local governments that adopt and implement local DRR strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030."
A convergence is needed between the current proposed indicator, the previous proposal of the UN Statistical System Organisations made in the section 'suggestions for modifications and replacement indicators' and this proposal. Obviously, they refer to similar Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. UN-Habitat agrees to replace the current proposed indicator as per The Philippines' suggestion. Still there is a clear need to refer to Sendai Framework 2015-2030 instead of continuously referring to 'the successor to the Hyogo Framework'.

UNECE proposes an additional indicator, "Number of national governments adopting strategies for resilience to disasters, including policies on safety and land-use planning/siting of hazardous activities."
UNECE proposal (Number of national governments) goes against the 'Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction', which recognizes that the State has the primary role to reduce disaster risk, insisting that the responsibility should be shared with other stakeholders including local government. In this sense UN-Habitat suggests to maintain the level of responsibility and reporting at local level.

Besides, notions such as 'safety and land-use planning' are also part of the Sendai Framework that advocates for strong articulation of the different dimensions of disaster, vulnerability, planning, accountability and preparedness.

III.   Additional Comments

China comments that explanatory notes need to be further clarified.
UN-Habitat alerts that when the process and frameworks related to this indicator would be completed, appropriate notes, definitions and technical clarification will be available.

Mexico comments that if the indicator is not improved by including quality thresholds or criteria to evaluate the plan's design and implementation, progress could be overestimated.
UN-Habitat alerts that when the process and frameworks related to this indicator would be completed, appropriate notes, definitions and technical clarification will be available. This will certainly include quality threshold and criteria to evaluate the plan's design and implementation to avoid over – and under- estimation.

Cabo Verde and African member states comment that this indicator should only be measured in cities with at least 100,000 inhabitants.

Every country should decide on the size of the cities to include in their national reporting mechanism. To ensure comparability in this and other indicators, data should refer to the notion of 'urban', which needs to be nationally defined. UN-Habitat recommends that governments create a national sample of cities to report on Goal 11 indicators, and technical and advisory services can be provided by UN-Habitat.

Italy comments that a definition of the indicator is necessary.
UN-Habitat alerts that when the process and frameworks related to this indicator would be completed, appropriate notes, definitions and technical clarification will be available.

Estonia comments that the indicator is suitable, but only in cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants. For example: in Estonia city with 2000 to 3000 people is already city, in China city starts probably from million.
Every country should decide on the size of the cities to include in their national reporting mechanism. To ensure comparability in this and other indicators, data should refer to the notion of 'urban', which needs to be nationally defined. UN-Habitat recommends that governments create a national sample of cities to report on Goal 11 indicators. China does not define urban through a population threshold. The country uses three parameters: a) administration system; b) permanent residence; and c) statistical classification.

UN-Habitat revised proposal for indicator 11.b.1

Percent of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies that include vulnerable and marginalized groups in their design, implementation and monitoring, as defined by the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030.

Target 11.c Support least developed countries, including through financial and technical assistance, in building sustainable and resilient buildings utilizing local materials.

Percentage of financial support that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource efficient buildings

I.   Suggestions for Modifications and Replacement Indicators

Cabo Verde and African member states suggest adding "utilizing local materials" to the indicator.
UN-Habitat agrees in principle to the suggestion made by Cabo Verde and African member states. However experience in computing similar information shows that the level of disaggregation of information does not allow – now- to identify the different categories in the utilization of materials. Still, the suggestion to utilize local materials, as indicated in Target 11.c, is welcomed.

Mexico proposes a modified indicator, "Percentage of financial support that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings and areas suitable for human development."
UN-Habitat requests further clarification to Mexico regarding the suggested addition of 'areas suitable for human development'.

II.   Suggestions for Additional Indicators

The Philippines proposes an additional indicator, "Sub-national government revenues and expenditures as a percentage of general government revenues and expenditures, including for buildings; Own revenue collection (source revenue) as a percentage of total city revenue."
UN-Habitat recommends to directly refer to cities instead of 'sub-national governments', since policy design, implementation and monitoring is done at this level of government.

As important as the local fiscal autonomy and local revenue collection are, the suggestion by The Philippines does not respond directly to the core of Target 11.c.

III.   Additional Comments

India comments that the Indicator needs to be redrafted as the focus of the target is on support to LDCs.
UN-Habitat agrees with the comment from India. The current indicator lacks clarity in various aspects. For instance, in the 'percentage of financial support', it is not clear which is the denominator to calculate such percentage; who is the provider of the financial support and who is the receiver (LDCs?). In order to remediate this, UN-Habitat proposes to modify this indicator as per India comment.

UN-Habitat revised proposal for indicator 11.c.1

-