

REPORTING ON THE REVIEW OF GLOBAL PROGRESS TOWARDS THE
MILLENNIUM DECLARATION GOALS

Synthesis of Discussion on Habitat's Millennium Goal Indicators

Note by Habitat

Background

- Preliminary discussion meeting by FT, IJ, CA, EM, GK - 31.08.01
- Technical meeting to prepare task force input by CA, GK – 04.09.01
- Task force meeting participated by IJ, EM, CA, DB, GK – 06.09.01
- Briefing meeting participated by NB, GK – 10.09.01
- Task force meeting participated by IJ, EM, MR, CA, NB, GK – 11.09.01

Rationale

- To report to the ACC Sub-Committee on Statistical Activities on status of the Centre's goal monitoring;
- To establish a long-term goal monitoring capacity;
- There appears to be an urgency to provide the relevant indicators for Habitat's Millennium goal particularly in view of the fact that the indicators from other agencies are fairly clear whereas Habitat's indicator(s) have not yet been communicated to UNSD. As a result UNDP in their latest Human Development Report did not list the Habitat goal; the same is true for a recent UNDG country report on millennium goals for Tanzania.

Consensus Points

- There was consensus that security tenure should be an indicator because of its importance for the (self) improvement of housing units as well as the potential reduction of insecurity for renters in slums;
- The first task force agreed on the following indicators: Access to water, access to sanitation, secure tenure and permanent structures;
- Furthermore, there was agreement that these four indicators could be combined in a single index based on percentages.

Discussion Points and Final Decision

Scenario 1

- After recognizing that the Urban Indicator data collected in for 1993 and 1998 are not a representative set of information for all cities in the world, it was proposed not to use UIP data for Millennium Goal monitoring at all and that a new data collection system based on census data from a representative city sample should be established for the monitoring of the Millennium goal.

Pros: Monitoring system will be comparable over the years based on reliable representative data.

Cons: It will take considerable time (most likely several years) to put such a system in place. UNSD expect data before the end of May 2002 in order to allow overall reporting by the Secretary General at the 57th General Assembly and annually thereafter.

Scenario 2

Immediate use: It was decided that for immediate reporting, existing Urban Indicators and Statistics Data will be used. In the case of the urban indicators, data from the 1993 data collection round will be compiled. This will be on secure tenure, access to water and permanent structures. The Statistics Programme data will compile data for access to sanitation and additional data for access to water.

There will essentially be two data sets coming from two different sets of cities. The 1993 Urban Indicator data sets covering access to water, secure tenure and permanent structures. The three indicators will form a slum index. The second data set comes from CitiBase/Compendium set of cities covering the access to sanitation indicator since the Urban Indicators Database does not have data on that indicator. Both data sets will be weighted in order to achieve representativity.

Pros: We have an immediate monitoring capacity and can report in time to UNSD.

Cons: This is not sustainable in the long term, because:

- 1998 data does not have permanent structures
- the two different data sets cannot be combined, therefore we cannot come up with one summary composite index.

For the long-term monitoring: it is agreed that a representative sample of cities (number and name to be statistically established) be elaborated and census data for sample cities be secured with the help of UNSD and assistance from National Statistical Offices for secondary analysis. Cities to be selected also on the basis of their participation in UNCHS projects.

Work with UNSD on the census definition and classification for secure tenure and slums should be initiated fairly soon. Even so it is referred to under the long-term monitoring capacity header, work on the development of a representative city sample framework has to start immediately because actual data reporting on the Centre's goal is required by May 2002 latest as input into the Secretary General's report to the General Assembly. We need the sample framework in order to carry a proper representative reweighting of our existing data.

Pros: A monitoring system will be in place, which allows for reliable and consistent inferences.

Cons: The indicator secure tenure enumeration will have to wait until the 2010 census rounds.

We are choosing Scenario 2