Metadata on SDGs indicator 11a.1 (proposed proxy indicator)
Tier III – indicator
Contributors: UN-Habitat and UNFPA

1. Goals and targets addressed

SDG 11: Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

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 11.a.1 proxy is: *Number of countries that have national urban policies or regional development plans that: (a) respond to population dynamics, (b) ensure balanced territorial development, (c) increase local fiscal space.*

1- Definition and method of computation

This process indicator places particular emphasis on the aspect of national and regional development planning that support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas. The method to quantify this indicator is based on policy analysis evaluation that can be supported by adopted policies, conventions, laws, government programs, and other initiatives that comprise a national/regional urban policy.

Definition and concepts:

National Urban Policies and regional development plans:

A National Urban Policy (NUP) is defined by UN-Habitat as a coherent set of decisions derived through a deliberate government led process of coordinating and rallying various actors for a common vision and goal that will promote more transformative, productive, inclusive, and resilient urban development for the long term.
This standard definition will be extended and adapted to country contexts and may include, where applicable terms such as National Urban *Plan*, *Framework*, or *Strategy*… as long as they are aligned with the above qualifiers. Similarly, regional development plans follow the same definition, only applied at the subnational level.

NUP that responds to population dynamics:

This first qualifier examines to what extent the NUP addresses issues to do with population composition, trends and projections in achieving development goals and targets.

- *Population composition* includes size, geographic distribution and density, household size and composition, mobility and migration, age and sex distribution and disaggregation, as specified in SDG target 17.18
- *Trends* are changes in composition of the population from over time

- *Projections* are expected changes over time that the NUP needs to ensure that they are well addressed.

Key questions for the assessment:
- To what extent are quality and timely data on urban and rural population composition, trends and projections available for use in the development, implementation and monitoring of NUPs or RDPs?
- To what extent do the NUP and/or RDPs use or refer to population composition, trends and projections to set goals and targets over the timeframe of the plan?

Ensure balanced territorial development:
This second qualifier entails the promotion of a spatially coherent territory that includes a balanced system of human settlements including cities and towns and including urban corridors; that addresses social, economic, environmental and spatial disparities particularly considering the urban-rural continuum.

Key questions for the assessment:
- To what extent does the national urban policy take into account the need for balanced development of the territory as a whole including the equal development of all types of settlements including villages, cities and towns, including urban corridors?
- To what extent are the linkages – social, economic, environmental and spatial – between urban, peri-urban and rural areas take into account with the ultimate goal of strengthening the urban-rural continuum?

Increase local fiscal space:
Local fiscal space is understood as the sum of financial resources available for improved delivery of basic social and economic services at the local level as a result of the budget and related decisions by governments at all levels without any prejudice to the sustainability of a government's financial position.

Key questions for the assessment:
- To what extent has the policy made allowance for the provision of local financial resources to provide for the implementation of the policy and for the delivery of essential basic social and economic services
- To what extent has the policy assessed the status of human capacities required to effectively use financial resources for the implementation of the policy and the delivery of essential basic social and economic services?

Developing:
Developing refers to the policy development phases that consider the feasibility, diagnosis of policy problems and opportunities, the formulation/drafting of the policy until the approval of the policy

Implementing:
Implementation refers to the realization of the policy proposal through legislative or financial action/commitments, including the continued monitoring and evaluation of that policy

Method of computation:
The methodology uses a policy evaluation framework that assesses and tracks progress on the extent to which country level national urban policy or regional development plans are being developed or implemented to cover or satisfy the following criteria:

a) Responds to population dynamics

b) Ensures balanced regional and territorial development
c) Increases local fiscal space

Essentially, countries that already have NUP and regional development plans, the NUPs are examined for their consistency in covering the 3 above qualifiers. While for countries that do not have NUP or are currently developing NUP, these are noted and documented as steps towards developing a NUP. Such countries are counted with zero scores to ensure a full coverage of status on all countries.
To maintain the objectivity and comparability in the policy analysis, five categories of assessment are used for each qualifier. These categories correspond to a progressive evaluation of the extent to which national and regional policies in plans integrate elements that contribute to the realization of each qualifier:

- Category 1: policy document does not make any reference to the qualifier or the country is not developing or implementing a policy (no national urban policy exists)
- Category 2: policy document make some reference to the specific qualifier, but this qualifier is not integrated in the diagnosis and recommendations of the policy
- Category 3: policy document integrates the specific qualifier, but this qualifier is poorly understood or misinterpreted
- Category 4: policy document integrates in a cross-cutting perspective the specific qualifier without clear policy recommendations
- Category 5: policy document integrates and mainstreams the specific qualifier with clear policy recommendations derived from the qualifier

Each category is assigned a percentage bracket, as follows:

- Category 1: 0 per cent
- Category 2: 1-25 per cent
- Category 3: 26-50 per cent
- Category 4: 51-75 per cent
- Category 5: 76-100 per cent

For example, in the table below, the evaluator provides a numeric value based on the category that corresponds to each qualifier analyzed, understanding that only one category per qualifier is selected:

Qualifier	Category 1 (0 %)	Category 2 (1-25 %)	Category 3 (26-50%)	Category 4 (51-75%)	Category 5 (76-100%)	Total (max 100 per qualifier)
Qualifier (a) *national urban policies or regional development plans respond to population dynamics*	0	0	40%	0	0	a = 40%
Qualifier (b)						

National urban policies or regional development plans ensure balanced regional and territorial development	0	20%	0	0	0	b = 20%
Qualifier (c) ***National urban policies or regional development plans increase local fiscal space***	0	0	0	75%	0	c = 75%

To reduce bias of subjectivity in the overall assessment, independent policy evaluation is undertaken by several evaluators. The table below provides a summary of the procedures for computation of the final values

National Urban Policy	Evaluation 1	Evaluation 2	Evaluation 3	Evaluation 4	Total (max 100 per qualifier)
Qualifier (a) ***national urban policies or regional development plans respond to population dynamics***	A1	A2	A3	A4	Qa = (A1+A2+A3+A4)/4
Qualifier (b) ***National urban policies or regional development plans ensure balanced regional and territorial development***	B1	B2	B3	B4	Qb = (B1+B2+B3+B4)/4
Qualifier (c) ***National urban policies or regional development plans increase local fiscal space***	C1	C2	C3	C4	Qc = (C1+C2+C3+C4)/4
Final value of the assessment (average values of all 3 qualifiers)					X = (Qa + Qb + Qc)/3

Countries that fall into categories 1, 2, and 3, which correspond to 1 – 50 percentage points, are not counted as "countries that are developing and implementing a national urban policy or regional development plan". These countries are encouraged to deploy efforts in order to improve their policies and plans.

Countries that fall into categories 4 and 5, which correspond to 51 percentage points or more in the assessment, are considered as "countries that are developing and implementing a national urban policy or regional developing plan" that contribute to the achievement of target 11.a. They can still be encouraged to continue improving their ratings for each qualifier.

2- Rationale and interpretation

National Urban Policies (NUP) can help achieve target 11.a.1

NUPs have been defined by UN-Habitat as a coherent set of decisions derived through a deliberate government-led process of coordinating and rallying various actors for a common vision and goal that will promote more transformative, productive, inclusive and resilient urban development for the long term[1]. Their explicit introduction in the wording of indicator 11.a.1 brings emphasis to a policy process that can better satisfy the requirements of target 11.a through sectorial, territorial and jurisdictional integration and coordination steered by the national level.

NUPs can first of all *support positive economic, social and environmental links* by ensuring at the highest level of government the coherent alignment of sectorial policies to support sustainable urbanization. With the world increasingly urbanizing, it is becoming clear today that how cities are managed and planned has ramifications well beyond their boundaries and that urbanization is a key force to harness for national and sustainable development. Urbanization has indeed historically been a catalyst for economic growth and social progress, and even holds the possibility for the protection and more efficient use of natural resources, and climate change mitigation and adaptation. However, this positive impact is not automatic, particularly in developing countries - where rapid urbanization can bring about negative economic, social and environmental externalities with increasing congestion, sprawl, informality, social exclusion and conflict – if the provision of services and infrastructure does not keep up with population growth. Governments need to be sensitive to this fact that urbanization is a nation-wide and multi-sectorial issue, and NUPs provide the framework to harness its opportunities and mitigate its negative externalities. A specifically urban policy at the national level calls attention to the impact of sectorial governmental policies on the sustainable development of cities, and encourages and enables the coordination of ministries and their policies to best support it.

This consideration in turn also encourages more cooperation and coordination between different levels of government to support the development and implementation of a national vision for urban development, effectively *strengthening national and regional development planning*. The urban policy process is led at the national level to ensure the articulation and coordination of different sectors and government levels, but engages both top down and bottom up processes. For a successful implementation, a NUP must create an enabling, collaborative and cooperative institutional environment, mobilizing different levels, assessing and building their capacities, and establishing jointly defined and transparent responsibilities for implementation. Subnational governments are key implementation partner due to their proximity to citizens and role in delivering services and infrastructure. As such, a NUP does not replace regional and local development policies and plans but strengthens them and relies on their horizontal alignment and vertical articulation, especially to tackle cross boundary

[1] UN-Habitat, 2014, *The Evolution of National Urban Policies, A Global Overview*.

challenges such as sustainable resource management, infrastructure development, climate change adaptation and mitigation, or urban-rural linkages.

Finally, NUP as an overarching framework articulating and aligning subnational and local plans and policies under a common vision for urbanization that also makes it particularly suited to consider the urban-peri-urban-rural continuum. The distinction between urban and rural is a key element of data disaggregation and administrative delineation in territorial planning. However, the importance of urban-rural linkages (through flows of people, natural resources, capital, goods, ecosystem services, information, technology, ideas and innovation) is increasingly being acknowledged for sustainable and integrated territorial development. The New Urban Agenda (NUA) for instance stresses the need to reduce urban and rural disparities to foster equitable development and encourage connectivity. Target 11.a is the only one that explicitly considers *urban, peri-urban and rural areas* under a city-centric SDG 11. NUPs are the adequate framework to strengthen and direct urban and rural flows towards the most sustainable patterns of consumption and equitable resource distribution, as they can strike the balance between competition and solidarity between territories of a country.

NUPs are more broadly instrumental for the implementation and monitoring of global agendas

NUPs therefore enable a cross-sectorial approach, and the horizontal and vertical institutional coordination needed to address the challenges and opportunities of urbanization, which are increasingly recognized as going beyond the boundaries of the city. Recent intergovernmental agreements have indeed shown a new interest in urbanization for sustainable development. This is illustrated of course in Agenda 2030 with its introduction of a standalone urban SDG-11, but many other SDGs also have clear urban dimensions and implications. Following the Agenda 2030, the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Development (Habitat III) adopted the New Urban Agenda, a roadmap for the next 20 years setting new global standards for sustainable urban development. Finally, although the Paris Agreement on Climate Change does not explicitly mention cities, the management of urbanization is still essential to addressing climate change, as is illustrated by the fact that two third of Intended Nationally Determined Contributions contain clear urban references and content[2].

As an instrument for governments to harness the dynamics of urbanization for national development, NUPs have therefore been identified as a key tool for the implementation and monitoring of such agendas.

The Policy Paper on National Urban Policies prepared for Habitat III for instance explained that *a NUP should constitute an important part of any serious attempt to implement the SDGs and should become a key instrument to measure the achievement of the SDGs.* As explained above, NUPs are a particularly appropriate framework to achieve target 11.a, and more generally can be instrumental in creating the necessary enabling framework to implement the urban development objectives of SDG 11. For instance, the NUA explicitly identifies NUPs as essential to achieve the urban paradigm shift it advocates for, recognizing the *leading role of national governments […] in the implementation of inclusive and effective urban policies and legislation for sustainable urban development* (NUA – 15.b). Moreover, the Action Framework for the Implementation of the New Urban Agenda (AFINUA) dedicates its first section to NUPs, referred to as the *basis for implementation of the NUA.* Finally, NUPs

[2] UN-Habitat, 2016, *Sustainable Urbanization in the Paris Agreement. Comparative review for urban content in the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs)*

can also be an instrument to coordinate the urban components of NDCs across scales and sectors and mainstream the principles of climate change adaptation and mitigation for the implementation of the Paris Agreement[3].

Qualifiers for a measurable process indicator

Given their instrumental role for the implementation and monitoring of global urban agendas, the adoption of a NUP by a national government can be considered as a strong indicator of political commitment to promoting sustainable urban development. It also makes them particularly well suited for measuring target 11.a through a *process* indicator. As a process indicator, 11.a.1 is indeed supposed to assess the progress made towards creating an enabling environment that will ensure achievement of the outcomes and impacts of the targets of the Sustainable Development Agenda. Its definition sets the foundation on *how* target 11.a can be achieved, through measurable means. The proposed revision of the indicator therefore supplements *national urban policies and regional development plans* with 3 qualifiers that indicate the means of successfully reaching the requirements of target 11.a.

The first qualifier is that policies and plans should *respond to population dynamics*. Grounding policies and plans in the most current and comprehensive spatial and demographic data and projections is indeed a prerequisite for a successful implementation. The challenges posed by rapid urbanization indeed stem from the fact that policy and planning framework and their implementation are outpaced by population growth, straining the provision of infrastructure and services, and causing socio-economic and environmental damages. Forecasting demographic trends and needs in the diagnosis phase of policies and plans enables governments to plan ahead for urbanization and provide adequate land and infrastructure in a more cost-efficient and less socially disruptive way than trying to catch up, repair and upgrade uncontrolled expansion. This process of developing urban policies and plans can also be the occasion to improve national data collection on urban areas, and serve other SDG-11 indicators, as well as provide a baseline for monitoring the outcomes of such interventions.

The second qualifier requires policies and plans to *ensure balanced territorial development*, in a direct answer to target 11.a.1's reference to the urban, peri-urban and rural continuum. Policies and plans should adopt a broad territorial perspective and consider the linkages and flows from urban to rural areas not only to avoid and reduce social, economic and environmental disparities between territories but also to promote distinctive strengths and encourage beneficial interactions for the most efficient path to sustainable growth for the country. Such a perspective for policies and plans is achieved higher territorial scale than cities, through regional plans and national policies.

Finally, the third qualifier is to *increase local fiscal space*. As integrated NUPs and regional development plans introduce a more coordinated and decentralized articulation of responsibilities for urban development, ensuring that subnational and local governments have the adequate financial resources to carry out their responsibilities is essential to the successful implementation of policies and plans. The transfer of competences from central to local levels must therefore be accompanied by a commensurate devolution of financial resources and autonomy. Moreover, in times of shrinking governmental budgets, the capacity of local governments to expand and diversify endogenous financial resources and revenues and not rely too heavily on central transfers should be increased. This involves more fiscal power and capacity, better land value capture mechanisms – which go hand in hand with

[3] UN-Habitat, 2016, *Addressing Climate Change in National Urban Policies*

a clear and enforceable land policy framework – and innovative financial partnerships, for instance collaborating with the private sector for service and infrastructure delivery. In all cases, fiscal policies and mechanisms must remain subordinated to the established urban policy and planning objectives: central transfers must be embedded within the NUP framework, and take into account territorial equity; and local fiscal systems must be closely tied to local territorial plans so as to incentivize sustainable patterns of development.

Broader impact of the indicator for SDG implementation and monitoring

Therefore, introducing NUPs – an appropriate framework to achieve target 11.a and more broadly a recognized tool of implementation and monitoring of global urban agendas – along with regional development plans, and adding three measurable qualifiers as requirements for successful plans and policies, makes indicator 11.a.1 not only a more adequate, measurable and implementable process indicator for target 11.a.1, but also will serve more broadly the progress of SDGs and the new urban agenda.

This revised indicator is indeed suitable for all countries and regions, and lends itself to regional analyses, as well as other forms of aggregation and disaggregation, according to development level, for example. It is also applicable at multiple territorial levels.

Moreover, monitoring this indicator will help more broadly with NUP monitoring and help increase awareness, capacity and knowledge of best practices for sustainable urban policy in the process. Also, due to the multidisciplinary dimension of NUPs and their role in global agendas, the enhanced data collection and analysis capacity that would be permitted by this indicator revision would participate in guiding the necessary steps to create a more enabling urban policy environment to support SDG 11 and urban dimensions of other SDGs. NUP monitoring according to SDGs would for instance serve as a gap analysis to help formulate tailored recommendations and identify best practices. As such, it epitomizes the universality spirit of the SDGs, as illustrated by its various policy connections in the table below.

SDGs	**Related targets**
Goal 1: Poverty eradication	**Target 1.4**: land tenure
	Target 1.5: resilience
Goal 2: Food security, nutrition, and agriculture	**Target 2.3**: land tenure security
	Target 2.c: urban rural linkages in food markets
Goal 5: Gender	**Target 5.2**: safety
	Target 5.a: ownership and control over land
Goal 6: Water	**Target 6.1**: access to drinking water
	Target 6.2: access to sanitation

Goal 7: Energy	**Target 7.2**: access to renewable energy
	Target 7.3: energy efficiency
Goal 8: Economic growth and employment	**Target 8.3**: job creation
	Target 8.5: decent work
	Target 8.6: youth
Goal 9: Infrastructure and industrialization	**Target 9.1**: access to infrastructure
	Target 9.4: upgrading infrastructure
	Target 9.a: financing infrastructure
Goal 10: Reduce inequality	**Target 10.4**: discriminatory laws
Goal 12: Sustainable consumption and production	**Target 12.5**: waste management
Goal 13: Climate change	**Target 13.1**: resilience and adaptive capacity
	Target 13.b: capacity for effective climate change related planning and management
Goal 15: Terrestrial ecosystems	**Target 15.9**: by 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning and development processes
Goal 16: Peaceful societies and inclusive institutions	**Target 16.7**: governmental subsidiarity
	Target 16.a: institutional capacity building
	Target 16.b: non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development
Goal 17: means of implementation and partnerships	**Target 17.14**: policy coherence **Target 17.17**: effective public-private and civil society partnerships

3- Disaggregation

Potential disaggregation

This indicator is disaggregated by geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts, for example national vs. subnational level. It is also further disaggregated by economic (GDP) and human (HDI) development levels.

National data collected through assessment is also aggregated at the regional and global levels to measure trends.

Quantifiable derivatives:

The analysis and reporting of data collected is presented and assessed based on the qualifiers, at the global or regional level, or according to level of development, for example:

- Number of countries that are developing and implementing national urban policy or regional development plans that responds to population dynamics
- Number of countries that are developing and implementing national urban policy or regional development plans that ensures balanced regional and territorial development
- Number of countries that are developing and implementing national urban policy or regional development plans that increase local fiscal space

4- Sources and data collection

The primary source of data is the official documents of national urban policies and regional development plans, available in or provided by national and regional administrations of the countries.

The alignment of the policies and plans with proposed indicators are assessed by independent policy evaluators to avoid subjectivity and bias. The field of practice on NUP has developed a database of experts across the regions where evaluators are routinely drawn for undertaking these reviews.

To help with this evaluation according to the three qualifiers, policy evaluators follow an agreed upon analysis framework. Other supporting tools such as expert opinion, baseline data, benchmarking, performance monitoring and reporting, and gap and content analysis could be used.

Global, regional and national level compilations and analyses of NUP have already been undertaken by UN-Habitat and partners, which provide a solid foundation of evidence and expertise for the monitoring of indicator this proposed proxy indicator for 11.a.1.

UN Habitat compiles and presents national urban policies into a National Urban Policy Database (http://urbanpolicyplatform.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/13092018NUP-database.pdf). This document gathers country level data on the presence of a NUP, their title and date, status of development, and focus. It also provides direct links to the national urban policy documents. It currently contains information on 150 NUPs worldwide, and is frequently updated.

5- Comments and limitations

Limitations

As the indicator mainly aims to track progress on the number of countries developing and implementing national urban policies, it does not suppose specific judgments of any individual country's policies.

The data for this indicator is based on the robustness of the assessment framework developed and pilot tested in selected countries. Baseline data and benchmarks build on UN-Habitat work on regional and global assessments of national urban policies, which need to be validated by key stakeholders.
There might be some limitations in correlating and quantifying the contribution and attribution of urban policy to the overall change and outcomes on the ground. Nevertheless, careful design of the baseline and benchmarking would provide clear indications on the possible impact on urban policy implementation on people's quality of life. Content analysis and opinion surveys can further support any evidence and change observed, but similar methodology needs to be applied.

Finally, as the policy evaluation process is qualitative, measures must be taken to avoid subjectivity and bias. This is why each policy evaluation is undertaken by several independent international evaluators. In addition, clear guidelines for assessment of each qualifier must be provided to evaluators. Capacity development efforts are in fact crucial for the successful implementation and monitoring of this proxy version of indicator 11.a.1; both for the evaluators to assess it, but also for national statistical commissions and governmental actors to understand the criteria against which their policies and plans are assessed, and how to improve on them.

Feasibility and suitability

The extensive experience of UN-Habitat and its partners in analyzing and assisting with the development of NUPs ensures that they have enough expertise, instruments, and reach to build the capacity of evaluators and national actors to successfully monitor the indicator.

UN-Habitat and UNFPA have worked to develop capacity development tools and materials that cover on both the needs of national statistical commissions and SDG evaluators to implement this proxy indicator in all countries and settings.

Moreover to refine the methodology, UNFPA has been collecting data on policies that reflect population dynamics. UN-Habitat has an extensive portfolio of work on NUP development, both through the production of normative guidance and tools, and direct country assistance, which will help refine the evaluation criteria of qualifiers. UN-Habitat has produced many publications that help develop a successful NUP, these include: *National Urban Policy: a Guiding Framework; National Urban Policy Framework for a Rapid Diagnostic,* and upcoming guides on the feasibility and formulation phases, as well as on the economics of NUPs, and on mainstreaming urban-rural linkages for integrated development.

The agency is currently involved in 40 countries for the development of their NUPs. Notable interventions for the indicator include a project in four African countries and states (Guinea, Zanzibar, Cameroon and Niger State) which aims to build capacities of policy makers to collect and analyze data for the development of policies and plans that promote integrated territorial development and urban-rural linkages. Another project aims to help West African Economic and Monetary Union countries harmonize and strengthen their urban policies at all levels.

UN-Habitat is also a member, along with the OECD and Cities Alliance, of the National Urban Policy Programme, which aims to support NUP development globally by providing a foundation of knowledge and tools, policy assistance to build capacity, and a platform to enable ongoing dialogue on NUP.

These partnerships and in-country interventions provide the necessary tools and platforms for capacity building for evaluators and national statistical commissions, and piloting the methodology in selected countries.

6- Current data availability/indicator tier

UN-Habitat's work in the areas of national and regional development planning has developed a strong foundation of evidence that can be adapted to monitor this target and indicator.

For instance, UN-Habitat and the OECD have jointly published the Global *State of National Urban Policy* Report, which identifies 150 NUPs worldwide, and analyses them according to their development phase, thematic components and institutional arrangement, and aggregates them into regional and global analyses. This Global Report will be published every two years, and future editions will align more closely with the terms of indicator 11.a.1, and will be able to directly look at the three qualifiers.

UN-Habitat also conducted in-depth analyses of the NUP trends and national case studies in global regions through National Urban Policy Reports in Arab States, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Sub-Saharan Africa.

Finally, monitoring of the indicator will also benefit from various ongoing initiatives of policy reviews undertaken by UN-Habitat for its country assistance, or the OECD in its Urban Policy Review series.

7- Responsible entities

UN-Habitat is the technical lead and will be supported by UNFPA for the compilation and reporting of the indicator at the global level. In addition, there is a diverse group of partners working on National Urban Policy and Regional Development Planning; such as other international institutions like Cities Alliance and the OECD, government ministries, and other regional think tanks and universities; who are involved in contributing to the reporting of this indicator.

8- Data collection and data release calendar

Monitoring and reporting of the indicator is repeated at annual intervals, allowing several reporting points until 2030. Comprehensive reporting will be undertaken on a biennial basis.

9- Treatment of missing values

Measuring this process indicator entails a policy evaluation of governmental National Urban Policies or Regional Development Plans, the data source as such is easily accessible for evaluation. In cases where countries do not have such policies and plans, they are automatically counted as part of the group of countries that are yet to develop or developing NUP.

10- Sources of difference between global and national figures

Not applicable

11- Regional and global estimates and data collection for global monitoring

Aggregation at global and regional level would consist of calculating the total number of countries that have been considered as having a national urban policy or regional development plan satisfying the qualifiers (having scored higher than 50% on the policy evaluation).

It is also possible to assess performances for specific qualifiers by averaging the average percentages of each identified policy or plan according to one qualifier, at the global scale, or within region or GDP or HDI groupings.

Such aggregated analyses have already been conducted by UN-Habitat and partners, at the global and regional scales, with the Global State of National Urban Policies 2018 Report and the National Urban Policy Regional Reports, including the Arab States, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Sub-Saharan Africa. While these analyses focused on assessing thematic aspects of NUPs such as economic development, spatial structure, human development, environmental sustainability or climate resilience; this approach could be reproduced focusing on the 3 qualifiers of the indicator.

UN-Habitat and other partners including UNFPA have built and will continue working with countries to build the capacity for national counterparts (national statistical agencies, ministries in charge of urban policies, and other relevant stakeholders) to monitor, track, and improve on the score of this indicator.

12- References

OECD Urban Policy Review Series
Available at:
http://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/urbanmetroreviews.htm

UN Habitat (2015), *National Urban Policy: Framework for a Rapid Diagnostic,* United Nations Human Settlements Programme: Nairobi
Available at:
https://unhabitat.org/national-urban-policy-framework-for-a-rapid-diagnostic/

UN Habitat (2015), *National Urban Policy: A Guiding Framework,* United Nations Human Settlements Programme: Nairobi.
Available at:
https://unhabitat.org/national-urban-policy-framework-for-a-rapid-diagnostic/

UN Habitat (2017a), *National Urban Policy, Arab States Report*, United Nations Human Settlements Programme: Nairobi.

UN Habitat (2017b), *National Urban Policy, Africa Report*, United Nations Human Settlements Programme: Nairobi.

UN Habitat (2017c), *National Urban Policy, Europe and North America Report*, United Nations Human Settlements Programme: Nairobi.

UN Habitat (2018a), *National Urban Policy Database*, United Nations Human Settlements Programme: Nairobi.
Available at:
http://urbanpolicyplatform.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/13092018NUP-database.pdf

UN Habitat (2018b), *National Urban Policy, Latin America and the Caribbean Report*, forthcoming, *United* Nations Human Settlements Programme: Nairobi.

UN Habitat (2018c), *National Urban Policy, Asia and the Pacific Report*, forthcoming, United Nations Human Settlements Programme: Nairobi.

UN-Habitat and OECD (2018), Global State of National Urban Policy, United Nations Human Settlements Programme, Nairobi
Available at:
https://unhabitat.org/books/global-state-of-national-urban-policy/