

EXPERTS GROUP MEETING

11 SUSTAINABLE CITIES
AND COMMUNITIES



REVIEW ON

SDG 11 SYNTHESIS REPORT

FOR THE 2018 HLPF

**“TRACKING PROGRESS TOWARDS INCLUSIVE, SAFE, RESILIENT AND
SUSTAINABLE CITIES AND HUMAN SETTLEMENTS”**

28TH - 30TH MAY, 2018 | NAIROBI, KENYA

With support of:



Agencia Andaluza de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo
CONSEJERÍA DE IGUALDAD Y POLÍTICAS SOCIALES

UN HABITAT
FOR A BETTER URBAN FUTURE

CONTENTS

List of acronyms	3
1. BACKGROUND	4
1.1. IMPORTANCE OF THE "URBAN" IN THE 2030 AGENDA	4
1.1.1.Introduction	4
1.1.2.Goal 11:	5
1.2. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES	8
1.3. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	8
2. OPENING REMARKS	9
Remarks from Eduardo Moreno	9
Remarks form Mr. Rafael Tuts.	10
Remarks from Mr. Robert Ndugwa:	11
3. PRESENTATIONS AND WORKING GROUP SESSIONS	12
3.1. CHAPTER 1 REVIEW	12
3.1.1.Chapter overview presentation.	12
3.1.2.First plenary session:	15
3.2. CHAPTER 2 REVIEW:	18
3.2.1.Chapter overview presentation.	18
3.2.2.Second plenary meeting	19
3.2.3.Group writing sessions to update chapter 2	20
3.3. CHAPTER 3 REVIEW:	21
4. CONCLUSION AND CLOSING REMARKS.....	25
4.1. ANNEX 1: Workshop's Agenda	26
4.2. ANNEX 2: List of Participants	28

LIST OF ACRONYMS

- CPI** - City Prosperity Initiative
- EGM** - Expert Group Meeting
- GDP** - Gross Domestic Product
- GIS** - Geographic Information System(s)
- HLPF** – High-level Political Forum
- LAU2** - Local Administrative Unit Level 2
- LDCs** - Least Developed Countries
- MDGs** – Millennium Development Goals
- MoU** – Memorandum of Understanding
- NGO** – Non-Governmental Organization
- NSC** - National Sample of Cities
- NSO** - National Statistical Office
- NUA** - New Urban Agenda
- NUP** - National Urban Policy
- ODA** - Official Development Assistance
- OECD** - Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
- OWG** - Open Working Group
- RCDB** - Research and CapacityDevelopment Branch
- SDG** – Sustainable Development Goals
- UCCN** - UNESCO Creative Cities Network
- UCLG** - United Cities and Local Governments
- UN DESA** - United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
- UNEP** - United Nations Environment Programme
- UNESCO** – United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
- UNODC** – United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
- UNPFA** – United Nations Population Fund
- UNISDR** – United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
- UPDB** - Urban Planning and Design Branch
- VNR** – Voluntary National Review
- WHO** – World Health Organization
- WUF** - World Urban Forum

1. BACKGROUND

Drawing from the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development, Member States settled on 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and 169 global targets, and nearly 234 indicators that will be monitored for the period 2015–2030. The 2030 Agenda further seeks to realize the human rights of all, and to achieve gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls. Unlike the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is an ambitious agenda that is supposed to be implemented universally by all countries in a collaborative partnership. Under Article 47 of the 2030 Agenda, “governments have the primary responsibility for follow-up and review, at the national, regional and global levels, in relation to the progress made in implementing the Goals and targets¹”. Regional bodies and international agencies were given the responsibility for regional and global follow-ups and reviews. As such, countries are expected to establish regular and inclusive review processes and develop new systems for ensuring high quality, accessible, timely and reliable disaggregated data to measure progress at the national and sub-national levels.

The High Level Political Forum (HLPF) is organized every year under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council to provide a global space for all stakeholders (e.g. governments, local authorities, civil society, private sector, academia, the scientific and technological community, etc.) to share and exchange their experiences on implementing the 2030 Agenda at national and global levels, identifying gaps and in fostering action, and every four years under the auspices of the United Nations General Assembly. Member States present national reports, which are reviewed together with reports and contributions from other major stakeholders (United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, etc). The 2018 HLPF will review the progress of several Goals including Goal 11 on cities and human settlements, with the overarching theme being “Transformation towards sustainable and resilient societies”.

1. See Page 11 of: United Nations General Assembly (2015). Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015. Seventieth session Agenda items 15 and 116

1.1. IMPORTANCE OF THE “URBAN” IN THE 2030 AGENDA

1.1.1. Introduction

Since 2007, half the world’s population live in cities or urban centres. Estimates show that by 2030, cities will be home to 60% of the global population. By 2050, the share of the world’s urban population will grow to about two-thirds, especially between 2010 and 2050 when it is expected that between 2.5 to 3 billion people will be added to the urban population worldwide. Urbanization is therefore an unstoppable trend, especially in less developed regions such as East Asia, South Asia, and sub-Saharan Africa². Indeed, 90% of urban growth in coming decades likely to occur in low- and middle-income countries by 2030.

The increasing urbanization features prominently in the new framework -“Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development” - that was adopted in September 2015 by the United Nations Sustainable Development Summit to guide development efforts between 2015 and 2030, through the endorsement of a stand-alone goal on cities (Goal 11), known as ‘The urban SDG’, – make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable. This first-ever international agreement on urban-specific development acknowledges sustainable urban development as a fundamental precondition for sustainable development, recognizing that beyond the development challenges brought about by urbanization, it offers formidable opportunities for development worldwide. Indeed, cities are often characterized by stark socio-economic inequalities, social exclusion, extreme poverty, high unemployment, poor environment conditions, and are drivers of climate change.

But they also drive innovation, consumption and investment worldwide, making them a positive and potent force for addressing sustainable economic growth, urban development and prosperity. Actually, cities contribute to 80 percent of global GDP, but 70 percent of global energy consumption and 70 percent

2 (United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2016)

of global carbon emissions occur in cities³. Cities can certainly take the lead in addressing many of the global challenges of the 21st century, including poverty, inequality, unemployment, environmental degradation, and climate change. Cities' density and economies of agglomeration, link to economy to energy, environment, science, technology and social outcomes. These interrelations are important to formulate integrated policies needed to achieve sustainable development.

It is therefore recognized that achieving of SDG 11 – the urban SDG – will be key in driving progress towards sustainable development in the world. Urban areas will be increasingly critical for achieving all SDGs and integrating the social, economic and environmental goals set forth in the 2030 Agenda, thereby contributing to upholding the Agenda's principle of "leaving no one behind". "Cities are where the battle for sustainable development will be won or lost", as clearly recognized by the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons for the Post-2015 Development Agenda, (<http://www.post2015hlp.org/the-report/>).

³ (Satterthwaite, 2008)

The main objective of this section is to highlight the importance of cities or "urban" for monitoring the 2030 Agenda, pointing out the specific linkages between SDG 11 and other SDG goals while demonstrating its linkages with other global agendas, frameworks or agreements.

1.1.2. Goal 11:

Targets and indicators

Goal 11 centers on a pledge to "make cities and human settlement inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable" through eliminating slum-like conditions, reducing urban sprawl, and ensuring universal access to safe and sustainable urban transit. Like many other SDGs, it is based on specific targets and indicators. At present, Goal 11 consists of 10 targets and 15 indicators; 11 indicators are output indicators while the remaining four are process indicators (Table 1). Of all these indicators, seven are in Tier III, seven in Tier II and only one in Tier I. Out of the 240 indicators that are part of the Global Monitoring Framework adopted; about one third of these can be measured at the local level. As a result, most of these indicators have a direct connection to urban policies and a clear impact on cities and human settlements.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS



Table 1. SDG 11 targets and indicators

Targets	Proposed Indicators
SDG Target 11.1 By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums	11.1.1 Proportion of urban population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing
SDG 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.	11.2.1 Proportion of population that has convenient access to public transport, by sex, age and persons with disabilities
SDG 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.	11.3.1 Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate
	11.3.2 Proportion of cities with a direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management that operate regularly and democratically
SDG Target 11.4 Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage	11.4.1 Total expenditure (public and private) per capita spent on the preservation, protection and conservation of all cultural and natural heritage, by type of heritage (cultural, natural, mixed and World Heritage Centre designation), level of government (national, regional and local/municipal), type of expenditure (operating expenditure/investment) and type of private funding (donations in kind, private non-profit sector and sponsorship).
SDG 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	11.5.1 Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people.
	11.5.2 Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global GDP, including disaster damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services.
SDG 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	11.6.1 Proportion of urban solid waste regularly collected and with adequate final discharge out of total urban solid waste generated, by cities.
	11.6.2 Annual mean levels of fine particulate matter (e.g. PM2.5 and PM10) in cities (population weighted).
SDG 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	11.7.1 Average share of the built-up area of cities that is open space for public use for all, by sex, age and persons with disabilities.
	11.7.2 Proportion of persons victim of physical or sexual harassment, by sex, age, disability status and place of occurrence, in the previous 12 months.
SDG Target 11.a Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning.	11.a.1 Proportion of population living in cities that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs, by size of city
SDG 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.	11.b.1 Proportion of local governments that adopt and implement local disaster-risk reduction strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030a.
	11.b.2 Number of countries with national and local disaster- risk reduction strategies.
SDG Target 11.c Support least developed countries, including through financial and technical assistance, in building sustainable and resilient buildings utilizing local materials.	11. c.1 Proportion of financial support to the least developed countries that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings utilizing local materials.
SDG Target 1.4. By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance.	
SDG Target 6.3: By 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater and substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally	

As part of this process, a Goal 11 synthesis report will be produced under UN Habitat's coordination to provide an in-depth review of the efforts and issues surrounding the implementation of urban and human settlements indicators- at local, national and global levels, sharing challenges and opportunities, and providing key recommendations for governments, civil society and the UN on the next course of action in terms of partnerships, collaborations and resource mobilization for effective implementation of the urban-related SDGs.

The report will focus on elements related to implementation; including the support that UN-Habitat, other UN agencies and partners are providing to Member States and other stakeholders through development of the necessary tools and methodologies as well as the capacity building activities, ownership and involving stakeholders, institutional mechanisms, incorporation of the urban-SDGs into national frameworks, and means of implementation. Specifically, the report will:

- Create an interactive space for dialogue involving Member States of the United Nations, specialized agencies, and civil society on the progress of Goal 11.

- Provide an update on the progress made in developing the methodology on all indicators
- Discuss strategies for building effective partnerships for addressing the monitoring needs of all indicators.
- Raise awareness on emerging critical urban issues, in addition to examining urban as a cross-cutting issue for accelerating the achievement of all other goals.

As part of the report development process, an Expert Group write-shop (EGW) was organized in Nairobi on **28th - 30th May 2018** to review, provide inputs, and help finalize the draft synthesis report prepared by UN Habitat, other UN agencies and partners. The three day workshop brought together 25 experts from UN agencies, regional commissions, academia and other stakeholders to critically review the draft synthesis report, identify gaps in the analysis, suggest ways of filling them, and help make recommendations to guide future work on SDG 11 monitoring. The workshop was funded by the Andalusian Agency for International Cooperation for Development. This report summarizes the deliberations and key highlights from the workshop, which have been integrated into the final SDG synthesis report to be officially launched in New York in July 2018, during the HLPF meeting.



1.2. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

The workshop objectives were;

1. Critically review SDG 11 draft synthesis report
2. Identify gaps in the of SDG 11 targets/indicators' analysis and suggest ways of filling such gaps.
3. Make recommendations to guide future work in the SDG 11 monitoring.

1.3. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The EGW was a hybrid of a review meeting and a write-shop. Experts were engaged at varying levels through presentations, question and answer sessions, plenary and discursive sessions, and direct input into a draft report that had been developed by UN-Habitat in collaboration with other SDG 11 custodian agencies. Each session aimed to identify and address the following key issues in the draft report:

- Omissions and Errors;
- Missing data, new data and thematic issues;
- Structural improvements;
- Regional partners/ integration issues; and,
- Additional improvements to the reporting on SDG 11.

To address the above mentioned issues, the 3-day workshop deployed the following working strategy:

- a) Three presentation sessions on the highlights of the synthesis report followed by discursive plenary sessions;
- b) Sessions involving writing down of comments, recommendations and questions on each report chapter – including identification of gaps and ways of filling them. The emerging comments were directly incorporated into the report revision during and after the meeting.
- c) Two working group sessions focused on direct improvement of the report content as per expert opinion and group discussions. The first session consisted of three groups working on content improvement per report chapter. The second session consisted of 14 smaller groups working on structural improvement of the report content per indicator;
- d) Group presentations and plenary sessions followed each working group session.

Annex 1 presents the detailed workshop agenda.



2. OPENING REMARKS

REMARKS FROM EDUARDO MORENO

HEAD, RESEARCH AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT BRANCH, UN HABITAT



Mr. Eduardo Moreno, Head of the Research and Capacity Development Branch, UN-Habitat opened the workshop by thanking the experts for being able to participate in the workshop; and .In his remarks, he highlighted the objective of the workshop as structural improvement and content review of the SDG11 synthesis report, as well as technical inputs from the rich expertise and experience among the participants. He encouraged the experts to review and contribute to all sections of the report and introduce as much relevant information as possible. After giving a brief background on the SDGs review process by the High Level Political Forum, he highlighted that SDG 11 was being reviewed in detail for the first time during the 2018 forum. As a result, it is expected that the deliberations from the workshop will produce a rich document which would be informative to all audiences during and beyond the HLPF.

Mr. Moreno identified 3 fundamental aspects for the experts to consistently look out for in the report, and/ or make inputs towards:

1. The progress made so far in methodological developments for SDG 11 indicators monitoring
2. The current/baseline status of SDG 11 indicators, with particular emphasis on data backed trends,

and significance of such trends for policy and the sustainable development discourse

3. Inclusion of good examples and best practices on ongoing monitoring efforts which can be applied across regions

Referring to the contents of draft synthesis report to be reviewed and finalized, he highlighted some emerging limitations such as lack of data on several indicators, making reporting difficult. On behalf of UN-Habitat, Mr. Moreno conveyed his gratitude to '[Andalusian Agency for International Cooperation for Development](#)' for their generous contributions towards funding the organization of the workshop. He singled out the Agency's continued support to UN-Habitat and the broader sustainable urbanization agenda, as proven through financial support for the workshop and other events related to the New Urban Agenda (e.g. first Quadrennial report). Mr. Moreno concluded by stating that the drafting team at UN Habitat was confident of fruitful deliberations and a finalized report that would be a powerful strategic document during the 2018 HLPF. He emphasized that the report, should be able to establish clear connections and linkages with other SDGs, and show the central role of SDG 11 as an enabler and promoter of the other SDGs.

REMARKS FROM MR. RAFAEL TUTS

DIR. PROGRAMME DIVISION, UN-HABITAT



The workshop was officially opened by Mr. Rafael Tuts, Director, Programme Division, UN-Habitat. During his opening remarks, Mr. Tuts reflected on the process that culminated in the formulation of Goal 11 indicators and its adoption as part of the SDGs framework; which he established as being a result of long periods of advocacy by large groups of partners such as UN Habitat, Cities Alliance among other stakeholders. The quest, he noted, was to have a stand-alone goal that addressed issues related to sustainable development within cities of the world. According to Mr. Tuts, the adoption of SDG 11, under UN-Habitat leadership, was just the beginning of a long process of engagement and innovation, with an immediate goal of addressing many data gaps across targets and indicators.

Despite a requirement to start developing some indicators and building their data structures, he acknowledged the progress made so far, which has in many ways been at par with efforts by other agencies and set timelines. While acknowledging the complex nature of measuring and reporting on Goal 11 indicators, most of which are still at Tier III level, Mr. Tuts asserted that he looks forward to drawing positive messages from the workshop, which would in turn inform future work on the goal monitoring. The indicators presented under the Goal, he continued, lie at the core of attainment

of sustainable urbanization, which UN-Habitat has been working towards for more than four decades. This would thus require clear messages which give direction to policy makers at the global, national and local levels on the significance of adopting, monitoring and reporting on SDG 11 indicators. In extension, it will help mobilize global and local action and inform the nature of support to be offered to countries, most of which lack the required systems and capacities for monitoring.

In his concluding remarks, Mr. Tuts noted that reporting on Goal 11 must be shown in a pro-active manner that generally supports development of capacities. The 3-day workshop presented a unique opportunity for Goal 11 to showcase what it stands for and why it is the most important goal in the entire SDG framework. The workshop was set up to be an EGM that promotes innovation, giving space to the experts to think 'outside the box': it presents an opportunity to develop the synthesis report that is unique from reports on other SDGs. As a result, he asked experts in attendance to ensure that the report was well integrated into the entire SDGs framework, and that its key messages were speaking on behalf of the entire UN system as well as other important partners such as local government associations, civil societies and private sector among others.

REMARKS FROM MR. ROBERT NDUGWA:

HEAD, GLOBAL URBAN OBSERVATORY



Mr. Ndugwa gave an overview of the workshop, its objectives and the expected deliverables. He broadly articulated the draft report focus against the broad HLPF review process and pointed out that, the drafting team at UN-Habitat was keen to get feedback from the experts on something new and innovative in matters related to monitoring and reporting on goal 11. He singled out three key aspects for the experts to look out for while reviewing, discussing and improving the report: a) innovative monitoring practices, b) integration of monitoring and reporting across SDG 11 indicators and between SDG 11 and other Goals, and c) inclusion of all relevant actors in the monitoring and reporting processes.

Mr. Ndugwa noted that the three-day workshop entailed going through the entire content of the synthesis report, discussing key elements, identifying gaps and filling them, ensuring consistency of information and re-structuring of the report where necessary. This would be achieved through presentations, plenary discussions, group and individual review and writing sessions, and brainstorming sessions.

Mr. Ndugwa summarized the workshop deliverables in to 3 outputs, namely:

4. Text improvements and production of the final synthesis report.
5. Production of shorter version of HLPF report - summary report (6 pages derived from the main report);
6. Key messages from these reports (thoughts and ideas put together) – issues emerging from the synthesis report that need to be highlighted for wider audience.

Mr. Ndugwa concluded his opening remarks by taking experts through the workshop agenda and giving guidance on how each session would be structured.

3. PRESENTATIONS AND WORKING GROUP SESSIONS

The workshop adopted “**thematic working group sessions**” as the main strategy for review and revision of the draft synthesis report. Three such sessions were established, each based on an individual chapter in the draft report. Each session was preceded by an introductory presentation, which would highlight the chapter’s intended purpose (the kind of information it sought to provide), the key findings, and gaps in information which the experts would work towards filling. A plenary discussion would then follow the presentations, where more areas and elements for the report enrichment would be identified. The key emerging issues and aspects of incorporation would thereafter inform the draft report revisions.

This section summarizes the key outcomes from three such-structured sessions, and their ensuing implementation towards the draft report revision.

3.1. CHAPTER 1 REVIEW

IMPORTANCE OF THE ‘**URBAN**’ IN THE 2030 AGENDA

3.1.1. CHAPTER OVERVIEW PRESENTATION

Robert Ndugwa - Head of the Global Urban Observatory – gave an overview of chapter one through his presentation titled “**Importance of the “Urban” in The 2030 Agenda**”. He identified the 2030 Development Agenda as consisting of 5 main focus areas, **17** goals; **234** indicators and **169** targets. Goal 11, the urban goal is focused on promoting the establishment of sustainable cities and human settlements across the world, with progress towards this being tracked through 10 global targets and 15 indicators.



The fact that today more people live in cities than rural areas, and the influence of urban areas to most sectors of development in a country place urban areas at the core of the 2030 development agenda. Decisions on cities will thus significantly impact on the levels of progress towards global sustainability across many goals and sectors. This not only requires a strategic focus on monitoring progress in Goal 11, but also keenly unpacking the underlying interlinkages and interconnectedness of the Goal with other SDGs and global development agendas (e.g. the New Urban Agenda, the Sendai Framework, Paris Agreement on Climate Change etc).

Mr. Ndugwa further established that, within the SDG reporting framework, different responsibilities are given to various partners. For example, All national statistical systems are responsible for collecting primary data for all the SDGs; regional agencies are responsible for facilitating and creating an enabling environment for implementation; while International agencies are responsible for developing methodologies for measurement of the indicators, supporting monitoring efforts by national statistical offices (NSOs) through capacity development and technical support on the indicator computations, and collating data from countries for global progress monitoring and reporting. The UN Statistical division is responsible for pulling together all the systems' databases to make sure they work as one unit for every partner in the data production and monitoring chain. All these processes interact at global, national and regional level. Making reference to the goal of the expert group meeting, Mr. Ndugwa highlighted that the roles allocated to international agencies present the responsibilities of UN-Habitat and other custodian agencies on Goal 11, to which the under-discussion synthesis report sought to fulfil.

According to Mr. Ndugwa, the division of responsibilities among the various actors pose several challenges, some of which include variations in data at the national and global levels, complexities associated to collaboration

between national and global data systems (and activities), and the slow pace of uptake for emerging/new data collection mechanisms into official national statistical systems. Various mechanisms have been put in place at the global level to address some of the emerging challenges. For example, in areas where national data does not agree with global data, Mr. Ndugwa identified that the current structure is to aggregate data from national to global levels (reducing the number of such conflicts); but that where such variations occur, various approaches have been proposed to combine such data into accurate and agreeable figures.

These, according to him rely on the type of data, especially since some indicators can better be measured at the local level, while globally produced data is more relevant for others. A major requirement to ensure smooth data collection, monitoring and reporting requires continuous engagement between actors, and capacity development among national statistical systems, which have been identified as a major threat to the SDGs monitoring efforts. UN-Habitat and other Goal 11 custodian agencies and partners are currently supporting such capacity development initiatives in various countries, including promoting the use of alternative data collection methods relevant for Goal 11 monitoring.

Referencing to the content of Chapter 1 of the synthesis report, Mr. Ndugwa summarized the chapter as providing highlights of the above aspects and the global reporting framework for Goal 11; interlinkages of the goal with other SDGs, targets and indicators; and explaining the diversity of tools developed by UN-Habitat and partners to support the global and local monitoring and reporting. He further outlined that the SDGs present a different reporting framework than that used for the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Unlike the MDGs whose reporting was localized largely to the developing regions, the SDGs introduced universal reporting encompassing all countries.

Mr. Ndugwa further outlined the prevailing challenges in SDG 11 monitoring, which he introduced by explaining the SDG indicators classification as proposed by the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs), which includes:

1. **Tier I indicators:** which represent indicators which are conceptually clear, have an internationally established methodology and standards, and for which data are regularly produced for at least 50 per cent of countries and of the population in every region where the indicator is relevant.
2. **Tier II indicators:** which represent indicators which are conceptually clear, have an internationally established methodology and standards, but for which data are not regularly produced by countries.
3. **Tier III indicators:** which represent indicators for which internationally established methodologies or standards are yet to be adopted, but where such are being (or will be) developed or tested.

According to Mr. Ndugwa, among the 15 indicators in Goal 11, 6 are classified as Tier III, implying that a lot of methodological work and data generation is required if the goal is going to be adequately monitored to 2030. In addition, he highlighted that the Goal introduced a new level of data generation, for which data collection should be done at the local city level across multiple indicators. This in itself requires an operational definition of what constitutes a city, to enable countries be able to collect data and report on the goal's indicators. Other prevailing challenges are related to limited data to support methodological developments and indicator computations; lack of policy frameworks to allow for

integration of alternative data sources into national statistics despite these being a requirement under the SDG 11 (egs GIS generated data, community collected data, etc); limited resources for mass application of methods and data collection; and complicated structures for inter-agency and stakeholder collaboration.

Reinforcing the importance and relevance of the current report, Mr. Ndugwa highlighted that UN-Habitat has been contributing the the Secretary General's (SG) SDG report which is produced annually and only features tier 1 & tier 2 indicators. Feedback from the global community has been unanimous on the inadequacy of the SGs-report, promoting custodian agencies across various Goals to produce more detailed synthesis reports on a regular basis. The under-discussion synthesis report for Goal 11, produced by the various custodian agencies is thus an important contribution to the SDGs reporting, and also aims to form a baseline against which future reporting and process can be monitored. The report, according to him complements efforts by other agencies and UN Regional Commissions – which also produce progress reports highlighting ongoing efforts at the region and country-levels. Beyond providing a good indication on the progress made in Goal 11 monitoring, the under-discussion synthesis report also gives a more detailed analysis of the challenges and opportunities related to Goal 11 monitoring and reporting.

In his concluding remarks, Mr. Ndugwa pointed out that one vital lesson is that Goal 11 is important on its own, but more effective when connected with all other goals; and thus linking Goal 11 with other SDGs will ensure sustainable development is achieved.

3.1.2. FIRST PLENARY SESSION: Discussion around Chapter 1

- Following Mr. Ndugwa's presentation, participants at the workshop sought clarification on the following elements; What will happen to Tier III indicators, which form a big share of Goal 11 indicators and what is the short and long term strategies to upgrade them to Tier II and eventually to Tier I?
- What would be the worst-case scenario for the tier III Indicators, and, which of these indicators would be having a real chance of being removed from the monitoring framework. What will be the consequence of such removal for SDG 11 monitoring?
- Can countries use proxies to report on indicators especially where data on important indicators is not available?
- What qualifies a country as "officially reporting on on SDG 11"? i.e. are there thresholds on the number of indicators it should be reporting on, and the number of cities which are deemed representative of the urban goal monitoring?
- How can the national sample of cities concept be applied to countries in the Caribbean and small island countries in the Pacific which are small in nature (city, population size), and with only a few cities?
- How can the interconnectedness between the SDGs and NUA be exploited for joint monitoring and implementation?

The above questions were deliberated upon and responded to through an open discussion, which included in-depth discussions around each element. Below are some of the key highlights in response to the raised questions.

a) Whereas a good number of Goal 11 indicators are still Tier III, there has been substantial progress in methodological developments and data generation

The current methodological and implementation status of tier III indicators for Goal 11 is not at the same position it was two years ago. Methods for computing most of the indicators have already been established through collaborative efforts by various custodian agencies (included about 12 EGMs conducted for SDG 11 indicators), and piloted in several countries and are currently being disseminated for global application. As a result, plans are underway to submit four of the Tier III indicators for review to Tier II during the September and December 2018 meetings of the IAEG-SDGs. The other two indicators (11.a.1 and 11.c.1) have been proposed for rewording, since their current formulation is difficult to measure. Processes and evidences are currently being packaged to support the submissions for reclassification. The current challenge for indicator reclassification that UN-Habitat and other custodian agencies are working on is no longer that of unclear methodologies, but the threshold of number of countries collecting data and reporting on each indicator.

Based on the monitoring and reporting timelines set by the IAEG-SDGs, indicator(s) that will still be classified as tier III by end of 2019 will be removed from the SDGs monitoring framework because their measurement will not be tenable. However, custodian agencies are allowed to identify indicators which are non-measurable and submit a request to IAEG-SDGS for its removal from the monitoring framework. (The process for removing indicators is the same as that adopted for indicator revision). As at 2018, none of the Goal 11 indicators are lined up for elimination as plans are underway for their reclassification. Beyond indicator reclassification and/or removal, the SDGs monitoring framework does not provide for inclusion of new indicators (countries are continuously calling for a reduction in the number of indicators as opposed to their increase).

b) Countries are required to report on all indicators, but lack of relevant data necessitates part reporting and use of proxies

The global reporting structure allows for some flexibility in indicator reporting, with part reporting and use of proxy indicators being alternatives that will be used by many countries over the next few years. The current suggestion from the IAEG-SDGs, which is based on request from custodian agencies and Member States is that countries can in the short term report on Tier III indicators using proxies. At the same time, they should adopt the already-in-place data generation and monitoring methodologies. Such reporting on Tier III indicators based on proxies will promote data generation and fast track their re-classification to tier 2. The use of proxies should however be limited to where necessary and holistic methods adopted to avoid misreporting. UN-Habitat is continuously monitoring country reporting status through regular communication with NSOs focal points. In addition, UN-Habitat organizes regular regional workshops to train countries on methodologies and tools available for monitoring and reporting. Several countries have send requests to the agency (and other co-custodian agencies) for direct advisory support in Goal 11 reporting. To validate when a country is reporting officially, communication is done between the country and the custodian agency.

c) All countries cannot report on all cities, necessitating adoption of a city sampling framework

Countries are compelled to define and identify the number of cities they have, collect data on all these cities and aggregate upwards the national level average performance of these city-specific indicators. For countries with many cities, it is difficult to collect information and report on all their cities, and this is particularly true for those that have limited resources (financial, institutional, human and systems). For these countries, UN-Habitat recommends the application of

the **National Sample of Cities (NSC)** approach, which employs scientifically and statistically sound methods to select a set of cities which represent the country's urban structure. The selected cities would then be continuously monitored and values aggregated to represent the national progress in Goal 11. This way, country specific reporting on the urban indicators will not be biased to the large cities, or cities for which data is easily available.

For countries with few or small cities such as those in the Caribbean and Pacific Islands, data can be collected for all the cities. Overall, a country will decide, based on its resources whether it is able to collect data on all its cities, or whether to sample a few representative cities and report on them.

Beyond the sought clarifications, the open discussion also identified gaps in the report, and ways of filling them. Participants contributed to the discussions by sharing their knowledge on the diversity of monitoring and reporting aspects; and provided inputs to the report by suggesting good practices in monitoring and reporting which could enrich the report.

One of the major gaps identified in chapter 1 was the need to include a section on means of implementation, which would discuss how SDG 11 monitoring would be accelerated at the global level. While acknowledging the importance of including this as a separate section, the UN-Habitat team established that a report focused on such information and that cuts across targets was being prepared under Goal 17. In addition, the UN-Habitat representatives highlighted that related information was also provided per indicator in chapter three of the synthesis report. It was however agreed that key messages towards this would be formulated during the three day workshop and included into the report to highlight the proposed approaches to accelerating the goal monitoring. Such recommendations would integrate aspects of technology, finance, programmes and projects, and capacity development.

Box 1 summarizes other aspects identified for clarification and/or further deliberation (both through the open discussion and as written comments submitted by each participant).

Box 1: Generic gaps and aspects for further development in chapter 1 and 2

- For all indicators, there is need to have data disaggregated by sex, age and vulnerability. In addition, it will be important to bring up spatial data analysis for spatially related indicators.
- Opening channels to incorporate data collected by civil societies would be significant in enriching available database for various indicators. It is therefore important to create an interactive space for dialogue involving Member States of the United Nations, specialized agencies, and civil society on the progress of Goal 11.
- It will be important to look at transparency, accountability and effectiveness while measuring participatory process.
- In the analysis of goal 11, it is important to include quantitative examples that link chapter 1 to chapter 3 on baseline status of each indicator.
- For the indicators, include more implementation information on technology, finance, strong specific programs and capacity development



3.2. CHAPTER 2 REVIEW:

PROGRESS ON SDG 11 INDICATORS MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION

3.2.1. CHAPTER OVERVIEW PRESENTATION



Donatien Beguy, in his overview of the contents of chapter two made a presentation titled “Progress on SDG11 Indicators Monitoring and Implementation”. The presentation highlighted activities undertaken between 2016 and 2018 to promote Goal 11 monitoring and reporting. He highlighted various efforts by custodian agencies, partners and other stakeholders, including those on methodological and tools development, capacity development and direct data generation on various indicators. He further highlighted the challenges and opportunities facing Goal 11 monitoring. On methodological developments, among other things, he established that Goal 11 has enjoyed collaboration between various custodian agencies, who have tirelessly worked to refine methods as well as to put in place and launch mechanisms for monitoring and reporting at the local, regional and global levels.

According to Mr. Beguy, Goal 11 monitoring still faces critical challenges, a major one being the lack of globally agreed upon city definition; which is a prerequisite for the entire goal monitoring. . He however identified that consultations with various experts and specialized institutions have resulted in narrowing down down to two definitions of a city: one of which is based on urban extents and the other on the degree of urbanization. From the custodian agency perspective, the main aim of having a common definition is not to change how countries define cities and urban areas but to support global monitoring and reporting.

Mr. Beguy further introduced the participants to a diversity of tools developed by UN-Habitat over the years, and which are critical to supporting progress towards sustainable urbanization through enhanced monitoring and translation of data to relevant policy initiatives. He emphasized the relevance of the National Sample of Cities model for Goal 11 monitoring, and informed the participants that the model has been tested in four countries, and that UN-Habitat is currently compiling a list of countries for which the approach can be applied. In addition, he introduced the urban observatory model developed by UN Habitat and deployed to cities and national governments to promote urban data generation and dissemination, and enhance informed decision making at various levels of government.. He also discussed the City Prosperity Initiative, a multi-indicator platform developed by UN-Habitat in 2012 and which supports use of data for informed decision making. These tools, according to Mr. Beguy bridge SDG 11 monitoring and implementation of informed decisions and actions which result in sustainable human settlements where no one is left behind.

The presentation also discussed aspects of mainstreaming gender, age, persons with disabilities and culture and heritage into SDG 11 monitoring, as discussed in detail in the draft report. In particular, Mr. Beguy pointed out that all Goal 11 indicators need to be disaggregated by several dimensions, with interpretation of results also focusing on the implication of various levels of service to different groups. As a result, all custodian agencies need to invest on up-scaling and capacity building efforts in different countries to empower NSOs to collect disaggregated data at the local level. He however acknowledged that data disaggregation is currently facing major challenges, especially due to its requirement for collection at local level; something that is often expensive for countries.

The presentation concluded by identifying some of the emerging opportunities for Goal 11 monitoring to which participants were requested to share best practices and additional information that could be included in the chapter.

3.2.2. SECOND PLENARY SESSION: FEEDBACK FROM CHAPTER 2 & 3 OF THE GOAL 11 SYNTHESIS REPORT

Mr. Beguy's presentation was followed by a discussion around the chapter contents, to which experts contributed new information for its enrichment. Written feedback on gaps identified and required amendments to the chapter were also provided, the key ones of which are provided as box 1.

- Participants sought clarifications on the chapter, based on the following questions: What is the possibility of opening channels to civil societies' data then validating the data later, because civil societies collect a lot of data?
- What possibilities are there to draw information from other indicators to feed to other goals? e.g., can data from Goal 16 be used to support computation of Goal 11?

- To what extent can participation in cities be increased with regards to indicators related to urban services delivered directly to the people e.g.s transport, access to public transport, sanitation?
- What mechanisms should be put in place to promote use information from other NSO sources, especially where data protocols attached to national data systems require validation and privacy of access to information?
- If there is civic participation being incorporated in the reporting and what are the minimum standards for the inclusion of civil society in SDG 11 reporting?
- What clever strategies can be applied to accelerate data disaggregation (and mainstreaming of various elements) at city level?

The ensuing discussion focused on data disaggregation, which was identified as a key challenge for the goal monitoring and attainment of inclusive development.

Data disaggregation has a positive impact on elements measured within the SGD framework. Whereas disaggregating data for all Goal 11 indicators is a daunting task, it is important because it is the best way to appropriately present inequalities within cities that need to be addressed, helping ensure that no one is left behind. Within Goal 11, there are issues of inequalities observed in all regions of the world which are linked to the variations in age, gender and disabilities, as well those connected to other goals. Therefore, it will be noble to create mechanisms that bring together all actors collecting related data within the world's cities.

There is also need to go beyond data offered by NSOs by creating stronger linkages between the SDGs and the New Urban Agenda at the synthesis stage. Civil societies collect a lot of relevant data and opening channels for data flow and its integration into national statistical systems will significantly enrich available databases for various indicators. Modern systems for collection of spatial data equally offer unique opportunities for enhanced data collection, sharing and informed decision making.

3.2.3. GROUP WRITING SESSIONS TO UPDATE CHAPTER 2

After the plenary discussions, three groups were formed, each of which was allocated specific sections of chapter two which they would review in detail and update accordingly. The groups were based on individual indicators. Each group, composed of between 8 – 10 experts with varied expertise performed this task and directly updating missing information, shifted text to enhance the chapter consistency, incorporated (or proposed) best practices and experiences from countries and regions to enhance the chapter messaging, and/or highlighted areas requiring more work beyond the workshop.

In addition, each team highlighted some key issues associated with the specific indicators they were working on, which are summarized in table 1 below.

Table 2: Summary of key issues from chapter 2 review per group

WORKING GROUP 1 (focus indicators: 11.1.1; 11.2.1; 11.3.1; and 11.7.1)
Key issues highlighted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the 4 indicators, Data disaggregation and Analytical information was weak and required reinforcements There was need to develop the status on methodological advancement and implementation for each indicator. Indicator 11.1.1: the approach used for the indicator computation should be clearly outlined in the text. In addition, the report should establish clear linkages between the indicator and basic services (indicator 1.4.1) and tenure security (indicator 1.4.2) Besides measurement of accessibility, the synthesis on indicator 11.2.1 should also measure convenience of public transport. IN addition, both formal and informal public transport components should be measured within the indicator – something that should be clearly highlighted in the report. For indicator 11.3.1, since the current limitation is on which method of city definition to be adopted, both methods can be proposed and countries allowed to choose the one that is easy to deploy Indicator 11.7.1: The gaps noted in data availability could be addressed through use of GIS/remote sensing technologies and ground truthing

WORKING GROUP 2 (Focus indicators 11.5.1, 11.6.1, 11.6.2 and 11.b.1)

Key issues highlighted

- There is need to bring out more linkages between goal 11 indicators and other SDGs
- There is a notable lack of standard methodology for measuring solid waste globally. As a result, data differs among different agencies (a standardized methodology will be available at the end of 2018; until then reporting requires a metadata on definitions at country level).
- For the four indicators, data reported was inadequate and required to be disaggregated further.
- The challenge for Asia-Pacific countries is to measure indicator 11.6.2 - because it is one of the most regressing indicators, with data available
- Not all cities can match the set threshold on the annual mean levels of fine particulate matter (e.g. PM2.5 and PM10) in cities (population weighted)
- Indicator 11.6.1 could be inter-linked to SDG8 and 12 and 14.1.
- Indicator 11.5.1 could be improved by reinforcing elements around unequal impacts from global climatic change and the exacerbated risks it poses eg. Exposure to hazards versus exposure to pollution.
- There is need for clear definition of a working definition on municipal solid waste for indicator 11.6.1
- For indicator 11.6.1, Regularization /formalization of informal waste management systems within cities could increase recycling efficiency.
- Member states can draw upon the methodology used by EM-DAT which contains data that can be used to report on indicators 11.5.1 and 11.5.2.
- Engaging relevant sectors as transport, housing, energy production and industry, would be important to draft and efficiently implement policies that will reduce the risks of air pollution in the long-run

WORKING GROUP 3 (focus indicators 11.3.2, 11.4.1, 11.a.1, and 11.c.1)

Key issues highlighted

- Indicator 11.3.2 has limitations on accountability, effectiveness, and measuring who is engaging through the proposed methods. It is thus difficult to know if specific groups are not being engaged. Discussions around the indicator can be enriched by adding a box on the example/ story of participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre, Brasil or Penang, Malaysia – UCLG. In addition, relevance of the indicator can be enhanced explaining more on some theoretical backings of the role of civil societ participation in sustainable development

- Awareness-raising/Advocacy for indicator 11.4.1 can be improved by adding some information from the UNESCO Creative Cities Network (UCCN) that was created in 2004 to promote cooperation with and among cities that have identified creativity as a strategic factor for sustainable urban development.
- Indicator 11.4.1: Sustainable urban development involves a wide network of actors, including international organizations, UN Member States, National Commissions for UNESCO, UNESCO Category 2 Centres, international and regional associations of cities, NGOs, the private sector, specialized funding bodies, goodwill ambassadors and civil societies
- Indicator 11.4.1: There is need to highlight key activities towards enhancing the conservation of the cultural and natural heritage as well as safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage are undertaken at the national and local levels
- Indicator 11.a.1 is based on the assumption that the proposed revision of the indicator will be adopted by IAEG-SDGs. More information needs to be provided on the proposed revisions for clarity of what is being measured and why.
- Indicator 11.c.1 does not present a global scenario since it only designed to target LDCs. Further, synthesis of the indicator should adapt assumptions that buildings should be sustainable. It should address resilient and sustainable use around the world.

3.3. CHAPTER 3 REVIEW:

BASELINE STATUS OF SDG 11 TARGETS AND INDICATORS

Unlike the review of chapter one and two which were preceded by introductory presentations, the review of chapter 3 was exclusively based on group activities. Following plenary and group discussions around the first two chapters, experts at the workshop unanimously agreed that Chapter 3 of the synthesis was the heaviest in terms of information provided. They also agreed that the structure of the draft chapter was not consistent, and that information on spread across paragraphs and sub-headings. As a result, it was agreed that a standard template be adopted and each indicator discussion be re-arranged to fit into the structure.

The template proposed and agreed for adoption on chapter 3 reporting contained the following sub-sections

- **Targets/indicators:** Description of the indicator itself. Specific of areas of work from the sub-programme/ regions
- **Awareness:** Specific activities promoting, informing and socializing about specific indicator or component of it.
- **Policy:** Actions and/or activities promoting policy interventions and coherence of the indicator to broader notion of sustainable urban development and/or the city.
- **Partnership:** collective actions taken to formulate actions and implement them with partners
- **Programmes and projects:** priority setting and types of interventions in their respective areas, providing examples, indicating status of implementation, location and possible results if any.
- **Financing:** Mechanisms of financing, conditions, funding partners, and scale of operation if any
- **Capacity development:** Explaining advisory technical services that are provided, status, partners and location
- **Technology:** explaining the use of modern technology, if any.
- **Best practices:** Indicate any notable good initiative towards monitoring of the focus indicator (including both those which one is directly involved and those one feels provide a good case on how things can be done). Providing example title and links or external attachments was also part of this sub-session.

Based on this consensus, the team of experts was divided into 15 sub-groups – each with 2 to three people based on specific expertise / experiences. Each team was then tasked with revising and revising a specific indicator to fit into the agreed upon template, identifying gaps in the reporting and filling them, pulling out 2 to 3 key messages, and incorporating all comments related

to each indicator that had previously been discussed during the preceding sessions. At the end of the group sessions, each group was asked to make a brief presentation on the key messages extracted and what they had achieved in terms of restructuring the chapter.

In general, all sections under chapter 3 were restructured appropriately, although consistent limitations in adequate information for the report were identified in the sub-sections on projects and programmes, financing and technology, demanding further action by the UN-Habitat team after the workshop. The participants also identified sections for which information could not be found, or where further information was required. For these areas, they tasked the UN-Habitat team with filling the gaps. This has been fulfilled in the final report that will be disseminated during the HLPF, entitled "Tracking progress towards Inclusive, Safe, Resilient and Sustainable Cities and Human Settlement

Below is a summary of the key messages proposed by the experts during the meeting, which have also been compiled into a [key messages pull out](#).

Key message(s): Indicator 11.1.1

(Proportion of urban population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing)

- The realization of adequate housing is part of basic human rights, and contributes to various economic, social and cultural aspects of development for individuals, households and communities. Conversely, inadequate housing impacts negatively on urban equity and inclusion, urban safety and livelihood opportunities, and cause negative health conditions. This indicator is a continuation of the MDGs with regards to the slum component that has been expanded to include informal settlements and adequate housing that is measured through housing affordability. With around 883 million urban dwellers living in slum conditions and many others yet to be measured facing inadequate and unaffordable housing, this indicator is strongly associated with other social challenges such as low educational attainment, crime, and poor well-being.

Key message(s): Indicator 11.2.1

(11.2.1 Proportion of population that has convenient access to public transport, by sex, age and persons with disabilities)

- Sustainable transport is a key ingredient for the achievement of most, if not all SDGs, particularly those related to education, food security, health, energy, infrastructure and cities and human settlements. Sustainable transport has to do with safety, affordability, accessibility, efficiency, including resource efficiency and the AVOID, SHIFT, IMPROVE approach for increased environmental sustainability, resilience and climate resilience. Although global transport data is collected on topics such as spatial access, usage, road networks, safety, passenger and freight volumes, transport injuries and fatalities, frequency of transport, etc., more efforts are needed to measure 'convenient access', as proposed by the indicator, which is connected to the functionality and prosperity of urban centers. Data on the overall access to arterial roads, a proxy of this indicator, shows that globally about 70% of the population in urban centers in 2015 had a good access to this type of roads. A good transport system is synonymous with the growth of many urban economies and the quality of life found in cities.

Key message(s): Indicator 11.3.1

(Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate)

- Urban sprawl is not a new phenomenon and has been monitored during the recent decades, but today new technologies and data sources allow for a more accurate measurement. Research from different sources has shown that urban areas are growing at a faster rate than its populations. As a result, densities are declining. Cities that use land more efficiently have far better conditions to provide public goods and basic services at a lower cost (e.g. water and sanitation, transport), can consume less energy, manage waste better, and are more likely to maximize the benefits of agglomeration. New data on land consumption, which is mostly generated using spatial analysis technologies, allows for more precise comparisons amongst cities regardless of the specific administrative boundaries defined at the local level.

Key message(s): Indicator 11.3.2

(Proportion of cities with a direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management that operate regularly and democratically)

- This is an important indicator which measures voice and influence of people – men and women, diverse communities, civil society including grassroots and informal sector organisations – in urban planning and management. Participatory, transparent, accountable urban planning and management, and the creation of an enabling environment, are important steps in assessing how national and local governments involve people, communities and organisations in implementing, monitoring, and evaluating SDGs policies and programmes such as urban planning. Quality participation by all is vital for sustainable development and for the successful design and implementation of integrated spatial and urban planning, and management.

Key message(s): Indicator 11.4.1

[Total expenditure (public and private) per capita spent on the preservation, protection and conservation of all cultural and natural heritage, by type of heritage (cultural, natural, mixed and World Heritage Centre designation), level of government (national, regional and local/municipal), type of expenditure (operating expenditure/ investment) and type of private funding (donations in kind, private non-profit sector and sponsorship)]

- Culture and sustainable urban development are intimately connected. The way urbanization is planned and managed has a direct impact on the protection and safeguarding of the world's cultural and natural heritage. Culture promotes social cohesion and intercultural dialogue, creates a collective identity and sense of belonging, encourages participation in political and cultural life and empowers marginalized groups. It also contributes to place making, understanding of the city's history and the valorization of urban spaces.
- Sustainable tourism, the cultural and creative industries, and heritage-based urban revitalization have proven to generate green employment, stimulate local development, and foster creativity. Measuring preservation, protection and conservation of all cultural and natural heritage at the national and sub-national levels requires more elaboration on the indicator's method that is progressing and being tested.

Key message(s): Indicator 11.5.1

(Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people.)

- National governments must put in place a right mix of mechanisms and investments to systematically collect information, statistics and best practices, while ensuring the full participation of both local governments and civil society actors. Data availability gaps should be addressed by March 2019, if countries are to be able to report against the Sendai Framework global targets as planned.
- While disaster related data is available from multiple sources, accessibility in the right format and in a timely manner has been noted by many countries as a major concern.

Key message(s): Indicator 11.6.1

(Proportion of urban solid waste regularly collected and with adequate final discharge out of total urban solid waste generated, by cities)

- Managing and controlling municipal solid waste and in an environmentally adequate manner is key for protecting our local and global environment. If municipal solid waste management system is established well, it provides numerous benefits such as employment opportunities for youth and women, energy generation, and helps to improve the overall urban environment leading to improved public health and improvements in ecosystems. Evidence shows that municipal solid waste collection coverage is higher in high income countries than in middle-low income countries. The health and environmental impacts of poorly managed municipal solid waste are more severe in densely populated urban areas and in slums, where urban infrastructure and services are often non-existent or inadequate. The cost estimates available suggest strongly that the economic costs to society of inadequate waste management are much greater than the financial costs of environmentally sound waste management. SDGs offer one of the most ambitious frameworks for addressing solid waste management in the 21st century.

Key message(s): Indicator 11.6.2

(Annual mean levels of fine particulate matter (e.g. PM2.5 and PM10) in cities (population weighted))

- Air pollution has a range of negative impacts, including human health, damage to ecosystems, food crops and the built environment and is currently responsible for around 3.4 million deaths annually.
- Air quality is worse off in developing regions than developed. Up to 97% of cities with more than 100 000 inhabitants do not meet WHO air quality guidelines, while this percentage reaches 49% in developed countries.
- A multi-sectoral approach is needed to develop and effectively implement long-term policies that reduce the risks of air pollution to health. More support directly to cities to enhance their systems (hardware and software) and human resources to monitor and report on air quality remains a key challenge especially for the developing countries.

Key message(s): Indicator 11.7.1

(Average share of the built-up area of cities that is open space for public use for all, by sex, age and persons with disabilities.)

- Public spaces are broadly associated with benefits such as enhanced safety and social cohesion, higher equality and improved health and well-being. They increase property values, retail activity multiplication and city attractiveness. Public space has been measured by different methods and approaches, including different definitions of what constitutes a public space. In response, experts have agreed on an operational definition that combines streets and open areas with a public use.
- There is a direct correlation between how much land cities allocate to streets, as public spaces, and their level of prosperity. Latest data shows that the expansion of the world' cities has been accompanied by changes in land use, both in terms of form as well as structure, and a progressive reduction of the proportion of space allocated to streets.
- The integration of public space in local, regional and national policies and frameworks promoting sustainability is key to secure the provision of public space and create more liveable cities. Ensuring city-wide distribution of public spaces is a way for governments to reduce inequalities and expand benefits and prosperity.

Key message(s): Indicator 11.a.1

(Proportion of population living in cities that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs, by size of city)

- The distinction between urban and rural settlements has been an element of data disaggregation for most part of the history of settlement monitoring. However, historical development trends show that urban-rural linkages include important flows (people, natural resources, capital, goods, ecosystem services, information, technology, ideas and innovation) that are drivers of economic growth and development. The indicator puts emphasis on the interdependency, interconnection and complementary of these settlement systems.
- In line with the SDGs and NUA, many countries are going back to the feasibility phase to revise their NUPs, as it is evidenced in the increase from 9 in 2015 to 24 countries in 2018 in the feasibility phase.
- Since the monitoring of this indicator is difficult to measure, ambiguous and not suitable for strengthening national and regional development planning, experts agreed to a revision and a rewording to measure National Urban Policy or Regional Development Plans. Currently, data can be measured for at least 108 countries with important level of thematic disaggregation, using UN-Habitat National Urban Policy Database. This platform remains a key resource for monitoring progress on indicator 11.a.1 and the NUA.

Key message(s): Indicator 11.c.1

(Proportion of financial support to the least developed countries that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings utilizing local materials)

- The construction industry has major implications on urban livelihoods and human comfort, but also on pollution standards. While progress has been made on sustainability initiatives of this industry at global level, the connection to local actions is still rather weak. An agreed definition on 'local' building materials is yet to be proposed, still it is granted that the use of materials within the same region are cost-efficient, and easier to re-use and recycle. This indicator is about the measurement of financial support from developed countries to LDCs on the development of sustainable and resilience buildings using local materials. Although data is available, it needs to be further disaggregated.

4. CONCLUSION AND CLOSING REMARKS.

The EGW on SDG 11 Synthesis Report achieved its intended goal of reviewing and improving the draft report developed by GUO and other partners. Its key outcomes included a) a refined document which adopted a new format suggested, agreed on and implemented by the experts, b) extraction of key messages per indicator, c) incorporation of new data and best practices, d) identification and filling of gaps in the report, and d) identification of areas requiring further inputs from the goal custodian agencies. All the suggestions and inputs from the experts have been adopted in the production of the final report, and the identified areas for further work have been addressed. In addition, feedback received from partners who did not attend the workshop was reviewed and integrated into the revised version of the report.

On indicators for which wording has been proposed, particularly 11.a.1 and 11.c.1, experts requested for the inclusion of text indicating the proposed wording, justification for such revision and presentation of any data that supports the proposed indicators.

While a lot of emphasis was put in restructuring and refining Chapter 3 on global baseline status, changes were proposed, and inputs provided to the other two chapters. For example, it was deemed necessary to further develop the sections on inter-linkages between SDG 11 and other SDGs, which is presented in Chapter 2 of the report.

Despite major efforts by the experts to ensure the production of a complete report, some indicators lack all the relevant data for comprehensive analysis, making reporting on them difficult. Many indicators equally were greatly limited in information that could be used for disaggregation, largely impacting on the report's presentation of mainstreaming elements (gender, youth, elderly, persons with disability, etc). Experts requested the custodian agencies to pro-actively work towards production of disaggregated data to avoid similar limitations in future reporting cycles.

Although there is significant progress in developing the monitoring tools and methods for goal 11, further work is required particularly in terms of reaching out to all countries in all regions. From the presentations, it emerged that SDG 11 measures progress within cities but does not put much effort on measurements of intra-cities differences. Experts requested UN Habitat and other Goal 11 custodian agencies to assist cities and countries to develop local level data that appreciates such differences, as these largely inform the nature of actions that will contribute to sustainable development, where no one is left behind. Equally, all custodian agencies were requested to invest in up-scaling of best practices reported at city and country levels across the world, and their support on capacity building statistical agencies in different countries to empower them to collect data at the local level. Countries require proper systems and proper capacities that must add up to local, subnational and national level—which is the main challenge for this goal.

The workshop ended with appreciation of all experts for their contributions to the report enhancement, and enriching it with new information. Delivering the closing remarks on behalf of UN-Habitat, Mr. Robert Ndugwa assured all experts of incorporation of all inputs into the final report, and called for continued collaboration towards SDG 11 monitoring. He also gratefully acknowledged the generous financial support provided by the 'Andalusian Agency for International Cooperation for Development', which has enabled UN Habitat to bring together all these experts to review and finalize the report. On the other hand, the experts acknowledged the efforts by UN Habitat in drafting the report and for engaging a wide diversity of expertise, each of whom contributed unique knowledge. They also made a commitment to support the agency's work on the development of the indicators. The next steps include: finalising the revised version of the report and sharing it with all the participants/partners; developing a short version of the report and key messages and preparing dissemination materials for the HLPF

ANNEXES

4.1. ANNEX 1: WORKSHOP'S AGENDA

Day 1	28th May 2018	Moderator: Robert Ndugwa
Time	Activity	
8.30 - 9.00	Arrival and Registration	Lola Ogunsanya, Anne Idukita & Mary Dibo
9.00 – 9:10	Welcome Remarks	Eduardo Moreno
9.10 – 9.15	Remarks from Andalusia government	Andalusia Rep
9.15 – 9.20	Remarks from Dir. Programme Division, UN-Habitat	Rafael Tuts
9.20 – 9.30	Introductions – Other Participants	All
9.30 – 10.15	Setting the agenda and overview of the report	Robert Ndugwa
10.15 – 10.30	Health break	
10.30 – 11.15	Overview of SDG monitoring efforts	
11.15 – 11.45	Overview of Chapter 1	Robert Ndugwa
11.45 – 12.00	Q/A on Chapter 1 –general feedback	All Participants
12.00 – 13.00	Guided discussion and feedback on selected issues 1: Omissions and Errors 2: New Data and Thematic 3: Structural improvements	All Participants
13.00 – 14.00	Health Break	
14.00 – 14.30	Overview of Chapter 2 (progress in methodological advancements, capacity building, partnerships)	Donatien Beguy
14.30 – 16.00	Guided discussion and feedback on selected issues 1: Omissions and Errors 2: New Data and Thematic 3: Structural improvements 4: Regional/partners issues integration	All Participants
16.00 – 16.15	Health Break	
16.15 – 17.00	Overview of Chapter 3	Robert Ndugwa

Day 2		29th May 2018	Moderator: Robert Ndugwa
Time	Activity		
9.00 – 10.30	Chapter 3: Guided discussion and feedback on selected issues 1: Omissions and Errors 2: New Data and Thematic 3: Structural improvements 4: Regional/partners issues integration	UN Habitat	
– 11.00	Health Break	All Participants	
11.00 – 11.15	Group work division: Discussion of Terms of Reference for each group	All Participants	
11.15- 13.00	Group discussions	All Participants	
13.00 – 14.00	Healthy Break		
14.00 – 16.00	Group Work (revisions of chapters) - Chapter 1 - Chapter 2 - Chapter 3	All Participants	
16.00 – 16.15	Health Break		
16.15 – 17.00	Group progress feedback Wrap-up of Day 2	Donatien Beguy	
Day 3		30th May 2018	Moderator: Ben Arimah
Time	Activity		
09.00 – 09:45	Group Presentations: - Chapter 1 - Chapter 2 - Chapter 3	All Participants	
09:45 – 10.30	Discussions/refinements on Key messages section Thematic of Key messages—SDG focal points Cross-cutting key messages--All	SDG Focal points All Participants	
10.30 – 11.00	Health Break - Yourself		
11.00 – 13.00	Group: Key messages and conclusions section - Chapter 1 - Chapter 2 - Chapter 3	Eduardo Moreno/Robert Ndugwa SDG Focal points	
13.00 – 13.30	Way forward and next steps	Eduardo Moreno	
13.30 – 14.30	Lunch and Departure		

4.2. ANNEX 2: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

	Names	Region/ Origin
1	<p>Ms. Gisela Nauk, Social Development Division United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (UNESCWA) Beirut, Lebanon Email: nauk@un.org</p>	Expert Asia, Beirut
2	<p>Mr. Omar Siddique Economic Affairs Officer Sustainable Urban Development Section Environment and Development Division Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UN ESCAP) Bangkok, Thailand Email: omar.siddique@un.org</p>	Expert Asia, Bangkok
3	<p>Ms. Alice Siragusa Project Officer European Commission - DG Joint Research Centre Lombardy, Italy Email: alice.siragusa@ec.europa.eu, alice.siragusa@gmail.com</p>	Expert Europe, Lombardy, Italy
4	<p>Ms. Carla-Leanne Washbourne City Leadership Lab University College London London, UK Email: c.washbourne@ucl.ac.uk</p>	UCL, London, UK
5	<p>Ms. Karalyn Montteli UNESCO</p>	UNESCO, Nairobi. Kenya
6	<p>Ms. Amie Figueiredo Housing and Land Management Unit United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) Geneva, Switzerland Email: amie.figueiredo@un.org</p>	Expert Europe, Serbia
7	<p>Mr. Ricardo Jordán Fuchs, Chief of Human Settlements Unit, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) Santiago, Chile Email: ricardo.jorgan@cepal.org</p>	Expert Latin America & USA, Santiago, Chile
8	<p>Mr. Jean Baptiste Buffet Director of Policy and Advocacy at United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) Barcelona, Spain Email: jb.buffet@uclg.org</p>	Barcelona, Spain
9	<p>Philipp Ulbrich PhD Researcher Warwick Institute for the Science of Cities Centre for Interdisciplinary Methodologies Resilient Cities Laboratory Email: P.Ulbrich@warwick.ac.uk</p>	

	Name	Region/Origin
10	Raf Tuts Director Programme division	raf.tuts@un.org
11	Jesus Salcedo Housing and Slum upgrading	Jesus.salcedo@un.org
12	Eduardo Moreno Head, Research and Capacity Development Branch (RCDB)	eduardo.moreno@un.org
13	Ben Arimah Head, Research Unit, (RCDB)	ben.arimah@un.org
14	Lucia Kiwala Chief, Partner Relations Unit, Partners and Inter-Agency Coordination Branch, External Relations Division	lucia.kiwala@un.org
15	Robert Ndugwa Head of the Global Urban Observatory Unit (RCDB)	robert.ndugwa@un.org
16	Donatien Beguy, Global Urban Observatory Unit, (RCDB)	donatien.beguy@un.org
17	Remy Sietchipinng, UN- Habitat, Urban Planning and Legislation	remy.sietchipinng@un.org
18	Cecilia Andersson, UN Habitat, City Planning, Extension and Design Unit, Urban Planning and Design Branch (UPDB)	Cecilia.andersson@unn.org
19	David Thomas, UN- Habitat, Gender Equality Unit	David.thomas@un.org
20	Stefanie Holzwarth, UN- Habitat, Urban Basic Services	Stefanie.Holzwarth@un.org
21	Nao Takeuchi, UN- Habitat, Urban Basic Services	Nao.Takeuchi@un.org
22	Jose Chong, UN-Habitat, City Planning, Extension and Design Unit (UPDB)	jose.chong@un.org
23	Laney Stone, UN Habitat, City Planning, Extension and Design Unit (UPDB)	Sarah-Laney.Stone@un.org
24	Dennis Mwaniki, UN-Habitat, Global Urban Observatory Unit (RCDB)	dennis.mwaniki@un.org
25	Lola Ogunsanya, UN-Habitat, Global Urban Observatory Unit (RCDB)	lolaogunsanya@yahoo.co.uk
26	Fikir Alemayehu, UN-Habitat, Global Urban Observatory Unit (RCDB)	fikiral2@gmail.com
27	Sammy Muinde, UN-Habitat, Global Urban Observatory Unit (RCDB)	muindesammy@yahoo.com