



**UNITED NATIONS
DEVELOPMENT GROUP
ASIA AND THE PACIFIC**

INTEGRATING URBANIZATION INTO THE CCA AND UNDAF A GUIDE FOR UNITED NATIONS COUNTRY TEAMS



**UNDG ASIA-PACIFIC PAPER ON URBANIZATION
INTEGRATING URBANIZATION INTO THE CCA AND UNDAF:**

A Guide for United Nations Country Teams

Working Draft Version 7 (15.12.2014) For UNCTs Roll Out

‘Our struggle for global sustainability will be won or lost in cities’.

United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, 2012¹

This document has been developed under the aegis of the United Nations Development Group Asia-Pacific (UNDG A-P) with the collaboration of 14 United Nations agencies. It aims to guide United Nations Country Teams (UNCTs) across the Asia-Pacific in the design and delivery of urban programmes that are effective, integrated and multi-sectoral. Spanning five main UNDAF pillars – governance; poverty reduction and employment; basic services; food, agriculture and rural-urban linkages; and environment, climate change and Disaster risk reduction (DRR) - it includes:

- **Part I: An overview** of the major trends and drivers of urbanization, highlighting the opportunities and challenges in cities, towns and peri-urban settlements across the Asia-Pacific.
- **Part II: A practical framework** of strategies, entry points and sample indicators to support the implementation of effective and targeted urban programmes, working in partnership with other sectors and in alignment with local needs.
- **Annexes: A selection of additional tools and materials**, with key questions, guidance notes, selected reading and a selection of some urban strategies from development partners working in the region.

This document, while not intended as an exhaustive or prescriptive “to do” list, outlines some of the practical tools and options for different agencies to maximize the potential of urbanization for inclusive and sustainable human development. Depending on priorities and local context, country teams across the region can decide on which key objectives and the optimal strategic steps to achieving them through joint programming.

¹ [Remarks](#) to the High-level Delegation of Mayors and Regional Authorities, New York, April 23, 2012.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	4
Background to the Guidance Note	5
Overview: Asia and the Pacific in an Urban Century	7
Part 1: Urbanization in the Asia and the Pacific Region	10
1.1 Introduction	10
1.2: Governance	13
1.3: Poverty Reduction and Employment	19
1.4: Basic Services	23
1.5: Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Rural-Urban Linkages	27
1.6: Environment, climate change and disaster risk reduction (DRR)	30
1.7: Towards a better urban future	35
2.1: Introduction to the Toolkit	37
2.2: Governance	40
2.3: Poverty Reduction and Employment	44
2.4: Basic Services	48
2.5: Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Rural-Urban Linkages	52
2.6: Environment, Climate Change and DRR.....	55
Annex: Additional Tools	61
A.1: Key Questions for Integrating Urbanization into Country UNDAFs.....	62
A.2: Strengthening Urban Data.....	65
A.3: Combining Local, National and International Capacity in Urban Programming	68
A.4: Promoting Cross-Sectoral Linkages	71
A.5 Task Team Members and Contact Points	77
A.6: Development Partners with a Focus on Urbanization.....	79
A.7 Selected Reading	80

Acknowledgements

This report is the result of extended collaboration between 14 United Nations agencies, under the aegis of the United Nations Development Group Asia-Pacific (UNDG A-P).

The UNDG A-P Task Team on Urbanization was led by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat: Mariko Sato) and supported by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP: Donovan Storey, Lorenzo Santucci) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO: Shashi Sareen) as co-leads.

The Task Team members appreciate the efforts of the Working Group members of the Task Team, comprising the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP: Thusitha Pilapitiya), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP: Jonathan Gilman), the United Nations Children's Fund East Asia and Pacific (UNICEF EAPRO: David Parker, Xavier Foulquier) and the United Nations Children's Fund South Asia (UNICEF ROSA: Andrea Rossi, Selene Lee), in addition to the lead and co-leads.

The Task Team members also include the following representatives from each agency: the International Labour Organization (ILO: Phu Huynh), the Office of the High Commission for Human Rights (OHCHR: Bahram Ghazi), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO: Shahbaz Khan, Giuseppe Arduino, Montira Horayangura Unakul and Julia Davies), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO: Sooksiri Chamsuk), the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS: Jeffrey Crawford), the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women: Roberta Clarke), the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP: Samir S. Wanmali, Jeffrey Marzilli) and the World Health Organization (WHO: Sudhansh Malhotra, Anjana Bhushan).

Additional and previous members who contributed to the Task Team included ESCAP (Adnan Aliani), OHCHR (Jyoti Sanghera), UNDP (Omar Siddique, Anuradha Rajivan), UNICEF (Jill Lawler, Festo Kavishe, Alessandra Heinemann), UN Women (Gitanjali Singh), UNAIDS (Dr. Maria Elena F. Borromeo), UN-Habitat HQ (Joseph Maseland) as well as other development partners.

The task team secretariat support was provided by UN-Habitat (Pornpun Pinweha, Emma Johnson, Anja Teschner). The document was put together by Peter Grant, a consultant engaged by UN-Habitat for the UNDG A-P Task Team.

The draft paper was informally shared with some of the United Nations country teams which provided valuable contributions.

The Task Team appreciates the guidance received by the UNDG A-P Chair, Haoliang Xu and former Chair Ajay Chhibber, and the Regional Directors Team, as well as the support rendered by the UNDG A-P Secretariat (Iori Kato, Duanglutai Khomson, Tshering Pem).

July 2014

Background to the Guidance Note

Urbanization has emerged as one of the key issues of the twenty first century. From the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in 2012 (also known as Rio+20) to the High-Level Panel on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, there is an increasing international consensus that “cities are where the battle for sustainable development will be won or lost”.² The challenges and opportunities are especially acute in developing countries, in particular in Asia and the Pacific³.

This guidance paper and framework has been developed for the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) Asia and the Pacific in response to the growing importance of urbanization to human development and poverty reduction in the region. It provides an overview of the issues affecting cities and towns, and the tools available to address them, to guide country teams in the delivery of more equitable and rights-based urban programmes.

In particular, this document aims to highlight the considerable potential of urbanization to bring together different sectors in collaborative partnerships, both among United Nations agencies and with other actors, including civil society organizations (CSOs), private sector organizations and local community groups. By synergizing the knowledge and capacity of these stakeholders, it should be possible to achieve

² United Nations (2013), [A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies Through Sustainable Development](#), p.17. The Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

³ This document is referring to the [UNDG definition of Asia and the Pacific](#). However, when referencing other sources, data reflect the particular definitions of the organization in question.

sustainable urbanization as a driver for sustainable development.

Process: The process of developing this paper was initiated based on the decision made at the UNDG A-P Regional Directors Meeting held in Delhi in March 2012. It was agreed that a regional time-bound Task Team would be established, led by UN-Habitat, with the objective of developing a regional paper on urbanization, ahead of the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III) in 2016.

A total of 14 agencies contributed to the Task Team. With UN-Habitat leading and ESCAP and FAO co-leading, UNDP, UNEP and UNICEF were working group members. ILO, OHCHR, UNESCO, UNIDO, UNOPS, UN Women, WFP and WHO contributed as members. The Task Team met and collaborated throughout 2012 and 2013 to discuss and develop the paper, including finalization of the current version. This report is delivered against outputs stipulated for UNDG A-P Work Plans, i.e. Work Plan 2012 Output 1.1, Work Plan 2013, Output 2.2. It is envisaged that UNDAF rollout country teams will provide feedback on the document when developing the next cycle of UNDAFs.

Structure: Using the UNDAF framework as a template, this guidance note highlights key issues affecting urban areas and outlines entry points for programmes to respond to these challenges. In line with previous UNDAF documents, it is structured around the following five pillars:

Governance: the capacity of urban areas to deliver inclusive urban policies and land management at a national, regional and municipal level, protecting and empowering all residents, including women, children, youth, migrants and persons with disabilities.

Poverty Reduction and Employment: the human challenges of rapid economic growth in cities with uneven human development benefits, the formal and informal labour market and the distinctive aspects of urban poverty, in particular living costs, insecure tenure and other rights gaps.

Basic Services: the availability of safe and affordable health care including HIV/AIDS prevention and support, education, clean water, sanitation and other services to the urban population, including access issues for women, children, migrants and slum dwellers.

Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Rural-Urban Linkages: urban nutrition and the web of urban-rural connections, from food systems to migration, connecting cities and rural areas.

Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR): vulnerability to natural disasters such as flooding, earthquake, volcano and tsunami, the effects of climate change, the degradation of ecosystem services resulting from unplanned urban expansion and the challenges of waste disposal, sanitation and pollution.

Part 1 examines the trends driving urbanization in the Asia-Pacific region, as well as the key challenges facing the region, in order to present an overview of the complex forces reshaping cities and how governments, agencies, CSOs and communities can seize the opportunity and maximize the potential of urbanization to achieve sustainable development. Building on this analysis, **Part 2** provides a framework with more detailed suggestions on entry points, resources and indicators to guide urban programming across different fields, as well as sample country UNDAFs with urban components from within the region.

The **Annex** contains further materials on urban data collection, cross-sectoral linkages and additional readings. Together, this guidance note aims to provide UN County Teams, development partners, practitioners and policy makers with an overview of the major issues and opportunities pertaining to urbanization to inform future programming in the region. While neither exhaustive nor prescriptive, it aims to outline the range of available options and some examples of good practice for UNCTs to consider and potentially adapt to their own work, as appropriate to their particular national and local context.

Box 1: The Potential of Urban Partnerships

In addition to formal institutions, urban areas host a variety of stakeholders, from community groups and CSOs to local businesses and corporations that require a fundamentally new approach to partnerships. Though this diversity can prove challenging for traditional models of urban governance, resulting in local tensions or exclusion, the potential for transformative and inclusive collaboration amongst different stakeholders is substantial. Many Asia-Pacific cities have successfully leveraged multi-stakeholder partnerships to pilot and implement rights-based frameworks. These include Pasay City's Child Welfare Council, Port Moresby's UN-partnered Safer City for Women programme and the 100 'accessible cities' in China's Twelfth Five Year Work Programme on Disability. These programmes, in addition to demonstrating the potential for urban areas to pilot progressive approaches to governance, have also drawn strength from the effective sharing of knowledge and capacity between different United Nations agencies and local authorities, as well as non-governmental stakeholders such as academics and CSOs. More information on multi-stakeholder partnerships, illustrated by a case study of the Child Friendly Movement in the Philippines, is provided in Annex 3.

Overview: Asia and the Pacific in an Urban Century

Urbanization is transforming the world and will shape this century's development experience - and this change is especially dramatic in the Asia-Pacific, where nearly half of the world's urban population reside⁴. In the process, it is redefining the region in a variety of ways:

- **Economically:** Accounting for more than 80% of the region's GDP, cities are where much of the region's productivity and employment opportunities are concentrated due to their scale and diversification.
- **Socially:** Urban areas are redefining popular norms, bringing diversity and tolerance but also new tensions and conflicts. As a result, cities can serve as social models but also create conflict between different groups.
- **Politically:** From civil activism to globalization, cities are on the frontline of political change. This is why urban areas can be associated with both progressive movements and instability.
- **Environmentally:** Cities can provide a range of positive environmental benefits, if well managed, but are also responsible for the region's increasing unsustainable consumption and production and environmental degradation. Rapid unplanned expansion increased urban risks and vulnerability, compounded by climate changes.

These factors necessitate a major shift in strategy from governments, development partners, CSOs and other stakeholders if the

potential benefits of urbanization for sustainable development and poverty reduction are to be realized. This paper provides an overview and analysis of the challenges the region faces as it moves towards a projected urban majority by 2030. Furthermore, it outlines key entry points and focus areas for actors to mainstream urbanization issues into programming and partnerships.

Development interventions in the region, whether by national governments or international agencies, have historically focused on rural areas. This approach made sense when the large majority of the population, not to mention the most extreme forms of poverty, were concentrated in the countryside and the primary source of livelihood was from the agricultural sector. However, with the growing interconnections between rural and urban areas, together with the emergence of new patterns of urban poverty and inequality within cities and unsustainable urbanization, national development strategies must be adjusted to reflect these changing realities. These strategies must take into account migration with large numbers of rural poor now relocating temporarily or on a permanent basis, to urban centres – and with them the need for development assistance.

Why then is there a need to reorient this practice? There are many reasons for a greater emphasis on urban issues, but none implies that poverty and underdevelopment in rural areas are now secondary or unrelated concerns. In fact, a central argument for a stronger emphasis on urban issues is that their interests are increasingly more intertwined than ever before, particularly as urban areas play a determining role in economic performance at a national level. Better management of urban areas, through

⁴ Asian Development Bank (2012), [Green Urbanization in Asia: Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2012](#), p.xxvii.

greater integration, benefits rural development too.

Furthermore, **poverty is increasingly urbanizing**, characterized by high living costs, limited services and social marginalization. While overall poverty has reduced in most countries across the region, especially in rural areas, the absolute number of urban poor has increased. Trends vary from country to country. The lack of comparable and updated data makes it difficult to develop a precise assessment, however, in many developing cities the challenges of urban poverty and the growth of slums remain.

Critically, the generally positive picture of urban development conceals the growth of inequality within and between cities, including the many people - from women, children and youth to migrants, slum dwellers and persons with disabilities - who are denied these benefits. Tacking the rights of these disadvantaged groups, particularly the political exclusion that reinforces monetary poverty in urban areas, is, therefore, essential. Nevertheless, well-managed and inclusive cities offer urban and rural residents alike the most effective routes out of poverty.

Rural and urban areas are also becoming more interdependent. With the development of transport and communications, cities are now affecting the even remote communities. The effects of rapid urbanization can be both positive (employment, remittances, urban markets for agricultural produce) and negative (conversion of farmland, social dislocation, depletion of ecosystem services), depending on how well it is planned. Effective urban management is, therefore, also vital for rural outcomes. Unplanned growth and urban sprawl decreases precious agricultural and forest lands, contributing to food insecurity.

However, many cities are struggling to adapt. Urban sectors in many countries in the past

have long suffered neglect, but for all its challenges this growth - a natural stage in every country's development - should not be resisted as a solely negative phenomenon. Instead, countries must leverage the benefits of urbanization and mitigate potentially adverse outcomes through sound strategies that ensure the wellbeing of their populations while protecting local resources and farmland.

Urbanization presents many opportunities to accelerate human development across the region. In China and other East Asia countries, for example, urbanization has been associated with significant poverty reduction and economic growth in both cities and rural areas. Furthermore, to manage urbanization processes effectively, local capacity in the area of urban planning, management and governance will need to be rapidly enhanced. This is an area where the United Nations and other development agencies can offer important support through their country and regional programmes.

Urban areas, due to their scale and size, have particular potential for effective, cost efficient and multi-sectoral poverty reduction. Collaborations between different United Nations agencies in urban contexts, such as the "ONE UN programme" in Hoi An, Vietnam, as well as city-to-city exchanges, regional and global city associations such as United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), CITYNET and Cities Alliance, demonstrate the value of multi-stakeholder partnerships for urban management and development programmes.

Achieving this, however, requires a fundamental rethink of how cities in the region are developing. In particular, this includes closer networks and partnerships at a regional, national and international level. Improved data collection, disaggregated by gender, location, income and other variables, is also an important step towards better

identifying vulnerability and delivering an appropriate response. Most importantly, the rights of all citizens, including the most marginalized, must be at the heart of the urbanization process if cities are to be socially and economically beneficial for all sections of the population.

Box 2: “New Urban Agenda”

Habitat III will reinvigorate the global commitment to sustainable urbanization through its “New Urban Agenda.” Forty years on from the first Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat I) conference in 1976, the United Nations General Assembly will convene Habitat III in 2016. It will offer a unique opportunity to take stock of the world’s urban future in the coming decades and develop a durable post-2015 framework for cities⁵. National governments are currently preparing country reports for Habitat III, including the achievements of the Habitat Agenda adopted at the Habitat II Conference in Istanbul, Turkey as well as the establishment or strengthening of National Habitat Committees. Regional preparatory processes are also underway, coordinated by ESCAP.

⁵ UN-Habitat, [“Habitat III”](#).

Part 1: Urbanization in the Asia and the Pacific Region

1.1 Introduction

Urban transformation in the Asia and the Pacific region over the past few decades has occurred at an unprecedented speed.

Furthermore, while the region's urbanization rate has begun to slow, urban growth is projected to continue for decades. The proportion of people living in urban areas in the region is projected to increase from 42 per cent in 2012 to 62 per cent in 2050, resulting in 1.2 billion more urban residents over the same period.⁶ Forecasts suggest that by the middle of this century the Asia-Pacific region (as per UNDG definition) will be home to 45 per cent of the world's urban population, compared to only 31 per cent in the year 2000.⁷

This demographic shift across the Asia and the Pacific towards cities is driven by a variety of forces.

As elsewhere, the primary factor is natural growth from a new generation of city-born urban dwellers. Globally, around 60 per cent of urban growth comes about this way.⁸ However, another contributing factor is administrative reclassification as urban boundaries expand or rural settlements themselves urbanize through development and population growth. Migration is also an important contributor in many countries, with millions moving from the countryside or abroad to towns and cities in search of employment, education and other opportunities. In 2006, for example, the number of rural to urban migrants in China was put at around 132 million. It is projected that around 80 per cent of the country's

urban growth this decade will come from migration or reclassification.⁹

In addition, some of the urban population in the region has been forcibly created as a result of displacement. The number of urban refugees in the Asia and the Pacific either displaced by political events such as ethnic conflict or by the consequences of climate change and geophysical disasters, totalled to 3.5 million in 2012, with another 4.1 million internally displaced in countries such as Afghanistan and Pakistan. Typically, those uprooted find themselves moving to cities. Some 66 per cent of UNHCR's "people of concern", among them refugees and internally displaced people (IDPs), are settled in urban areas though in some countries the proportion is even higher - for example, as much as 97 per cent in Iran.¹⁰

Some 63 per cent of the population in North and Central Asia are urban and a half (50 per cent) of it in East and North-East Asia, and 42 per cent in South-East Asia and even lower in South and South-West Asia, where only a third (33 per cent) of the population live in cities.¹¹ The disparities are even more apparent at a country level. While as much as 83 per cent of the Republic of Korea's population are now living in cities, for example, in Sri Lanka the proportion is below 15 per cent.¹²

Cities across the region are also at very different stages in their development. While some, such as Bangkok, have already undergone significant urbanization, others

⁶ UNDESA [World Urbanization Prospects](#) 2012 Revision.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Plan (2010), [Digital and Urban Frontiers: Girls in a Changing Landscape](#), p.26. Because I Am a Girl: State of the World's Girls 2010.

⁹ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), pp.38-44.

¹⁰ UNHCR (2014) [Global Appeal 2014-2015 – Asian and the Pacific regional summary](#), pp. 102-107

¹¹ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#).

¹² *Ibid.*, p.256.

such as Vientiane are at an early stage of this transformation. In fact, many of the countries with the lowest levels of urbanization in the region are changing at the fastest rate. Only a third of the population of the Lao PDR live in cities, for instance, yet its annual urban growth (at almost 5 per cent) is one of the highest in the Asia-Pacific region. South Asia, currently the least urbanized sub region, will also witness the most intense growth in the coming decades. Its urban population, currently under 600 million, is projected to exceed 1.4 billion by 2050.¹³

This process of rapid urban growth is transforming traditional social structures.

From lower fertility rates to increased paid employment for women, urbanization is changing established cultural and social norms. In Bangladesh, for instance, urban areas offer women an alternative to early marriage: one study found that less than a third (31 per cent) of girls who moved to urban areas as adolescents were married by the age of 18, much lower than the proportion (71 per cent) in rural areas.¹⁴ Nevertheless, while greater freedoms are often possible in cities for marginalized groups, such as women, the price for many has been increased inequality, uncertainty and marginalization. Family units, in the past highly cohesive and spanning multiple generations, are now increasingly fragmented by migration and shifting norms. While some cities are confronted with an ageing population, others are experiencing a “youth bulge” – a phenomenon that, while offering many potential benefits, also brings accompanying challenges of employment, development and security.

¹³ UN-Habitat (2011), [Affordable Land and Housing in Asia](#), p.4.

¹⁴ Plan (2010), [Digital and Urban Frontiers: Girls in a Changing Landscape](#), p.17. Because I Am a Girl: State of the World’s Girls 2010.

The region’s accelerating growth is also altering the nature and structure of its cities.

Even historic urban centres, such as Beijing have been rapidly reconfigured by globalization, information technologies and other powerful forces of change. This has led to the emergence of new and unprecedented urban forms. Cities, such as Shanghai or Karachi, for example, have now expanded into metropolitan areas encompassing tens of millions of urban residents: by 2015, 15 of the world’s 27 megacities will be located in the Asia-Pacific region.¹⁵ These immense agglomerations may even coalesce into “mega-urban regions” that are closer to countries in scale and economic significance than cities in the traditional sense. The size and variety of these extended urban areas demand new approaches to urban governance, from local municipal authorities to multi-nuclear regional or metropolitan frameworks spanning a range of different structures.¹⁶

Though megacities often dominate policy and media discussions, these account for only 11 per cent of the total urban population in the region.¹⁷

About 50 per cent of the region’s urban residents are in fact located in urban areas with populations of 500,000 or less. In some countries, the proportion is even higher.¹⁸ These secondary cities, though often attracting less attention in policy and public discussion, are frequently where the challenges of urbanization and inequality are most acute as local authorities do not have capacity to respond to the challenges of rapid urbanization. In India in 2004-2005, for instance, though the incidence of urban poverty was only marginally lower

¹⁵ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of the Urban Youth 2010/11](#), p.9.

¹⁶ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.25.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p.8.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p.59.

(26 per cent) than in rural areas (28 per cent), there was considerable divergence between smaller and larger urban settlements: while cities with populations of a million or more had poverty levels of approximately 15 per cent, while in small towns with less than 50,000 residents, the proportion was doubled (30 per cent).¹⁹ This highlights the importance of channelling more support and investment into smaller towns and peri-urban settlements across the region.

Furthermore, much of today's urban growth is occurring not in the heart of cities, but at their margins. Over three-quarters (77 per cent) of growth in Jakarta metropolitan region until 2025, for example, will be in peri-urban areas²⁰. This has resulted in the creation of peripheral *desakota* that are a hybrid of rural and urban. These settlements pose particular governance challenges as many lack the resources, infrastructure or even official recognition to be effectively managed.

The diversity of urban forms in the Asia-Pacific region also spans extremes of prosperity and poverty. While the technological flair of Tokyo, wealth creation in Shanghai and Singapore's green development are the region's globalized face, many developing cities are largely characterized by insecure employment and unsanitary living conditions. Though developed cities do still face challenges, such as affordability or energy consumption, these are distinct from those confronting urban areas in developing countries. Policies must therefore be tailored on a city by city basis, as no single prescription exists for urbanization this varied.

¹⁹ World Bank and IMF (2013), [Rural-Urban Dynamics and the Millennium Development Goals: Global Monitoring Report 2013](#), p.9.

²⁰ UNESCAP and UN-Habitat (2009), *Urban Safety and Poverty in the Asia and the Pacific: Key Findings from Sub-Regional Studies on South-Asia, South-East Asia and the Pacific*, p.44.

This century will see the focus of the region decisively shift to cities. As many Asia-Pacific nations graduate to Middle Income Country (MIC) status, their needs are shifting from traditional areas of development to more diversified sectors, including services. Demand for technical assistance and support in urban management is therefore likely to grow, presenting an important entry point for international agencies to support development across the region. Urbanization need not be a "problem", if soundly managed: though it hosts many challenging urban environments, the Asia-Pacific region also has some of the most liveable, well planned and well managed cities in the world.

To a large extent, the distinction between positive and negative urban characteristics - cosmopolitanism or ethnic division, density or overcrowding, livelihood creation or the growth of criminal economies - ultimately depends on how a city is managed. Urbanization can boost prosperity, participation and service access, but it can also lead to slum formation, inequality and disenfranchisement. For cities to realize their full potential, as the High-Level Panel has argued, "the post-2015 agenda must be relevant to urban dwellers".²¹ The value of "localizing" the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) is especially important in the context of cities.²²

Box 3: "Urban" – the Problem of Definitions

One of the challenges of defining urban areas is the fact that there is no single internationally accepted definition of what classifies as "urban". These parameters in fact vary from country to country: a 2008 survey of 26

²¹ United Nations (2013), [A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies Through Sustainable Development](#), p.17. The Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

²² [Localizing MDG in the Philippines](#).

different countries in the Asia-Pacific region found a multitude of different classifications, determined by administrative status, density, population size, economic function and service provision.²³ Even working within the general consensus of urban areas as “settlements with between 5,000 and 10,000 inhabitants”,²⁴ the Asia-Pacific region hosts an extraordinary diversity of urban forms, from megacities to peripheral settlements. For instance, while Asia and the Pacific has the highest urban density of any region,²⁵ much of its growth is occurring in the form of peri-urban development where the challenges are distinct to those within the city centre itself. In this context, defining what constitutes “urban” is difficult as the breadth of scale blurs the boundaries between city and countryside – making the traditional distinction less meaningful. A settlement of 10,000 people, for example, may classify as urban but have more in common with its rural surroundings than a megacity of millions.

1.2: Governance

The Asia-Pacific’s response to urbanization is still evolving. Many countries, such as China and Viet Nam have historically discouraged the growth of their towns and cities through ‘ruralization’ programmes or restrictive registration systems. In recent years, however, there has been a shift towards more deliberate engagement, reflected in the growth of urban policies and partnerships. In particular, the Government of China now has deliberate plans to bring as many as 250 million rural residents into cities by 2025 and raise the proportion of its population in urban

²³ UNESCAP (2008), Statistical Yearbook for Asia and the Pacific 2008, cited in UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.33.

²⁴ UNESCAP (2007), [Urban Poverty and the Working Poor: Facing the Challenges of Urbanization and Urban Poverty in Asia and the Pacific](#), p.2.

²⁵ Asian Development Bank (2012), [Green Urbanization in Asia: Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2012](#), p.6.

areas to 70 per cent - though this process is likely to bring a multitude of social and environmental challenges in its wake²⁶. In general, however, authorities are still struggling to keep pace with urban growth, while state and agency programmes alike remain focused on rural areas without acknowledging their deepening connection with cities.

Given their size and diversity, the Asia-Pacific’s urban areas require innovative and collaborative systems of governance. For cities to function successfully, not only central governments but also local authorities, communities, CSOs and businesses must be allowed to participate fully in governance structures and decision-making mechanisms. Developing the knowledge and frameworks for successful multi-stakeholder collaborations - for example, with private sector actors - is still a challenge for many urban areas. These can, if poorly managed, lead to service gaps or shortfalls or inequity. Yet well designed and regulated public-private partnerships have the potential to substantially benefit service delivery and other basic functions.

Creating platforms to promote genuine participation and accountability is therefore vital in ensuring that individuals and civic groups can contribute meaningfully to these processes. This should include, through fair and equitable negotiation, underrepresented communities and marginalized groups to ensure a “bottom up” approach to urban governance and policy development. Mainstreaming their concerns into the planning and management of cities is an essential step towards realizing what UNESCO

²⁶ New York Times (2013), [‘China’s great uprooting: Moving 250 million into cities’](#). June 15, 2013.

and UN-Habitat, among others, have termed the “right to the city”.²⁷

Well managed decentralization can also provide the basis for more effective and participatory governance for cities, provided sufficient resources and capacity are in place. With a well-established legal, institutional and financial framework to support municipal capacity, together with sufficient political will and accountability, localized governance structures can facilitate more inclusive processes.²⁸ Urban areas when effectively managed and implemented can serve as very effective platforms for the delivery of national priorities. The creation of ‘Local AIDS Councils’ in cities across the Philippines, for example, has enabled local authorities to provide targeted services to at-risk populations.²⁹

However, while urban areas are especially well suited to decentralization, in practice many cities suffer from weak and fragmented implementation. In many instances, the transfer of responsibility has placed greater pressure on already strained resources. This is especially the case when the duties of government have been devolved to municipal authorities without the necessary financial or human resources and capacities to discharge these duties effectively. This can lead to a deterioration of infrastructure and services that disproportionately affects the urban poor and vulnerable groups.

²⁷ Brown, A. and Kristiansen, A. (2008), [Urban Policies and the Right to the City: Rights, Responsibilities and Citizenship](#). UNESCO and UN-Habitat.

²⁸ UN-Habitat (2007), [International Guidelines on Decentralisation and the Strengthening of Local Authorities](#), p.2.

²⁹ Philippine National AIDS Council (2012), [Philippines 2010-2011: 2012 Global AIDS Response Progress Report](#).

To be effective, then, political decentralization must also be accompanied by an appropriate level of fiscal and budgetary transfer to ensure local authorities are equipped to meet their responsibilities. This should include devolution of key functions, such as local fiscal management, with the provision of capacity development. There also needs to be due processes of monitoring and transparency to ensure local authorities remain accountable. Cities should, therefore, enjoy significant autonomy within a broader framework that ensures their continued commitment to their constituency, including the poorest and most vulnerable.³⁰ Countries undertaking decentralization reforms should do so incrementally, using monitoring tools such as UN-Habitat’s Urban Governance Index³¹ as well as the International Guidelines on decentralisation and basic services for all³² to ensure service delivery remains functional throughout the transition.

New and unprecedented urban patterns, from crowded city centres to peripheral expansion, have compounded these problems. Besides megacities, the economic and spatial spread of globalization has also encouraged the development of mega-urban regions with multiple cities and even countries in their orbit. These range from China’s Pearl River Delta, the so-called ‘workshop of the world’³³, to the 1,500 km corridor that connects Beijing, Pyongyang, Seoul and Tokyo, spanning 77 cities, 97 million people and four different countries.³⁴ This has

³⁰ IIED (2013), ‘A future urban poor groups want: Addressing inequalities and governance post-2015’.

³¹ UN-Habitat, [Urban Governance Index](#).

³² UN-Habitat (2009) International guidelines on Decentralisation and basic services for all.

³³ The Economist (2002), ‘The Pearl River Delta: A new workshop of the world’. October 10, 2002.

³⁴ UN-Habitat (2010), [Urban trends: Urban corridors – shape of things to come?](#)

also led to the melding of urban centres with their rural surroundings, placing significant parts of many cities outside their formal boundaries. In this context, the pressures of large urban centres are combined with the additional difficulties of unplanned peri-urban settlements.

Managing the social and ecological impacts of these vast areas, across a multitude of provincial, municipal and national boundaries, poses unique challenges. A new scale of urban governance is, therefore, required to manage these overlapping jurisdictions effectively. The Chinese megacity of Chongqing, for example, has designed a plan to promote balanced rural and urban development across an area totalling 82,000 km², covering a range of densities from inner city to agricultural farmland.³⁵ A key challenge with these large regional structures, however, is to ensure that integration is balanced with meaningful local autonomy to avoid the development of “top down” or unresponsive governance structures.

Box 4: The Emerging Challenges of Pacific Island Urbanization

Compared to the megacities of East Asia, the Pacific small island developing States may seem an unlikely frontline of urbanization in the region. However, this is in fact where some of the most dramatic regional urban transformations are occurring – and where many problems are appearing in their most extreme form. While many Pacific countries have already undergone significant urbanization, others such as Papua New Guinea are still at a relatively early stage of development but face the prospect of rapid urban growth as rural populations move to towns and cities to seek employment and services. However, unlike in some parts of the region, this process of urbanization and

³⁵UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.101.

migration has been deepening poverty. Crucially, the growth of many Pacific cities is occurring in a context where basic services and infrastructure like sanitation and secure housing are often non-existent. This is also contributing to other problems, including crime and unemployment.³⁶ Better urban management, with targeted rural investment, could change this – but only if accompanied by equitable land access and service delivery for its growing informal settlements, in a framework of rights-based partnership and stakeholder consultation. At present, urban expansion is largely unplanned and taking place in peri-urban areas without the infrastructure or capacity development to sustain it. This is where urban governance has a key role to play in guiding Pacific countries towards better urban outcomes.

Despite the growing number of megacities in the Asia-Pacific region, the majority of the urban population live in secondary cities. The majority of urban inhabitants reside in areas with populations below a million people. These rapidly growing urban centres besides serving as local and regional economic hubs, also provide an essential “bridge”³⁷ between rural areas and wider national or international economies. Consequently, they often have an important role to play in boosting rural development and poverty reduction.

However, frequently these secondary towns or cities lack the capacity, political connections or financial resources to manage these challenges effectively. As a result, many critical urban challenges, from child protection to disaster risk reduction, are most acute in these smaller urban areas. More investment and research must, therefore, be

³⁶ Storey, D. and Connell, J. (2010), ‘Urban challenges’. In Agergaard, J., Fold, N. And Gough, K., *Livelihoods, mobility and markets in Africa and Asia*.

³⁷ UN-Habitat (2012), *Sustainable Urbanization in Asia: A Sourcebook for Local Governments*, p.31.

focused on addressing the distinct issues these secondary cities face, particularly for vulnerable groups such as the growing population of children, adolescents and slum dwellers and squatters.

While cities offer the possibility of a more collaborative and democratic approach, urban governance in many areas is still not fully inclusive or rights-based. Cities require broad and meaningful multilateral participation in decision-making mechanisms, including CSOs, local communities and the private sector. This can be difficult to achieve in countries with a tradition of centralized rule. In this context, authorities can be unresponsive to the needs and rights of the poor and other marginalized groups, such as women and children. This is particularly the case for ethnic minorities, rural migrants and urban refugees as many cities, though hubs of migration and cultural exchange, have yet to reflect this diversity in their policies.

Nevertheless, while establishing the frameworks for multi-stakeholder partnerships can be challenging, the benefits of well-managed public-private partnerships (PPPs), community-managed programs and other collaborative models of governance is very considerable. In fact, the Asia-Pacific region has demonstrated many examples that are now regarded as models of best practice across the world. Many national or regional movements have in fact been initiated or refined in cities, including associations mobilized by the urban poor themselves such as the Slum Dwellers International (SDI) and the Asian Coalition for Housing Rights (ACHR) and others have been empowering urban poor communities as constructive partners to engage with local authorities. For all their challenges, therefore, well-managed urban areas are capable of producing highly progressive and democratic governance structures. **Insecure land tenure and the**

resulting threat of eviction is a primary cause of urban vulnerability, particularly in slums and informal settlements. Nevertheless, land governance remains a challenge for some urban areas, particularly where formal and non-formal tenure systems come into conflict. In many Pacific cities, inefficient administrative processes and the competing claims of public, private and customary land tenure systems have halted development and necessitated the growth of informal housing to fill the gap.³⁸ In addition to placing the urban poor at constant risk of eviction, it also bars them from using their property as collateral to secure credit for business or education. As land prices continue to rise due to development projects and investment speculation, the poor are increasingly driven out of the cities.

Land regularization, slum upgrading and the development of a rights-based housing policy are all important steps towards long term poverty reduction. Relocations, if unavoidable, should occur in a transparent and participatory framework with the free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) of the entire community. In addition, informal settlements should be converted into secure and accessible land for communities through innovative financial and legal mechanisms. Encouragingly, some cities are already moving towards a more participatory approach. One example is Thailand's *Baan Mankong* programme, providing residents with the foundation for slum upgrading and investment in their homes and allowing communities to negotiating their place in the city.³⁹

³⁸ Storey, D. and Connell, J. (2010), 'Urban challenges'. In Agergaard, J., Fold, N. And Gough, K., *Livelihoods, mobility and markets in Africa and Asia*.

³⁹ Community Organizations Development Institute (2012), [*The Baan Mankong National Collective Housing Program*](#).

Haphazard urban planning and management in many cities are also adversely affecting the urban poor. Inequality has taken on an increasingly physical dimension, with public space privatized or replaced by exclusionary zones, such as gated communities and malls. The unregulated commodification of land markets, without adequate or inclusive financing mechanisms for low income groups, has also undermined the delivery of affordable housing and led to the displacement of informal settlements for speculative development or “beautification”.

This typically pushes slum dwellers out of the city centre, leaving them even more marginalized from services and livelihoods. This is further compounded by inequitable urban transport policies. With private vehicles prioritized over non-motorized or public transit, mobility has become an increasing challenge for poor residents. This, together with their relocation to the urban margins, has dramatically increased travel times and costs between home and the workplace.

Historic cityscapes and communities have also been destroyed to make way for “world class” or luxury development. This homogenization not only reflects the growing reach of globalization, but also a deeper inability to accommodate diversity in decision-making. Urban heritage in particular, whether physical or intangible, represents traditions and customs that must be protected rather than erased. Many cities still lack a framework to protect or promote their cultural identity. While effectively managed heritage can enhance urban liveability, its destruction can weaken social and physical cohesion even in well-functioning neighbourhoods. The loss is especially acute for ethnic and indigenous minorities, whose cultural and social rights are so often sidelined in urban areas.

Weak governance has also led to rising social unrest, including violence and crimes. In India, for example, the urban crime rate is almost double the national average.⁴⁰ Against a backdrop of inequality and deprivation, as well as the erosion of traditional forms of protection and surveillance, the positive diversity of urban areas can lead to divisions of religion, ethnicity or other affiliations that can heighten social divisions and tensions.

Public security is almost wholly absent in many informal settlements. In some cases this has enabled criminal gangs, such as *mastaans in Dhaka*, to fill the vacuum.⁴¹ This absence of effective policing may result in part from lack of capacity, but it is also underlined by social invisibility, especially in slums and informal settlements. By contrast, in such cities as Manila, many of the most affluent urban residents increasingly favour gated compounds and other forms of privatized security. In both cases, the absence of effective public security is a primary cause of these developments.

Cities may often empower marginalized groups such as women and youth by providing better access to basic services and greater autonomy. In many areas of their lives, such as sexual and reproductive freedom, urban residents are able to enjoy a much greater degree of control over their own lives. One study, for instance, drawing on data from 31 Asian countries between 1980 and 2010, has estimated that with every percentage rise in the level of a country’s urbanization, there has been a net reduction of five births per 100 women of reproductive

⁴⁰UNESCAP and UN-Habitat (2009), *Urban Safety and Poverty in the Asia and the Pacific: Key Findings from Sub-Regional Studies on South-Asia, South-East Asia and the Pacific*, p.13.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p.26.

age.⁴² In the case of urban refugees cities are not just a means of surviving, but may also represent the best long-term solution for rebuilding their lives.⁴³

However, these benefits are often undermined by lack of security. Women, children, the most poor and other marginalized groups, may especially face particular disadvantages in urban areas. For instance, women often exposed to higher levels of physical and sexual violence, including greater vulnerability to HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), affecting their health, mobility, livelihoods and overall wellbeing.

In particular, South Asia and some Pacific countries have some of the highest levels of gender-based violence in the world. Besides putting women and girls at constant risk of physical and sexual assault, this insecurity undermines their ability to access parks, streets, markets, public transport and other services – thus, reinforcing their lack of participation in many of the aforementioned potential opportunities of cities. This situation is often replicated within urban households: according to a study conducted in Bangladesh, 53 per cent of urban women have experienced domestic violence.⁴⁴ This is in part due to the lack of a credible institutional response. In many South Asian cities, women are especially alienated from local police. A survey of women in Delhi, for example, found that just 0.8 per cent of victims reported incidents of sexual harassment due to the

⁴² Asian Development Bank (2012), [Green Urbanization in Asia: Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2012](#), p.26.

⁴³ UNHCR (2009) [UNHCR policy on refugee protection and solutions in urban areas](#), p. 5-8.

⁴⁴ WHO (2005), cited in UNESCAP and UN-HABITAT (2009), *Urban Safety and Poverty in the Asia and the Pacific: Key Findings from Sub-Regional Studies on South-Asia, South-East Asia and the Pacific*, p.16.

widespread perception that their case would not be taken seriously.⁴⁵ Developing an effective and holistic strategy to address the reality of gender-based violence, from a more responsive police and judiciary to accessible sexual health care and HIV/AIDS services, is an essential component in the protection and wellbeing of vulnerable groups.

Children and adolescents, despite comprising a growing proportion of urban populations, still suffer from a chronic lack of investment in basic services such as health or education. Many also face acute protection gaps as informal labour or sex workers. Youth are especially vulnerable to the constant threat of gang violence, and are often confronted with a stark choice between victimization or recruitment.

Cities across the region, therefore, require a stronger focus on gender, youth and child friendly spaces and amenities, from safe and accessible sanitation to designated work areas for breast feeding and child care. Their limited participation in budgeting, planning and decision-making is a major barrier to improving urban safety. Through more inclusive and rights-based governance, however, cities could deliver substantial developmental gains to women, children and other marginalized groups in the future.

Case study: Making Delhi a Safer City

Since 2009, the Indian NGO Jagori has been leading the Safe Delhi campaign in collaboration with UN Women, the Department of Women and Child Development and other partners. Beginning with a baseline study of more than 5,000 residents in Delhi, the findings were then developed into a strategic framework for the capital. Importantly, the work not only has helped Delhi take significant steps towards

⁴⁵ Jagori and UN Women (2011), [Report of the Baseline Survey Delhi 2010](#).

becoming a safer city but, with the programme transferred to cities in Kerala, it has also demonstrated potential as a replicable model for other urban areas. Subsequently, as part of the UN Women Safe Cities Global Programme (2011-2015), developed in partnership with UN-Habitat, the initiative has continued to undertake advocacy, workshops and community led safety audits to build on these achievements. A key element in the work of Safe Delhi is the diverse range of urban stakeholders, from government ministries and international agencies to grassroots organizations and local women's collectives, involved in designing and delivering its programme.⁴⁶

1.3: Poverty Reduction and Employment

Cities as engines of development offer unique opportunities for economic growth and a route out of poverty for both rural and urban residents. Urbanization has long been associated with positive developmental outcomes.⁴⁷ According to the World Bank / International Monetary Fund 2013 *Global Monitoring Report*, “more-urbanized countries have had greater success in attaining the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) than less-urbanized ones: countries with a degree of urbanization above 60 per cent are expected to achieve 50 per cent more MDGs than those with a degree of urbanization of 40 per cent or less.”⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Jagori, [Safe Delhi Campaign](#); UN-Habitat (2010), ‘[Safer cities for women](#)’, December 2, 2010.

⁴⁷ According to economist Edward Glaeser, ‘there is a near-perfect correlation between urbanization and prosperity across nations. On average, as the share of a country’s population that is urban rises by 10%, the country’s per capita output increases by 30%’. Glaeser, E. (2011), *Triumph of the City: How Our Greatest Invention Makes Us Richer, Smarter, Greener, Healthier, and Happier*.

⁴⁸ World Bank and IMF (2013), [Rural-Urban Dynamics and the Millennium Development Goals: Global Monitoring Report 2013](#), p.8.

Consequently, cities present a major entry point for effective efforts to meet critical poverty reduction and sustainable development goals post-2015.

This is especially true of the Asia and the Pacific region, where urban areas currently account for more than 80 per cent of the region’s GDP.⁴⁹ With the growing role of foreign investment and globalization, cities are becoming more transnational. Some, having begun as manufacturing hubs for clothing and other goods, have now shifted to higher value products like automobiles or computer parts. Bangalore, for example, has played a central role in the emergence of India as a global leader in information technology.

Urbanization has also been a central component in falling poverty rates, particularly in rapidly developing countries such as China and Indonesia. In East Asia and the Pacific, for example, urban growth has been accompanied by a rapid decline in poverty in cities and countryside alike: from 24.4 per cent to 4.3 per cent (urban) and 67.5 per cent to 20.4 per cent (rural), respectively between 1990 and 2008. Even in less urbanized sub-regions such as South Asia, where overall poverty levels are markedly higher and the decline less dramatic, the same trends are evident too: urban poverty there fell from 40.1 per cent to 29.7 per cent during the same period, mirrored by a reduction in rural areas from 50.5 per cent to 38.0 per cent.⁵⁰

Yet despite its success, recent urban growth in the region has not been inclusive. Cities in the Asia-Pacific region are in fact becoming more unequal, with a growing urban divide

⁴⁹ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.4.

⁵⁰ World Bank and IMF (2013), [Rural-Urban Dynamics and the Millennium Development Goals: Global Monitoring Report 2013](#), p.9.

between rich and poor. Social disparities are generally more pronounced in urban areas: even in China, where cities have historically been more equal than rural areas, the trend was finally reversed in 2008 due to the rapid growth of urban inequality.⁵¹ Consequently, the benefits of economic growth and urban development have primarily benefitted the elite, while often leaving the poor in a heightened state of insecurity.⁵² This can have serious social repercussions as inequality and exclusion, rather than poverty alone, are associated with rising levels of social unrest, political upheavals, violence and crime.⁵³

Box 5: Urban Poverty – the Data Gap

One of the barriers to tackling urban poverty is the absence of reliable local data, particularly in slums. The last comprehensive study in the region profiled the growth of urban poverty between 1993 and 2002⁵⁴ but no authoritative research has been produced since then to update this assessment. Furthermore, the economic context in cities is very different to rural areas and the measurements that have historically been designed around them. Living costs in cities for food, housing and transport are typically much higher, for instance, yet this is not reflected in the standard \$1.25 baseline. Many countries lack separate poverty lines for urban areas which take into account their higher costs of living and consumption. In addition, measurements must go beyond income to include the other dimensions that impact on the urban poor, such as rights gaps, lack of social protection, insecure tenure and unequal service

access. These need to be disaggregated by location, gender, ethnicity and other variables to highlight specific vulnerabilities. Identifying who, behind the numbers, is being excluded is the first step to meaningful poverty reduction: as the *High-Level Panel on the Post-2015 Development Framework* concluded, improved urban outcomes can be achieved “by disaggregating data by place, and giving local authorities a bigger role in setting priorities”.⁵⁵ This issue is discussed further in Annex 2.

Poverty is in fact becoming increasingly urbanized. At a country level, due in part to urbanization, poverty levels have generally reduced across the region. Yet poverty in rural areas, though generally higher, is falling at a faster rate than in cities. In general, the proportion of the urban population living below the poverty line has fallen across the region, nevertheless urban poverty in absolute terms, in fact, appears to be not declining but increasing. Between 1993 and 2002, for example, the number of people surviving on a dollar or less a day dropped by 150 million in rural areas but rose by 50 million in cities.⁵⁶ In Indonesia, for example, while urban poverty rates declined dramatically from 29 per cent in 1980 to 11.7 per cent in 2008, the total number of urban poor has nevertheless risen from 9.5 to 12.8 million.⁵⁷ As increasing flows of migration from the countryside are effectively relocating rural poverty to cities, these patterns are not unrelated.

⁵¹ Asian Development Bank (2012), [Green Urbanization in Asia: Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2012](#), pp.9-11.

⁵² UN-Habitat (2012), [Prosperity of Cities: State of the World's Cities 2012/13](#).

⁵³ UNESCAP and UN-Habitat (2009), *Urban Safety and Poverty in the Asia and the Pacific: Key Findings from Sub-Regional Studies on South-Asia, South-East Asia and the Pacific*, p.39.

⁵⁴ Ravallion, M. et al. (2007), [New Evidence on the Urbanization of Poverty](#). Development Research Group, World Bank.

⁵⁵ United Nations (2013), [A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies Through Sustainable Development](#), p.17. The Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

⁵⁶ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.112.

⁵⁷ Tambunan, T., ‘Assessing the Impacts of Social Safety Net Programs on Urban Poverty in Indonesia’, in UNESCAP (2009), [Social Protection in Asian Cities](#).

While China has managed to reduce the number of poor in its cities, for example, in India the number of urban poor rose from 94 million in 1993 to almost 107 million in 2002⁵⁸ – despite a period of relatively high economic growth.

The depth of urban poverty is also an important dimension that is not always reflected in comparisons with rural poverty. In Vanuatu, for instance, though recorded levels of poverty are greater in rural areas, the prevalence of extreme poverty in urban areas is actually higher.⁵⁹ Even well performing and affluent cities contain concentrations of poverty that are routinely concealed by the aggregated figures presented in most national and international assessments. Many informal settlements, being illegal or unregistered, are also overlooked in official estimates.

Urbanization, if poorly managed, can contribute to a range of negative impacts.⁶⁰ Across the Asia-Pacific, an estimated 571 million people are now living in slums about a third of the total urban population. In countries, such as Cambodia, the slum population in fact represents a majority, making informality the rule rather than the exception.⁶¹ This growth is not necessarily a direct reflection of poverty, as the urban poor are not concentrated exclusively in informal settlements, nor are all residents within them necessarily poor themselves. Slums, in fact, are typically the product not just of

deprivation but also due to poor planning, inequitable governance and the denial of basic rights to marginalized groups.

Urban deprivation involves unique risks and rights gaps that distinguish it from rural poverty.

These include political marginalization, lack of social protection, overcrowding, inadequate housing, violence, a higher incidence of certain health risks such as HIV/AIDS, food and energy insecurity, as well as other potential shocks such as natural disasters, epidemics and riots. The challenges of urban poverty, as a result, are different in many ways from those of rural poverty: this is why poverty reduction requires a distinct approach in towns and cities. The issue for slum dwellers and other marginalized groups is not necessarily the lack of jobs or services in urban areas per se – most still belong to the “working poor” and are physically close to a range of amenities – but the insecurity of their employment and the barriers to access.⁶²

Urban poverty is generally underpinned by the central issue of rights and their denial to large sections of the urban poor. Lack of legal tenure, for instance, is a major cause of vulnerability for many slum dwellers, excluding them from services and putting them at constant threat of eviction. The limited availability of housing credit or loans for the urban poor to upgrade or purchase homes also undermines their access to safe and adequate shelter. They also struggle to access services, information, training or business loans. This is compounded by the fragmentation of traditional mechanisms of support, in particular social and familial networks, and the absence of formal public welfare. Nevertheless, grass-roots

⁵⁸ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.112.

⁵⁹ Storey, D. and Connell, J., ‘Urban challenges’, in Agergaard, J., Fold, N. and Gough, K. (2010), *Livelihoods, mobility and markets in Africa and Asia*.

⁶⁰ World Bank and IMF (2013), [Rural-Urban Dynamics and the Millennium Development Goals: Global Monitoring Report 2013](#), p.9.

⁶¹ UNISDR and UNESCAP (2012), [Reducing Vulnerability and Exposure to Disasters: The Asia-Pacific Disaster Report 2012](#), p.40.

⁶² UNESCAP (2007), [Urban Poverty and the Working Poor: Facing the Challenges of Urbanization and Urban Poverty in Asia and the Pacific](#).

cooperatives have provided an important informal system of social protection and credit for poor households in need of emergency assistance or business loans. Often led by women, these savings groups and federations can also serve as platforms to mobilize in tackling such issues as housing.⁶³

Resilience is, therefore, a real challenge for the urban poor – made worse by the absence of social protection. This is especially true for rural and foreign migrants or refugees, who typically face a nexus of informality in their housing, employment and political residency, barring them from any rights to participation, protection, or basic services. They may also, as unauthorized urban residents, actively choose to distance themselves from formal structures out of fear of exposure and forced removal. Social protection for marginalized groups, through assistance, insurance or labour market interventions, is therefore a crucial component in alleviating urban poverty. Encouragingly, some countries are also now developing social protection programmes for urban areas to increase their resilience.

A central problem is that economic expansion in urban areas has not been accompanied by a proportionate increase in urban employment – the phenomenon of so-called “jobless growth”. Formal positions in certain high skill fields, such as information technology, has increased, but they are not readily accessible for low income groups. Though urban areas have considerable potential to create livelihoods for the poor, including the many millions who migrate to them every year, many Asia-Pacific cities are still failing to realize these opportunities. With

⁶³ Satterthwaite, D. Mitlin, D. and Patel, S. (2011), [Engaging with the Urban Poor and their Organizations for Poverty Reduction and Urban Governance: An Issues Paper for the United Nations Development Programme](#), pp.8-9.

poor working conditions and an absence of protective laws and regulations, urban areas continue to host high numbers of “working poor” who still struggle to meet a living wage or remain trapped in casualized employment. The majority of job creation in future is likely to occur in cities, the success or failure of urban areas to generate employment will also have profound implications at national and regional levels.

Women in particular, despite enjoying opportunities in urban areas that would not be available to them elsewhere, are often sidelined from secure employment and overly represented in the most vulnerable and poorly remunerated jobs. Urban youth face similar barriers. In Metropolitan Manila, for instance, youth unemployment is at 28.1 per cent – more than four times the rate for adults.⁶⁴ Youth unemployment is also particularly acute in the Pacific islands, where very few formal sector jobs exist even for those with high levels of education. Many children in urban areas across the Asia-Pacific region are exploited for menial work like rag picking, street vending, factory labour, sex work or are even trafficked.

Informality remains pervasive in urban areas. An official survey of six cities in China found that nearly a third of all non-agricultural workers were informally employed.⁶⁵ Informal workers often face poor working conditions and an absence of even basic labour protections, such as insurance. Nevertheless, in many cities, authorities are either hostile or indifferent towards their informal sector, and have been slow to exploit opportunities for pro-poor job creation in other areas, including creative economies, such as tourism, crafts and heritage industries.

⁶⁴ ILO estimates based on the Philippines National Statistics Office (2012), ‘Labour Force Survey’.

⁶⁵ ILO (2012), [‘Asia-Pacific labor market update’](#), p.5. referencing the China Urban Labour Survey.

The “green economy” is another area that must be developed significantly to boost employment. With a substantial contraction in migrant and blue collar jobs anticipated in the near future, together with increasingly unsustainable patterns of development, green growth must be encouraged to meet this gap.⁶⁶ Cities like Mumbai, where more than 30,000 waste pickers are employed in recycling with a net impact of between \$650 million and one billion annually, demonstrate the considerable potential of environmentally sound practices to urban employment and the economy while also addressing critical urban problems.⁶⁷ To achieve this, however, greater investment in green growth and ecosystem services is necessary, as outlined in the ESCAP publication, *Low Carbon Green Growth Roadmap for Asia and the Pacific*.⁶⁸

Case study: Urban Partnerships for Poverty Reduction (UPPR) in Bangladesh

More than 60 per cent of the urban population of Bangladesh are based in slums.⁶⁹ To tackle these substandard living conditions, the Urban Partnerships for Poverty Reduction (UPPR) initiative has been set up in partnership with UNDP, the Department for International Development (DfID) and the Local Government Engineering Department, with additional assistance from ILO, UNICEF, UN-Habitat and other organizations.⁷⁰ This innovative programme bridges the technical expertise of these

⁶⁶ UN-Habitat (2012), *Sustainable Urbanization in Asia: A Sourcebook for Local Governments*, p.31.

⁶⁷ ILO (2012), [Working Towards Sustainable Development: Opportunities for Decent Work and Social Inclusion in a Green Economy](#), p.116.

⁶⁸ UNESCAP (2002), [Low Carbon Green Growth Roadmap for Asia and the Pacific](#).

⁶⁹ United Nations (2009), [Millennium Development Goals Indicators](#).

⁷⁰ UNDP, Project Factsheet: Urban Partnerships for Poverty Reduction.

agencies with local community networks through a strong partnership approach and a multi-pronged strategy to tackle the different aspects of urban poverty. This includes community empowerment through the establishment of savings groups and other federations, settlement upgrading, livelihoods development and local capacity development to strengthen links between local government and communities.⁷¹

1.4: Basic Services

Overall, cities generally benefit from an “urban advantage” when it comes to basic services such as education, health, water and sanitation, mobility and energy. Through the scale and concentration of their resources, cities still offer the possibility of cost-efficient services and significantly improving the wellbeing and human development of women, children and other marginalized groups. From basic consultations to expensive social infrastructure such as hospitals, cities and towns typically enjoy much higher levels of service coverage. For example, in Bangladesh, while only a fifth of 16-20 year old girls attend school in rural areas, this proportion is doubled in urban areas.⁷² Similarly, 60 per cent of births in urban areas of Pakistan have a skilled attendant present, a significantly higher proportion than in rural areas.⁷³

However, this positive picture is less apparent when disaggregated by income and other variables. The so-called “urban advantage”— the higher average levels of service coverage - has meant that

⁷¹ UPPR, Urban Partnerships for Poverty Reduction.

⁷² UNFPA (2007), [Growing Up Urban](#), p.33. State of World Population: Youth Supplement.

⁷³ Plan (2010), [Digital and Urban Frontiers: Girls in a Changing Landscape](#), p.17. Because I Am a Girl: State of the World’s Girls 2010.

development efforts have concentrated on rural areas on the assumption that urban areas were relatively well served. However, this overlooks the central issue of access, affordability and rights, since for much of the urban poor, even quality primary care remains out of reach. In practice, the most vulnerable groups, despite their physical proximity to services, may in fact face even greater barriers of access in urban areas due to their social and institutional invisibility.

While data on the current health situation of slum dwellers, migrants, urban refugees, IDPs and other marginalized groups are generally limited or incomplete, it is clear that many have little access to formal services and are reliant, as a result, on unregulated private operators. In particular, there is a growing service gap for invisible or non-registered populations, such as migrants. In cities such as Shenzhen, where a significant portion of the population is undocumented, many find themselves in limbo between rural and urban insurance programmes, excluding them from even basic services, such as health care. This incomplete information, especially of informal settlements, may lead to data imbalances and result in a distorted picture of the true extent of urban service delivery.

Service gaps are often especially acute in smaller or peripheral urban areas, where local capacity and resources are insufficient to deliver effectively to their rapidly growing populations. The difference between major cities and secondary urban centres with more limited resources can often be significant. In Nepal and India, primary enrolment exceeds 90 per cent in the largest cities, but is almost 10 per cent lower in smaller urban areas.⁷⁴ This has a direct impact on the local population's developmental outcomes,

⁷⁴UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.97.

particularly children and other vulnerable groups.

Furthermore, even within a city the inequalities of access between formal and informal settlements or higher and lower income households are often comparable to those between developed and developing countries. As a result, even centrally located slum dwellers may be unable to access or afford public services. In Bangladesh, secondary school attendance in 2009 among children living in slums was just 18 per cent, compared to 53 per cent for urban areas in general and 48 per cent for rural areas.⁷⁵

Though overall access to safe water and degradation of waterways and sanitation remains high in cities, many of the poorest urban households lack these amenities.

While water provision in urban areas has generally been improving across the region, the relative proportion of people without access in Myanmar, Indonesia and Nepal has increased.⁷⁶ In terms of urban sanitation, while some countries are close to achieving universal access, the coverage in Asia and the Pacific region remains the lowest in the world after sub-Saharan Africa.⁷⁷ Insecure land tenure in the poorest settlements perpetuates the problem, placing inhabitants beyond the reach of formal services: for example, in South Tarawa, Kiribati, where sanitation is unavailable for many informal households, as much as a third of the population defecates on the beach.⁷⁸ This practice affects heavily the health of the

⁷⁵ UNICEF (2012), [State of the World's Children 2012: Children in an Urban World](#), p.30.

⁷⁶ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.16.

⁷⁷ UN Habitat (2012), [State of the World's Cities 2012/13: Prosperity of Cities](#), p.50.

⁷⁸ Storey, D. and Connell, J. (2010), 'Urban challenges'. In Agergaard, J., Fold, N. and Gough, K., *Livelihoods, mobility and markets in Africa and Asia*.

poorest urban residents. Women in particular bear the negative health consequences of inadequate sanitation due to their duty to collect water collection and carry out other household chores.

Even when urban water and sanitation coverage are close to universal, the “last mile” in lack of access (though it may comprise a small fraction of the total population) often reflects deep social and political exclusion. The key question is who is not getting access – women, migrants, ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities – and why. In many developing cities, the main barrier to delivery is not resources or capacity, important though these are, but political will and recognition. Service targets must, therefore, extend beyond numbers to a qualitative focus on the rights and inequalities of disadvantaged groups.

Another issue is that the urban poor are often required to pay higher fees for basic services. Cities are typically able to offer better access and lower service fees - the average cost of piped water comes to \$0.70-0.80 per m³ in urban areas, for example, compared to about \$2 in rural areas.⁷⁹ Yet many low income urban households, because they are located in informal settlements or in marginalized districts with limited public service delivery, depend on private operators for basic needs such as water. This has the perverse effect of inflating the access costs for the most disadvantaged urban residents. In Manila, for example, poor households may pay up to \$5 m³ from container-bought water from vendors while those with access to piped

supplies - the majority of them non-poor households - pay just \$0.10 m³⁸⁰

Urban mobility is a key dynamic of urbanization; yet urban mobility system is becoming unsustainable. Owing to urban sprawl – the horizontal, low-density growth of cities over vast areas – distances between functional destinations, such as workplaces and schools become longer and unproductive causing congestions and pollutions. Urban poor settlements are often excluded from affordable public transport networks.⁸¹

Box 6: Building Learning Cities

In 2012, UNESCO established the Global Learning Cities Network (UNESCO-GLCN), which recognizes the increasing challenges faced by urban governance due to rapid urbanization. Among other activities, the Network provides support for capacity development and policy dialogues. This includes the rollout of locally managed Community Learning Centres where residents, with support from government, NGOs and the private sector, can provide the foundation for lifelong learning to children, young people and other groups who may otherwise be excluded from these opportunities, such as women and the elderly. The 2013 Beijing Declaration on Building Learning Cities also emphasizes the individual empowerment, social cohesion and economic and cultural vitality that a “learning city” can bring.⁸²

The threat of communicable diseases is especially high in cities, particularly in dense and poorly managed areas. Besides lack of clean water and sanitation services, urban water amenities, overcrowding, poor ventilation and other negative aspects of slum environments also contribute to a range of

⁷⁹ World Bank and IMF (2013), [Rural-Urban Dynamics and the Millennium Development Goals: Global Monitoring Report 2013](#), p.9.

⁸⁰ McIntosh, A. (2003), [Asian Water Supplies: Reaching the Urban Poor](#), p.1. Asian Development Bank.

⁸¹ UN-Habitat (2013), [Planning and Design for Sustainable urban Mobility](#) p1.

⁸² UNESCO (2013), [Beijing Declaration on Building Learning Cities](#).

transmittable health conditions, including respiratory disease, tuberculosis, cholera and diarrhoea. As a result, the risk of a future epidemic in the Asia and the Pacific region remains acute.⁸³ Women and children are exposed disproportionately to these risks, particularly in low income or informal settlements with little or no public services such as solid waste disposal or health care. In the city of Ahmadabad, for example, the infant mortality rates in its slums are double India's rural average.⁸⁴

HIV/AIDS prevalent rates are also typically higher in cities, too. In Cambodia, women in urban areas are three times more likely to be infected.⁸⁵ This is generally due to the disruption of traditional networks, the isolation of vulnerable persons, such as female migrants and the limited availability of sexual and reproductive health services, particularly among marginalized at-risk groups, such as sex workers, drug users, transgender people and men who have sex with men. HIV/AIDS infection may, in turn, compound other vulnerabilities of low income urban households and drive them into deeper poverty.

Asia-Pacific cities are also facing a rise in the incidence of non-communicable diseases (NCDs), such as obesity and diabetes, even among children. This is due to limited or low quality urban diets, predominantly in poor households but also among the “westernizing” middle classes - the so-called “nutritional transition” - and increasingly sedentary lifestyles. Urbanization has also contributed to the deterioration of health in many Pacific small islands developing States,

⁸³ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.20.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p.151.

⁸⁵ Based on 2005 survey data, cited in Commission on AIDS in Asia (2008), [Redefining AIDS in Asia: Crafting an Effective Response](#), p.63.

where diabetes rates are among the highest in the world.⁸⁶ This and other negative nutritional factors, such as the general decline in breast feeding in cities due to knowledge gaps and lack of public amenities,⁸⁷ particularly affect children and their long term development.

Outdoor air pollution is also raising the incidence of respiratory diseases, causing hundreds of thousands of premature deaths every year. In Mumbai, for example, air quality is so poor that it has the same effect as smoking two-and-a-half packets of cigarettes daily.⁸⁸ Chinese cities are also struggling with critical levels of pollution that, in addition to their devastating economic impact, are causing thousands of premature deaths every year. In Beijing alone, fine particle (PM2.5) pollution resulted in 3,317 deaths and \$420 million in losses in 2010.⁸⁹

In addition, there is the rising toll of death and injury from roads – a burden that falls disproportionately on the poor. In 2000, for example, car and taxi passengers made up only 2 per cent of road fatalities in Delhi, a fraction of the number of pedestrians (42 per cent), motorized two-wheel vehicle users (27 per cent) or cyclists (14 per cent) killed – those forms of transport used most by low income residents.⁹⁰

Despite these challenges, overall access to essential services remains better in urban areas. Cities still offer higher levels of access

⁸⁶ World Health Organization (2012), [‘Obesity’](#), and World Health Organization (undated) [‘South Pacific Situation’](#).

⁸⁷ UNICEF (2012), [State of the World's Children 2012: Children in an Urban World](#), p.18.

⁸⁸ WHO (undated), [‘Facts: Urban settings as a social determinant of health’](#).

⁸⁹ Greenpeace (2012), [Dangerous Breathing – PM2.5: Measuring the Human Health and Economic Impacts on China's Largest Cities](#), p.6.

⁹⁰ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.155.

to essential services, such as skilled professionals at birth or HIV/AIDS prevention, testing and retroviral treatment. Furthermore, the potential for future improvements in service coverage remains especially promising in urban areas. Cities can provide excellent platforms for the piloting and localization of ambitious national health programmes.⁹¹

Besides their scale and density, many cities are leading the development of progressive service delivery, with many now tailoring more targeted systems of delivery for marginalized groups. Cities do not have to create negative health outcomes for their poor: with more inclusive and rights-based outreach, using measures such as community training, urban areas could also benefit the most vulnerable and disadvantaged groups.

1.5: Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Rural-Urban Linkages

With rapid urban growth, cities and rural areas are now increasingly interconnected.

Well-managed, prosperous cities play an important role in boosting rural livelihoods and investment in the Asia-Pacific region. While many rural residents are reliant on cities through trade, remittances and seasonal migration, the opposite is also true. Stable and productive rural areas strengthen urban economies and food security. This has heightened the importance of rural-urban linkages and the development of integrated city-region frameworks. Even small and medium-sized cities play an essential role in bridging rural areas with larger urban centres⁹² and can contribute significantly to

⁹¹ ASEAN (2013), '[Melaka historic city launches "Getting to zero HIV by 2015"](#)', September 6, 2013.

⁹² UN-Habitat (2012), [Sustainable Urbanization in Asia: A Sourcebook for Local Governments](#), p.2.

rural poverty reduction.⁹³ Policy makers must, therefore, move beyond the fallacious rural-urban dichotomy. "The most pressing issue," according to the report of the High-Level Panel on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, "is not urban versus rural, but how to foster a local, geographic approach to the post-2015 agenda".⁹⁴

Though cities offer many positive benefits to rural areas, they also pose serious threats.

The pressure of unmanaged and unplanned urban growth is concentrated on the periphery of cities, where migrants and other newcomers are often forced to settle. This "in situ" urbanization typically occurs with little or no planning or infrastructure to support it, leaving rural or peri-urban areas with a variety of social and environmental problems, from land conflicts, destruction of ecological resources, increasing vulnerability, and overcrowding, to a lack of essential services such as sanitation or waste management. Even remote communities can be dramatically affected by urbanization, thus making better urban management as much a concern for rural areas as the cities themselves.

Lack of services and livelihoods in rural areas can also trigger urban migration. As many have also been displaced from their original communities by illegal land conversion, conflict or development, a rights-based framework for rural migrants is essential to ensure their disempowerment is not replicated in cities. The social dislocation that results as many rural families rely on circular or even protracted urban migration – in particular, the millions in China that make up

⁹³ Yap, KS. [Poverty Alleviation Through Rural-Urban Linkages: Policy Implications](#), p.11.

⁹⁴ United Nations (2013), [A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies Through Sustainable Development](#), p.17. The Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

the “floating” population of temporary urban migrants – can also be considerable. Families may be separated and children left behind as the rural poor pursue livelihoods outside their villages and communities. Migrants and their dependents, on arriving in cities, are also frequently excluded from labour markets, basic services and welfare support. According to one recent analysis, “up to 250 million people in Chinese cities do not live genuinely urban lives, because migrant workers from the countryside are not entitled to urban social security and face institutionalised discrimination in the cities”.⁹⁵ The need for a stronger protection net, both for migrants in urban areas and those left behind, is therefore pressing.

Though hunger and malnutrition are often framed as rural problems, the urban poor are also increasingly at risk. Providing urban areas with safe and sufficient supplies of fresh produce is in itself a challenge.⁹⁶ In addition, urban populations now face a greater dependence on processed foods that, though often cheaper per calorie, contain high levels of fat and sugar. This can lead to the development of related health issues, including NCDs such as diabetes, and over time affect life expectancy.

Affordability is also a key concern for poor urban households. Lacking access to agricultural production, many depend on monetized exchange for their intake and spend a large portion of their income on food. Despite on average higher incomes, extremely poor urban households still spend a major portion of their budget on food: 49 per cent in Viet Nam, for example, and as much as 61 per

cent in India.⁹⁷ This makes them especially vulnerable to sudden price shocks or bottlenecks in supply, as evidenced in 2008 by the outbreak of urban riots in the wake of the global food crisis. Under-five malnutrition and other indicators of food insecurity are strongly correlated with household income: in Delhi, for example, children from poor families are three times more likely to be undernourished than children from more affluent households.⁹⁸ Among the very urban poor, nutritional outcomes may be even lower than those of their rural counterparts. This can have a lasting impact on their social and economic prospects as adults in the decades to come.

In many countries, such as India and China, food security is being undermined as large swathes of rural areas are converted for urban use.⁹⁹ Farmland is often on the frontline of urban expansion: around 10 km² of agricultural land is converted to urban use every day in Asia.¹⁰⁰ Urban food supply chains also require more complex and energy intensive distribution and food packaging processes, changing food consumption habits and, for low-income families, particularly women, additional time and cost to access food supplies. Governments, working with other stakeholders, need to ensure better performing environments by managing and mitigating the risks and threats associated with these issues.

One positive step towards strengthening food security in cities is the promotion of resilient local food systems, including urban

⁹⁵ Miller, T. (2012), *China's Urban Billion; The Story Behind the Biggest Human Migration in History*.

⁹⁶ FAO, '[Food for the cities: Fresh food](#)'.

⁹⁷ Ahmed, A. et al (2007), [The World's Most Deprived: Characteristics and Causes of Extreme Hunger](#), p.97.

⁹⁸ Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India (2007), [State of Urban Health in Delhi](#), p.xii and 66.

⁹⁹ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.177.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p.18.

agriculture, husbandry, forests and fisheries.

Even megacities have the opportunity to develop some form of urban farming. Beijing, for instance, meets over half of its vegetable consumption from its market gardens.¹⁰¹ In addition to reducing a city's dependence on imported and processed food, urban farming can also serve as an important source of local livelihoods. Depending on productivity, urban agriculture and associated services may create employment for 1 in every 50 to 100 city residents.¹⁰² Furthermore, it can provide much needed green space and act as a protective buffer for cities from landslides, floods and other environmental challenges.

Urban agriculture can also pose health risks if poorly managed, particularly in a context of general environmental degradation. Given the potential effects of disasters and climate change on city-region systems, environmental resilience should, therefore, be mainstreamed into urban supply chains.

Groundwater is a major and essential source of water supply for many cities. However, it can become depleted through excessive abstraction or contamination by sewage and industrial pollution leaving it susceptible to the risk of salmonella, bird blue and other issues. In the case of some coastal settlements, there is a risk of saltwater intrusion from rising sea levels. Urban aquifers are vitally important for safe drinking water supplies but are very fragile, easily damaged and slow to repair. The dangers of ill-managed soil, waterways in urban and peri-urban areas must be addressed through appropriate regulation.

¹⁰¹ FAO (2010), [Growing Greener Cities](#), p.6.

¹⁰² FAO (2011), [The Role of Urban and Peri-Urban Agriculture \(UPA\) in National Food Security Programmes](#), p.7.

Box 7: Hanoi's "Garden City"

Hanoi is an example of how a modern and vibrant urban centre can, with appropriate planning and land management, function effectively as a farm for its own community. With more than 150,000 tonnes of fruit and vegetables grown in and around the city every year, about 10 per cent of its skilled labour force currently works in agriculture. The sector is a source of earnings for almost a quarter (24 per cent) of the city's households. Its agricultural greenbelt also supports the city's environmental resilience by improving soil quality and reducing runoff, so lowering the incidence of flooding.¹⁰³

By strengthening coordination between rural and urban areas, positive improvements could be achieved both in cities and in the countryside. This requires a stronger appreciation of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of urban food supply and their connections with rural areas. At present, many characteristics of urban-rural systems are undermining their long term sustainability. This includes the unsustainable consumption of land, water and energy by agro-industrial food systems, as well as the high levels of food wastage¹⁰⁴ in a context in which supply is typically dependent on an extended chain of processing, storage and transportation.

There are, however, many ways that improved rural-urban management could promote better outcomes. Capacity development, particularly in smaller cities and in peri-urban areas, is especially important if the potential of better rural-urban linkages is

¹⁰³ FAO (2010), [Growing Greener Cities](#), pp.6-11.

¹⁰⁴ In 2011 FAO estimated yearly global quantitative food losses and waste at roughly 30 per cent for cereals, 40-50 per cent for root crops, fruits and vegetables, 20 per cent for oilseeds, meat and dairy, and 30 percent for fish. However, the extent varies according to the particular context of each country. FAO (2011), [Global Food Losses and Food Waste: Extent, Causes and Prevention](#).

to be exploited.¹⁰⁵ Furthermore, by putting the appropriate structures and policies in place, a more integrated approach to rural and urban management would be possible. One example, in the area of food and nutrition, is local food councils: these can support small-scale farmers and agricultural holdings in bringing their produce to city markets, benefitting both producing communities and urban consumers.

If rural and urban areas are treated as discrete phenomena, without acknowledging the linkages between them, opportunities to strengthen rights protections and promote development may be missed. What is needed is an adequate institutional framework to creatively integrate their shared benefits and threats.

Case study: Boosting food security in Manila

Food and nutrition security is a critical concern for disaster-affected urban areas. Cash transfers, given the highly monetized nature of food supplies in cities, are an important element in securing access to essential goods for poor and displaced households in the wake of an emergency. However, identifying and reaching the most vulnerable is especially challenging in a crisis context. The World Food Programme launched an innovative response to this challenge when it partnered in 2010 with the telecommunication company Globe to deliver targeted cash assistance through text messaging to about 2,000 destitute households in Metropolitan Manila and nearby urban areas.¹⁰⁶ By leveraging the widespread social use of mobile technologies in the Philippines, supported by community

training materials and software, the project demonstrated the particular value and resources that a private sector partner can bring to emergency relief efforts. Urban areas were specifically chosen for the pilot, in part because of the reliable strength of the mobile signals, but the project also has important implications for rural areas where traditional modes of cash delivery such as banks are inaccessible.¹⁰⁷

1.6: Environment, climate change and disaster risk reduction (DRR)

Though cities are often associated with negative environmental impacts, well-managed urban areas can become resilient and in fact benefit the environment. Among other potentially positive outcomes, cities and towns can promote more compact land use and deliver better access to essential services, such as sanitation and waste management. They can also provide the necessary scale for energy efficient services and infrastructure, resulting in lower per capita emissions. In addition, urban areas are ideally suited for financing and implementing progressive green technologies that can lower per capita fossil fuel consumption.¹⁰⁸ When well managed, cities harness immense power to absorb and become resilient from the impact of any plausible environmental, social or economic hazards.

The Asia-Pacific region already boasts many models of resilience that, through smart planning, serve to protect rather than degrade urban and rural environments. Resource efficient cities, green urbanism, eco-cities and other forms of low carbon urban development, sustainable consumption and

¹⁰⁵ Sheng, Y.K. [Poverty Alleviation Through Rural-Urban Linkages: Policy Implications](#).

¹⁰⁶ World Food Programme (2010), '[Cash-by-text pilot goes live in Philippines](#)', October 15, 2010; World Food Programme and Globe (2010), '[A first in Southeast Asia: WFP introduces mobile phone-based cash disbursements via Globe G-Cash](#)'.

¹⁰⁷ IRIN (2010), '[Philippines: Cash for work goes mobile](#)'. October 6, 2010.

¹⁰⁸ Asian Development Bank (2012), [Green Urbanization in Asia: Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2012](#), pp.22-23.

production, and city-level decoupling across the Asia and the Pacific provide alternative models of “green” urbanization. The newly constructed city of Caofaedian, near Tianjin, for instance, has been designed to promote a range of environmentally sound outcomes, including recycling, renewable energy and compact development. Among other criteria, it includes the target of achieving 60 per cent of all trips through public transport.¹⁰⁹ Similar strategies across the region, adapted to the particular context of each city, could help break the current link between urbanization and environmental degradation.

Box 8: UNEP and UN-Habitat- Green Cities Initiative

Under the Urban Environment Partnership Framework for 2008-2013, UN-Habitat and UNEP have revitalized their cooperation to provide better and more extensive services on urban issues to local and national governments. The current “Greener Cities Partnership” initially covering the period 2014-2016, has been launched to enable cities to better assess and prioritize local environmental concerns and to have a voice in national and global environmental debates. UN-Habitat and UNEP will work together in mainstreaming the environmental and urban perspective into policy making, as well as highlighting the local and global linkages of environmental issues. Priority areas include resilient, resource efficient cities; sustainable transport and mobility; and waste water management.¹¹⁰

Despite this potential, the impact of urbanization on the environment has frequently been harmful. In part, the damage has arisen from the deterioration of natural ecosystems, such as forests, mangroves and urban aquifers, as urban expansion, in particular unplanned peri-urban expansion,

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p.35.

¹¹⁰ UNEP and UN-Habitat, [Greener Cities Partnership](#).

has destroyed or destabilized fragile ecosystem and natural buffers. This in turn is often linked to urban governance, urban environmental management and the political will and capability of local authorities to enforce effective land use regulations and appropriate urban planning.

The environmental impact of urban areas is also determined by the quality and inclusiveness of their service delivery, in particular sanitation and waste management. These issues are especially acute in slums and informal settlements where public services may be limited or unavailable. Waste dumping and open defecation, for example, lead to the contamination of local urban environments, including water supply, especially ground water supplies. Air contamination also remains a major challenge for many Asian cities, too, affecting quality of life and economic output. Of the 20 most polluted cities globally, 11 are located in the Asia-Pacific region.¹¹¹ The human cost of these degraded environments and ecosystems, particularly to health, are very considerable and fall disproportionately on the urban poor.

Pollution in slums is primarily a consequence of exclusion and lack of access to services and infrastructure, rather than poverty and illegality. The urban poor typically produce lower levels of waste and emissions per capita than middle- and high-income groups: the unsustainable levels of resource use in many urban areas in the region are in fact more closely associated with the emergence of an affluent middle class with a larger environmental footprint.¹¹² Rising levels of consumption and increased urban

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p.3.

¹¹² Satterthwaite, D. (2002), [‘The ten and a half myths that may distort the urban policies of governments and international agencies’](#), pp.28-31.

productivity are also creating significant environmental impacts. Rapid demands for housing, infrastructure and commercial construction, for example, can lead to the demolition of the established urban fabric, including heritage, to accommodate new development: this can create large volumes of pollution and waste that could be avoided through revitalization and retrofitting of existing buildings.

The Asia-Pacific region also is home to many of the most vulnerable urban areas in the world to natural disasters such as flooding,¹¹³ and this exposure will intensify in a context of unplanned urban expansion and climate change. The causes of this vulnerability are partly human-related: in particular, the impact of poorly managed urbanization in environmentally sensitive areas such as low-elevation coastal zones (LECZ), where more than half (54 per cent) of the region's urban population are now located.¹¹⁴ Together with climate change, these issues will increase the risk to life, infrastructure and economic assets significantly. One recent study by ADB estimated that 303 million urban residents in Asia were at risk of coastal flooding in 2010, with another 245 million potentially vulnerable to inland flooding: by 2025, however, the exposed population is projected to reach 410 million and 341 million respectively.¹¹⁵ Natural disasters have already triggered substantial movement to and from cities in such countries as Bangladesh, with Dhaka alone attracting 140,000 migrants

¹¹³ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.21.

¹¹⁴ UNESCAP (2011), [Statistical Yearbook for Asia and the Pacific 2011](#), citing UN HABITAT (2008), *State of the World's Cities 2008/2009*.

¹¹⁵ Asian Development Bank (2012), [Green Urbanization in Asia: Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2012](#), p.19.

annually due to environmental stress and dislocation.¹¹⁶

Even cities in developed countries in the region are exposed to potentially catastrophic weather events, including typhoons and flooding. Nevertheless, they often have the financial assets and other resources required to invest substantially in resilience strategies. This may prove more difficult in many developing cities, particularly smaller and secondary urban centres where human and financial capacities will be most constrained in mounting an effective DRR response. In these cases, the best option may be to support ecosystem-based adaptation - for example, to protect mangroves, forests and coral reefs to alleviate the effects of a natural disaster.

Box 9: The Rising threat of natural disasters

Though the Asia-Pacific region is already the most disaster-prone region in the world, climate change and the growing concentration of urban populations in environmentally sensitive areas threaten to significantly increase the region's vulnerability. By the 2070s, the eight most exposed cities in the world in terms of population will be in Asia and the Pacific led by Kolkata. With projected changes in sea level and flooding, together with the rising population and infrastructure development, its potential exposure in the event of a 1 in 100 year flood event – less than 2 million people and \$32 billion in 2005 – is projected to rise to 14 million people and almost \$2 trillion by 2070.¹¹⁷

With the increasing effects of climate change in the region, cities are likely to experience even greater environmental insecurity - and urbanization is itself a major cause. Globally, cities account for an estimated 70 per cent of

¹¹⁶ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.58.

¹¹⁷ Nicholls, R.J. et al (2007), [Ranking of the World's Cities Most Exposed to Coastal Flooding Today and in the Future](#). OECD.

energy-related greenhouse gas,¹¹⁸ making urban growth one of the major contributing sources. For instance, the dramatic rise in China in per capita carbon dioxide emissions since the beginning of the 1990s has been mainly concentrated in urban areas.¹¹⁹ Shanghai has per capita emissions of 8.1 tonnes of carbon dioxide annually (1998) compared to 3.4 tonnes (1994) for China as a whole.¹²⁰ These trends are the result not only of the high levels of industry and production clustered in and around urban areas, but also due to the sharp rises in consumption levels among urban populations.

Better urban policies and investment, therefore, have an important role to play in mitigating the onset of climate change in the region. More sustainable patterns of consumption and production can be achieved through a variety of resilient measures, including renewable or low carbon energy sources, energy efficient construction and design in the construction sector including housing, the enforcement of carbon tariffs and emission codes, and planning strategies, such as transit-oriented development that facilitate the use of public or non-motorized transport. These resilient strategies are, therefore, an essential element in reducing the contribution of urban areas to climate change and other negative environmental impacts.

In addition to contributing to climate change, Asia-Pacific cities are themselves particularly

exposed to its effects. The region is likely to experience a significant rise in the incidence of climate change related effects such as rising sea levels. This will expose a growing number of urban residents, not to mention assets and infrastructure, to extreme weather events such as flooding and typhoons. Climate change is also likely to undermine food and water security in many cities, and in the process, raise the incidence of water-borne disease.

Environmental vulnerability has strong social dimensions, with the poorest residents often the most affected. The increasing concentration of people in hazardous areas correlates closely with poverty and marginalization. As slum dwellers, migrants and other groups are often forced to settle in the most vulnerable low-lying areas, such as river banks and coastal areas, and peri-urban areas outside the city, they are more susceptible to natural disasters, such as flooding and landslides. This means that the costs are borne disproportionately by those who can least afford them: 90 per cent of the \$4.3 billion in typhoon-related damage in the Philippines in 2009, for instance, represented losses from poor urban households.¹²¹ Women, given their responsibility for household duties, such as water collection and food preparation, are disproportionately affected by these threats.¹²²

With little official recognition or support, many informal settlements are both the most exposed and the least protected. Besides individual economic resources and local environmental conditions, the ability of poorer urban residents to adapt and recover is greatly contingent on the governance

¹¹⁸ Baeumler, A., Ijjasz-Vasquez, E. and Mehndiratta, S., Sustainable Low Carbon Cities in China: Why It Matters and What Can Be Done, in [Sustainable Low-Carbon City Development In China](#).

¹¹⁹ Asian Development Bank (2012), [Green Urbanization in Asia: Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2012](#), p.13.

¹²⁰ Data for Shanghai from 1998 and for China from 1994. Cited in UN-Habitat (2011), [Hot cities: Battle-ground for climate change](#).

¹²¹ UNISDR and UNESCAP (2012), [Reducing Vulnerability and Exposure to Disasters: The Asia-Pacific Disaster Report 2012](#), p.vii.

¹²² UNDP (2012), [One Planet to Share](#), p.123. Asia-Pacific Human Development Report 2012.

structures in place to protect them, in particular social protection systems.¹²³ From disaster insurance to micro-credit, these have an essential role to play in strengthening the resilience of individuals and communities to natural disasters. Legal security - for instance, tenure regularization programmes - can also empower slum dwellers to invest in local resilience strategies.

As a result, there is an urgent need for greater political and economic investment in effective adaptation and resilient solutions to minimize the negative consequences of natural disasters and climate change on urban areas. The aim of resilience must be to transform the underlying development drivers and processes that generate already existing risks whilst avoiding the accumulation of future risks. This may include funding for dykes, dams and other resilient infrastructure that prevents or reduces the impact of destabilizing environmental events on cities. However, these policies must be accompanied by “soft” measures such as improved building standards and adaptive design – for example, ‘fluid’ vernacular architecture found in Bangkok, with its raised stilts, and its flexible ecosystem of weirs and canals¹²⁴ - as well as stricter land planning codes and multi-hazard assessments to minimize urban development in environmentally sensitive areas. Ecosystem restoration can also help stabilize urban environments and boost their resilience to extreme weather events. Adaptation can also be strengthened through more efficient and sustainable production and consumption systems, using rainwater harvesting, recycling and other innovative approaches, such as urban agriculture.

Together, these approaches could help cities realize their green potential. This, however,

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p.122-124.

¹²⁴ UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities 2010/11](#), p.187.

will require sustained support through central government assistance, as well as international resources, including carbon credit instruments, such as the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). These have considerable potential to provide the necessary upfront funds to invest in reorienting cities towards more sustainable patterns of growth, including the CDM-approved metro system in Delhi.¹²⁵ Yet, by and large, these opportunities are underexploited: the proportion of CDM-registered projects focused on cities is below 1 per cent.¹²⁶ With better credit access for innovative low carbon urban development, available not only for large centralized programs but also for small-scale and community-led projects, cities could dramatically enhance their sustainability.

Case study: Partnering cities in the fight against climate change

Climate change is a challenge for urban areas across the Asia-Pacific region, yet its impacts are also highly localized. Cities across the region need to share knowledge, as much as possible through city to city cooperation and South-South cooperation, while at the same time conduct individual research to tailor a response appropriate to their own specific context. One example of this collaborative approach to urban programming is Asian Cities Adapt, a partnership of eight different cities in India and the Philippines that conducts research into local adaptation. The experience gained through this research, besides informing pilot projects and local adaptation strategies, will be shared collectively through transfer workshops, publications and other media.¹²⁷ Building on the premise of city to city cooperation, in

¹²⁵ Governance Knowledge Centre, ‘[Delhi metro](#)’.

¹²⁶ World Bank (2010), [A City-Wide Approach to Carbon Finance](#), p.vii.

¹²⁷ [AsianCitiesAdapt](#).

2008 UN-Habitat launched the Cities and Climate Change Initiative (CCCI). The initiative now works in over 30 cities in 15 countries in Asia-pacific. The cities and climate change initiative brings together local and national governments, academia, NGO's and international organizations to promote active climate change collaboration with the aim to alert cities to the innovate actions they can take to strengthen the capacities of cities and their partners in response to climate change challenges. Similarly, the Asian Cities Climate Change Resilience Network (ACCRN) initiative helps selected cities across Thailand, India, Indonesia and Vietnam develop climate change risk, vulnerability strategies and a range of resilience-building interventions such as climate-resilient housing and more effective water management systems.

1.7: Towards a better urban future

The future of the region will be largely determined by its urban areas – both their strengths and their shortcomings. Urbanization is both a positive and inevitable process in a country's development that cannot be ignored or forcibly constrained. It can, however, be guided towards more inclusive and sustainable outcomes. The Asia-Pacific region has many positive examples of well managed urban areas that could serve as case studies for other cities to adapt to their own circumstances.

Despite their challenges, urban areas still represent an extraordinary opportunity for countries to lift themselves out of poverty. In Asia and the Pacific as elsewhere, urbanization is associated with higher levels of wealth, prosperity, wellbeing and human development. Though the growing concentration of poverty in cities demands more targeted initiatives, particularly in informal settlements, more productive and

less divided urban centres will benefit rural areas as well. Even many slums, despite their problems, exhibit positive characteristics such as cohesion or innovation that could flourish with the right support. Cities can also, through their density and economies of scale, lower costs for service provision. For all its challenges, then, urbanization has the potential to accelerate human development in the coming decades.

The linkages between environment, poverty, health, employment, governance and planning in urban areas are inextricable. This can translate, as what has occurred in many slums, into a negative loop in which an adverse impact in one area undermines another. Consequently, an isolated intervention is unlikely to succeed without addressing the wider urban context. However, by engaging multiple issues in an integrated manner, it is possible to create a virtuous cycle with a range of positive outcomes.

Addressing current gaps in knowledge and capacity, with a particular focus on marginalized groups, will support more equitable urban strategies. At present, urban poverty is obscured by the lack of reliable data: typically, the worst affected communities are either not disaggregated from overall figures or are excluded altogether from official estimates. Furthermore, urban data are typically used to highlight rural-urban disparities, rather than identify inequities within and between cities. This absence of reliable inter- and intra-urban data can undermine the effectiveness of poverty reduction programmes. By improving their capacity to identify vulnerabilities, particularly through direct engagement of slum communities, policymakers and service providers could reverse these negative trends.

Urban areas in Asia and the Pacific offer valuable arenas for cooperation between different sectors and organizations, including-South and city-to-city partnerships.

This can encourage creative and “value added” interventions with greater impact. As many countries move towards a more holistic and inclusive approach to the planning and management of urban areas, the potential for collaboration amongst local authorities, communities, CSOs, international agencies and the private sector is growing. In recent years many urban areas have also leveraged alternative forms of service delivery, such as community-based management and public-private partnerships, to improve service delivery. Urban stakeholders have the opportunity to work with other sectors for a more integrated and multi-disciplinary approach, using platforms such as UN-Habitat’s World Urban Forum, the Asia-Pacific Urban Forum, United Cities and Local Governments Asia Pacific (UCLG-AP), CITYNET and Cities Alliance.

Box 10: Delivering as One in Hoi An, Viet Nam

Launched by UNDG in 2007, the Delivering as One United Nations programme provides a framework for United Nations agencies to work together within a single cooperative structure. By providing a platform for knowledge-sharing and joint programming, it enables a more coherent response to the challenges of the twenty-first century. A pilot project is now applying this approach to develop an eco-city in Hoi An, Viet Nam. Directed by the local government, it aims to promote green industry and cleaner production while also creating local employment and tackling climate change. The project highlights the particular opportunities that urban areas offer for integrated and multi-agency programmes.

Part 2: Integrating Urbanization into Country Programmes

2.1: Introduction to the Toolkit

This section presents a detailed breakdown of the key entry points, resources and indicators that can be used to effectively tailor development programmes in urban environments. As with the introductory section, it is structured around the following five UNDAF pillars:

- Governance: working directly with city governments to ensure duty bearers are responsive to their constituency and claim holders are able to have their rights protected and voices heard. This includes the promotion of a coherent national policy on urbanization, with effective decentralization and accountable municipal bodies to ensure rights and protections are delivered inclusively to all urban residents.
- Poverty reduction and employment: promoting economic growth that benefits all and reduces vertical and horizontal inequalities. This could include, through better data collection, the targeting of development assistance to the most vulnerable, so increasing access to livelihoods and opportunities while strengthening resilience to shocks.
- Basic services: the gender responsive delivery of essential services to the most marginalized to reduce access disparities in urban areas, using a comprehensive approach that tackles the physical, social and economic determinants of poor health and educational outcomes.
- Food security, agriculture and rural-urban linkages: developing stronger rural-urban linkages and effective regional governance platforms to improve disaster resilience, strengthen social welfare systems and reduce hunger and malnutrition, through measures such as

urban agriculture, improved efficiency and hygiene regulations.

- Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR): the strengthening of urban sustainability through improved environmental management, green investment, smarter city planning and urban resilience, particularly for the poorest households.

Using a similar structure to a typical UNDAF, each pillar has four overarching targets for achieving improved outcomes. These, in turn, are broken into separate outputs, with accompanying entry points to illustrate their practical delivery. A list of supporting resources and sample indicators are also presented to demonstrate how these can be achieved.

This toolkit is not intended as a definitive list of prescriptions, but as a general overview of the different options that UN country teams and other practitioners have at their disposal. As such, it may not capture all the complexities of development issues in urban areas and should be framed within the specific national context of the programme. With limited resources, agencies must decide on which entry points will achieve the most positive impact in their particular working environment, as well as the nature of the role that they can play in their delivery. This may be determined not only by their own capacity or specialism, but also the specific areas where government and local partners are seeking support. Nevertheless, a number of general principles do apply.

Meaningful local data: as disaggregated and qualitative information on poverty within most developing cities is scarce or non-existent, especially in relation to gender, migration, youth and other vulnerabilities, a significant data collection component may be

required as part of the urban programme, especially in a context in which a publicly available survey or census results are limited. However, the expense and effort of a large-scale data gathering exercise is clearly not feasible for many country teams. In this scenario, innovative approaches such as community-led mapping and participatory enumerations, the use of creative proxies and the sharing or “piggybacking” of other surveys may deliver an adequate body of evidence for programme targeting. Additional guidance in this area is provided in Annex 2.

Engagement of local stakeholders, including municipal authorities: though country level cooperation with the national government is essential for UN agencies and other organizations, for addressing issues of urbanization, this needs to be accompanied by responsive relationships at municipal levels and local stakeholders. This should be realized through participatory dialogue and negotiation in a rights-based framework, with local partners engaged as equal partners in decision-making mechanisms. With stronger local partnerships, more appropriate and collectively owned urban programming can be achieved. More specifically, urban collaborations such as pilot city projects may often pose the most promising entry point to enhancing national policy, particularly in countries where urban areas have historically been neglected. Many transformative developments in national urban policy have been informed by successful local initiatives. In addition, the need for support in fields, such as urban planning or municipal governance is frequently most acute in secondary cities, slums, peri-urban settlements and other areas that are unlikely to be reached through ‘top down’ channels alone.

Diverse and inclusive local partnerships: this is generally true for any programming, urban or otherwise, but is especially relevant in a city context where the range of stakeholders is uniquely complex. Programmes in urban areas must recognize the heterogeneity of local communities and work to develop a truly representative platform that does not overlook or sideline any groups. Even participatory tools, such as community mapping must be undertaken with an acute sensitivity about who is potentially being left out, whether through lack of engagement or active exclusion from other local groups. An expansive partnership base reduces the risk of marginalization and also ensures a more sustainable social base for the life cycle of the programme.

The value of a rights-based approach: this is important at every stage of the project, from data collection and partnership outreach to delivery and evaluation. One reason for the inadequacy of urban poverty reduction in many Asia-Pacific countries is that, at an aggregate level, cities appear to be serving their citizens relatively well. However, even when only the “last mile” in coverage remains, this apparently small fraction may in fact represent the concentrated marginalization of a disenfranchised ethnic minority or slum dwellers. The barrier to access may be more political than technical as “unofficial” populations are excluded and even rendered invisible in many cities. A rights-based perspective, by shifting the focus to the question of who is being left out and why, can help address this and guide a “last first” approach to service delivery.

Integrating international, national and local resources: While successful urban programmes are delivered locally, they frequently leverage funding, technical support and strategic guidelines from national and international partners. These can range from

the UN and other organizations to governments and universities. Annex 3 presents an overview of stakeholders and resources at the global, country and municipality level, with a case study (the Child Friendly Movement in the Philippines) of an urban programme that successfully engaged these different elements.

A flexible framework of action and cooperation for urban programmes: the ideal role may vary considerably, depending on context, and so agencies must assess how they can best contribute to positive urban development. While direct programme delivery may be appropriate in certain areas, in other cases, it may be more efficient to identify existing providers with a good record of performance and provide them with targeted financial, technical or institutional support. As always, unnecessary replication should be avoided. This is especially challenging in towns and cities, given the large cast of local, national and international actors, so urban programmes must take particular care to identify those organizations and groups already active before finalizing their own strategy. Some organizations, whether small CSOs or large regional networks, may in fact be better suited to delivery in certain areas than the UN country team: in this instance, funding or capacity support may be the most effective line of action.

Promotion of dialogue and cooperation: Another important role that organizations, including UN agencies, can play is at points of coordination between local and national stakeholders, leveraging relationships at both levels to guide and develop partnerships. UN country teams can also act as a bridge between different and sometimes competing local groups to promote collaboration among communities, municipal authorities, private sector organizations, CSOs, regional

federations and academics. In certain contexts, the UN may be most effective by providing technical assistance to government agencies in their programme design and implementation, particularly in areas such as urban planning and disaster risk management, in which knowledge gaps are common.

Capacity strengthening and assessment, with a clear identification of priorities: before developing a coherent framework to guide urban engagement to gain a clearer idea of where and how agencies can best respond to urbanization. This need not require a separate urban strategy or division per se, though this may in some cases be appropriate. One of the main messages of this guidance paper, in fact, is that the traditional line between “rural” and “urban” is increasingly irrelevant, meaning the two have to be considered side by side. Even agriculture is increasingly being shaped by urban and peri-urban development. A more desirable approach for some agencies, then, may be to integrate urbanization concerns across its programmes so that the unacknowledged gaps in rights and services among the urban poor are adequately reflected in their own activities. How this can best be achieved may vary. This toolkit attempts to give an overview of the different steps that agencies can take to meet the clear and present reality of urbanization in the Asia-Pacific region.

2.2: Governance

1. <i>Urbanization issues are marginalized from national policy agendas</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite better engagement among decision makers in dynamic urbanization issues, reflected in the growth of city-based programmes, policy and poverty reduction measures by states and international agencies alike remain largely focused on rural areas. Urban areas, on the other hand, particularly informal settlements and secondary cities, are often overlooked.
2. <i>Capacity of urban government is limited, especially at a local level</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many Asia-Pacific cities have historically had highly centralized governance, with little devolution of budgetary or policy control. Though decentralization has been widely initiated, the transfer of responsibility is often not accompanied by adequate resources to deliver urban governance effectively at a local level, particularly in smaller urban areas.
3. <i>Participation and accountability in urban governance is low</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad and multilateral governance platforms, involving not only national government but also local authorities, CSOs, women's groups, community organizations and the private sector, is an ongoing challenge for many urban areas with fragmented collaboration between different stakeholders.
4. <i>Authorities fail to empower women and protect vulnerable groups, including children.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Unofficial' groups such as migrants, minorities and slum populations are often sidelined in urban areas, while land policies reinforce poverty through evictions and privatization of public space, including local heritage. Women and youth are also inadequately protected from the threat of violence, intimidation and sexual abuse.

Strategy	Entry points	Sample indicators
1. Integrating urbanization into national policies		
Guidelines, collaborations and joint programmes.		
✓ <u>Development of a national urbanization policy with components on decentralization, rights, inclusion, city level programming and localized data collection.</u>	International guidelines such as the MDGs , the Habitat Agenda , SDG Goal 11: Sustainable Cities and Human Settlements , Rio +20's outcome document , rights conventions and guidance of UN country programmes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of a national urban policy or framework. • Proportion of funds allocated in national budgets to urban areas, compared to ratio of urban to national population, by city size.
✓ <u>Participation of municipal authorities in multi-stakeholder platforms to articulate local urban concerns.</u>	National consultation, local forums and regional city partnerships such as ICLEI , UCLG , CityNet and Cities Alliance .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of international and national associations of municipal bodies. • Level of meaningful participation of local authorities in national decision making.
✓ <u>Promotion of a joint programme around a city, with the possibility of replication of best practice at country level.</u>	City level initiatives such as Child Friendly Cities or a joint United Nations urban programme , as well as knowledge and capacity sharing networks like ACCCRN .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of local pilot projects or regional city networks.
✓ <u>Assist the preparation of the National Report for Habitat III</u>	General guidelines on National Reports for Habitat III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affiliation of city with international association or city-to-city exchange.

Lao PDR UNDAF (2011-15)

By 2015, the government promotes more equitable and sustainable growth for poor people in Lao PDR.

- Local authorities better able to deal with challenges and opportunities of urbanization.
- *National Urban Forum established.*
- *No. of small towns where an Urban Inequalities survey was conducted.*

2. Decentralizing urban governance and developing local capacity.

Decentralization and capacity development of urban authorities.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ <u>Devolution of political and administrative control over service delivery, urban development and other functions to local authorities, with the necessary capacity to undertake them.</u> | <p>Establishment of transparent and inclusive local elections, independent councils and elected mayors, with capacity strengthening of municipal officials and development of a localized urban strategy such as a MDG City Profile.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Ability of local government to recruit and dismiss local personnel.</i>• <i>Ability to elect council and mayor locally.</i>• <i>No. of residents registered with urban governments able to vote in local elections.</i>• <i>Independence of local bodies and municipal councilors from national government.</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ <u>Fiscal and budgetary decentralization to urban and municipal authorities, with ring-fenced spending for local services and infrastructure, including informal settlements.</u> | <p>Devolution of spending, borrowing and taxing powers to local authorities, with capacity development for functions like land and property taxation.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Ability of municipal authorities to borrow money, determine local taxes and set user fees.</i>• <i>Predictability of national transfers.</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ <u>Capacity development to ensure capability of local authorities to undertake governance functions.</u> | <p>Training programmes, performance testing and other mechanisms to ensure effectiveness of local fiscal and governance capacity.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Ratio of local government revenue to total public expenditure.</i>• <i>Ratio of mandated to actual tax collection.</i>• <i>Coverage of key public functions, % of total urban area.</i> |

India UNDAF (2008-12)

Capacity of cities to undertake urban governance reform strengthened.

- Capacities of city managers and elected representatives developed to undertake urban governance reform including mainstreaming sound financial management, public-private partnership, citizen interface, development of M&E systems and use of ICTs for improved service delivery.
- Urban reform agenda raised at various forums and research and advocacy strengthened.

Samoa UNDAF (2008-12)

Decentralization of governance and participatory decision making is enhanced.

- Strengthened Urban Governance Framework that ensures safeguarding of social wellbeing, cultural identity, resources and stimulates opportunities for social and economic development.
- *Urban Governance Framework publicly discussed, approved and established by 2008.*
- *Proportion of government and CSO representatives trained in local governance, management and planning (disaggregated by sex/age).*

3. Achieving accountable and transparent urban governance through greater participation.

Participation and inclusive governance processes.

- ✓ Effective, accountable and gender responsive governance and budget allocation mechanisms, with a focus on transparency and due process. Codes of conduct, [participatory budgeting](#), service reviews, complaints mechanisms and performance [monitoring](#) with indicators like the [Urban Governance Index](#) to [measure outcomes](#).
 - % of municipal revenue spent in poor areas.
 - Performance standards, complaint channels and customer surveys.
 - Audits, open tenders, anti-corruption measures and asset disclosure by officials.
- ✓ Meaningful, gender responsive participation in local governance, data collection and decision making processes. Regular elections or referendums at city and district level, civic associations, [e-governance](#), activist forums, urban pacts and [inclusive processes](#) such as [city consultations](#) and neighborhood committees.
 - Frequency of local elections, turnout and right to vote, by gender, tenure and migrant status.
 - No. of CSOs per 10,000 urban population.
 - Existence of urban forum or other platforms.
- ✓ Inclusion of poor, women and marginalized groups in local office, resident groups and urban programmes, including youth, migrants and minorities. Anti-discrimination legislation, female quotas for local councils, [gender responsive planning](#) and budgeting, youth engagement programmes.
 - % of women and youth in municipal councils, CSOs, local SMEs or development programmes.
 - Existence and implementation of anti-discrimination laws or quotas.
- ✓ Inclusion of migrants and squatters through registration and rights frameworks. Registration, voting rights and political platforms for the inclusion of [migrants](#) and slum dwellers.
 - % of migrants or slum dwellers registered or with the legal right to vote in elections.

Bangladesh UNDAF (2006-10)

Policies and laws to ensure progressive fulfilment of human rights established, streamlined and implemented.

- *Policies are adopted that reflect the rights and aspirations of slum dwellers and their children and public service delivery to the urban poor is improved.*

Bangladesh UNDAF (2012-16)

Municipalities and urban poor have greater capacity for participatory and pro-poor urban governance.

- *No. of targeted urban poor communities that have presented their concerns to local authorities.*

4. Empowering and protecting residents through effective urban management.

Violence reduction and public security.

- ✓ Inclusive and gender responsive solutions to policing and surveillance through partnerships and community based solutions, with a particular focus on the urban poor. Neighborhood and community partnerships; monitoring of reported crime; 'zero tolerance' policies to physical and sexual violence; rehabilitation of gang members; gender mainstreaming programmes; human rights training for police; assistance programmes for victims of violence.
 - Homicide, theft and rapes per 1,000 population, by district.
 - Official policies on domestic violence, weapons, control, crime prevention and violence at school.
 - Perceived insecurity by gender and ethnicity.
 - % of population using formal justice system.
 - Ratio of complaints to prosecutions for violence, sexual assault and theft.
- ✓ Safe and accessible urban design for parks, sanitation facilities, schools, markets and public [Slum upgrading](#) and urban safety programmes such as the [Safe and Friendly Cities for All](#) initiative; [gender](#)
 - % of population experiencing sexual violence, from verbal harassment to assault, in streets, transport

transportation, to support women, children, youth and persons with disabilities.

responsive, child friendly urban planning such as public lighting and women's safety audits in markets, transport and sanitation; zero tolerance policies to domestic/public harassment.

and public spaces.

- *Districts or settlements considered inaccessible by police.*
- *Municipal expenditure on protection and safety of women and girls in public spaces.*
- *Urban safety policy for women and youth.*

Land access and housing rights.

✓ Development of a rights-based, gender responsive framework for land access to protect residents from evictions, including the poor, squatters and indigenous groups.

The Global Land Tool Network and other partnerships; measurements such as the Right to Adequate Housing Toolkit, with a focus on indigenous groups, women and migrants.

- *% of households evicted or in fear of eviction.*
- *Legal protections for slums, including indigenous groups, from forced evictions.*
- *Available land information in informal areas.*

✓ Secure and transparent land registration processes for all, including the poor, with available routes to regularization or intermediary tenure.

Pro-poor land registration systems, guidelines such as the World Bank's Land Governance Assessment Framework or UN-Habitat's Legal and Institutional Framework Index, legal aid, participatory enumerations, regularization programmes and innovative tenure arrangements such as land proclamations, usufruct, land banks and land readjustment.

- *% of legal literacy and access to legal aid.*
- *% of households with titles, tax receipts or certificates of occupation, by gender.*
- *% of households with right to sell or inherit.*
- *Recognition of land rights, including customary rights.*

✓ Inclusive and gender responsive land financing and management to deliver upgrading and affordable housing for the urban poor.

Housing finance strategies, Public-Private Partnerships and other frameworks, including formal and non-formal credit mechanisms for women and men, social investment funds, land banks, community mortgages and local finance facilities.

- *% of urban population by tenure type (formal ownership, tenancy, squatter, other).*
- *Legal routes to secure or intermediary tenure.*
- *Transition from non-formal to formal tenure.*
- *% able to access formal housing credit and mortgages.*
- *% of municipal expenditure on social housing.*
- *Housing price and land cost-to-income ratio.*
- *% of new housing stock built illegally, yearly.*
- *Land or housing price-to-income ratio*

Bangladesh UNDAF (2012-16)

Key stakeholders are better able to provide the urban poor with secure tenure and affordable housing.

- *No. of programme towns where Government authorities clarify the tenure security status of low-income settlement dwellers.*

Cambodia UNDAF (2011-15)

By 2015, national and sub national institutions are more accountable and responsive to the needs and rights of all people living in Cambodia and increased participation in decision making.

- ✓ State institutions at national and sub-national levels better able to protect citizens' rights under the Constitution and provide effective remedies for violations, in particular those related to labour, children, land and housing, gender-based violence, indigenous people, people living with HIV and people with disabilities.
- *Gap in laws addressing protection of rights of children, women, workers, indigenous people, urban poor and people living with IPS, PLHIVS revised.*

- (Target for urban poor, 2013: Legal framework to regulate eviction and resettlement processes, in accordance with human rights standards, is in place).
Iran UNDAF (2012-16)

Improved national and sub-national capacities contribute to people living in/most at risk of capability poverty having enhanced access to and participating in education, health and social protection programmes which contribute to national human capital development.

- Capacity of relevant organizations for publicly supported housing programmes that include enhanced access of the poor is improved.
- Localized (tested and piloted according to national context) and integrated capability development approach to housing development (including addressing the issue of informal settlements) is in place.
- No. of trained government staff who have increased knowledge on design and management of household programmes (including addressing the issue of informal settlements) development in the context of capability development is increased.

2.3: Poverty Reduction and Employment

Challenges	Context
1. Urban poverty, though rising, is still largely invisible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Though poverty levels are typically lower in urban areas, these figures conceal concentrations of extreme poverty that are only captured in localized studies. As poverty estimates are often not disaggregated and many informal settlements are discounted from assessments, much of this poverty is unacknowledged.
2. Access to the rights and benefits of urban areas is unequal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A key characteristic of urban poverty is that the 'right to the city', including mobility, accessibility, public security and political participation, is unavailable for many poorer urban residents, particularly women, youth, slum dwellers, ethnic minorities and rural migrants.
3. Job opportunities are limited and of low quality, particularly for women and marginalized groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban economic and labour force growth has not been accompanied by proportional increases in employment, while increasing informalization and precariousness have also created a large number of workers in poor quality jobs, many of whom remain poor. Slum dwellers, women, youth and rural migrants often lack the skills or information to access productive employment.
4. The poor are inadequately protected from a variety of threats.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asia-Pacific cities expose the poor, particularly slum dwellers, to a range of hazards including financial crises, natural disasters, epidemics and riots. Lack of secure tenure is a central dimension of their vulnerability. Other challenges include overcrowding, high living costs and the absence of supportive mechanisms.

Strategies

1. Researching and identifying urban poverty.

Localized and disaggregated urban data collection.

- ✓ District and ward level profiles and assessments, with a focus on slums and poor areas, as well as women and vulnerable groups such as migrants and minorities.

Entry points

City profiles, local urban observatories, targeted sampling and city or national level data from censuses or household surveys, disaggregated for low income districts.

Sample indicators

- Poverty headcount ratio as % of urban population, by district, gender and ethnicity.
- % of urban population in slums.
- Population density, persons per km².
- Availability of locally disaggregated data,

- ✓ Holistic and participatory data collection that extends beyond income to include housing tenure, work status and other dimensions of urban inequality.

Community mapping, [enumerations](#), participatory GIS and other locally managed tools, with multi-dimensional measurements such as the [Habitat Agenda](#) or [Global Urban Indicators](#).

- including in informal settlements.
- Tenure security, employment, educational levels, nutritional status and service access.
- Basic living costs per household.
- Disaggregation of City Product and urban productivity measurements by income group, gender and tenure status.

See Annex 2 for more guidance on data gathering in urban areas.

Bangladesh UNDAF (2012-16)

By 2016, at least three million urban poor have improved living conditions and livelihoods to realize their basic rights.

- Urban extreme poverty rate in 28 urban areas as measured by Direct Calorie Intake.
- % of targeted urban poor households who report their living conditions have improved in the past 5 years.

Economic growth is achieved in an equitable manner, extending opportunities to the rural and urban poor and protecting the vulnerable from shocks.

- Per capita GDP growth at constant prices.
- Labour force participation rate, disaggregated by gender.
- % of poorest quintile in national consumption.

2. Delivering equitable access to the opportunities of cities.

Accessibility and mobility for marginalized groups.

- ✓ Extension of social and economic access to livelihoods, socialization and recreation to low income districts through the creation of civic spaces.

Community centres, local markets, green spaces, paved paths, safe roads and other civic amenities, with a focus on low income and informal areas.

- ✓ Implementation of a safe and well-connected transport system for all, especially women, the elderly and the disabled, with a particular focus on access and affordability in informal settlements.

Integration of public transit into slum upgrading; public-community partnerships for flexible and well regulated transport; pedestrian paths, cycling routes, bus lanes and other pro-poor options.

- Ratio of green space, paved paths and roads to total area, by district and tenure.
- No. of community centres, local markets and other civic amenities, by district or tenure.
- % of municipal expenditure on private, public and non-motorized transport modes.
- Average travel time to work, mins.
- % of population able to access formal public transport.

3. Ensuring open labour markets and safe, non-exploitative employment.

Pro-poor welfare, protections and equitable urban labour policies.

- ✓ Development of welfare and protective mechanisms

Health insurance; minimum wages; safety regulations; worker rights such as collective bargaining and

- % of unemployment, informal employment, vulnerable (own account/contributing family

for workers, including migrants and the informal sector, to improve the security and long term prospects of the urban poor.

- ✓ Promotion and protection of pro-poor livelihoods, with a particular focus on informal sector workers such as street vendors and waste recyclers.
- ✓ Investment in historic districts, to foster employment in tourism, crafts and creative related industries by harnessing cultural heritage, cultural resources and creativity for economic development

participatory budgeting; legal guarantees for rural and international migrants; inclusion of informal workers through legal recognition; worker-controlled cooperatives and integration into existing formal structures.

Legal protections for street vendors from harassment or punitive restrictions, transparent public rents, informal sector federations, public space and infrastructure for local markets.

[UNESCO's Creative Cities Network](#) and other cultural promotion initiatives, conservation and heritage protection policies, community managed crafts and tourism projects.

worker) employment and working poverty rate, by gender and age.

- *Safety regulations, minimum wages and worker rights, including migrants.*
- *Allocated public spaces such as markets for informal sector activities.*
- *Legislation outlining the rights and protections of informal sector workers.*
- *No. of jobs created through heritage sites and cultural creative activities, goods and services.*
- *Inclusion of cultural industries in national development policies.*

Mongolia UNDAF (2012-16)

Improved livelihood opportunities with a focus on the poor and vulnerable groups.

- A study of the informal sector will guide pilots of alternative-livelihood activities for herders, urban migrants and other poor people who have been adversely affected by economic and environmental factors.
- *% of people who report improvement in livelihoods (project areas).*

Bangladesh UNDAF (2012-16)

Gender equality and women's advancement.

- Marginalized and disadvantaged women in selected districts and urban slums increase their participation in wage employment and other income-generating activities.
- *Proportion of marginalized and disadvantaged women in the total female labour force participation in the selected districts and urban slums.*
- Marginalized and disadvantaged women in selected districts and urban slums have increased skills and knowledge leading to improved employability and entrepreneurship.
- *% of women and girls receiving vocational and entrepreneurial skills training in the selected areas who secured employment within six months of the training.*
- Marginalized and disadvantaged women in the poorest districts and urban slums have increased access to accurate, relevant information and credit.
- *% of women applied for institutional credit who received it without collateral in the selected areas.*

India UNDAF (2008-12)

Capacity of cities to undertake urban governance reform strengthened.

- *Capacities of city managers strengthened to protect and develop urban heritage (for employment generation and urban employment generation).*

Training, education and pro-poor credit mechanisms.

- ✓ Entrepreneurship support, technical training and apprenticeships for the urban poor, including for rural migrants, youth and other groups.

Basic training and skills development to advanced management and marketing programmes, with a focus on pro-poor areas such as recycling, urban agriculture and heritage.

- *Subsidized or affordable training programmes, in formal and informal sectors.*
- *No. of jobs created in pro-poor employment sectors.*

- ✓ Finance, grants and improved access to formal credit to poor urban entrepreneurs, including women, youth, minorities and the informal sector. Microfinance, seed capital and support to savings groups and credit associations, as well as expanding formal credit access to informal businesses through innovative loan mechanisms.
 - % of urban population with access to loans and credit, in formal and informal sectors.
 - Total value of business loans to poor urban residents, as % of city GDP.

India UNDAF (2008-12)

Strengthened design and implementation of national programmes and policies on poverty reduction for disadvantaged regions and groups, including women and girls.

- Disadvantaged and excluded groups equipped with quality and market driven skills and services for improved employability in select areas, including urban and peri-urban areas.
- National state and district level programmes improved for implementation and monitoring of select poverty reduction schemes and programmes (e.g. NREGS, Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission).

4. Strengthening the resilience of poor households to social, economic and environmental shocks.

Safety nets and social protection.

- ✓ Formal and non-formal mechanisms to protect the urban poor from a variety of vulnerabilities, including illness, unemployment, natural disasters and food shocks. Public implementation of a [Social Protection Floor](#) for the basic needs and services of the urban poor; social protection programmes such as unemployment benefits; safety nets such as food or cash transfers; community-based insurance and microcredit with a focus on women lenders.
 - % of urban poor with social protection.
 - % of urban poor receiving food subsidies, unemployment benefits or social insurance.
 - % of urban population with private or community based insurance.
- ✓ Multi-stakeholder consultation to promote linkages and collaboration between different sectors in urban areas. Health programmes with a strong food security element, environmental upgrading in slums with a component on land regularization, crime reduction strategies with youth 'reskilling'.
 - No. of urban programmes led by more than one agency, ministry or CSO.
 - No. of urban programmes with a multi-stakeholder consultation prior to rollout.
- ✓ Land regularization and slum upgrading. [See Governance section for more details on land regularization and slum upgrading.](#)
- ✓ Community-based environmental adaptation and mitigation. [See Environment section for more details on adaptation and resilience programmes.](#)

Bangladesh UNDAF (2012-16)

Urban poor have improved access to financial services and decent employment.

- % of targeted urban poor who have regular, decent employment.

Bangladesh UNDAF (2006-10)

Integrated response to meet the needs of urban poor and slum dwellers.

- Working children from slums and poor urban areas are provided with education, vocational training and livelihood skills.

2.4: Basic Services

Challenges	Context
1. <i>Urban service rates often conceal significant disparities, particularly for the poor.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources for services in a given area are often assigned on the basis of statistical averages, yet these can mask substantial variations within cities, districts and even neighborhoods. This can mean that accessibility issues for slum dwellers, low income households and smaller urban areas are not identified or even included in official estimates.
2. <i>Education and health access in slums is low and often worse than rural levels.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though cities enjoy better health and education levels overall, the poor face economic and institutional barriers to access. These include high fees, institutional marginalization and a lack of entitlement. The children of domestic or international migrants, as well as stateless juveniles, are particularly excluded.
3. <i>The threat of communicable diseases in cities remains high, particularly for slum dwellers.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban areas typically have higher levels of HIV/AIDs, while tuberculosis, malaria, dengue and other communicable diseases are ongoing challenges. Overcrowding, unsanitary conditions and a lack of services in many slums expose the poor to water-borne illnesses such as typhoid, cholera, diarrhea and viral hepatitis.
4. <i>Cities also face the challenge of rising non-communicable diseases, violence and traffic.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changing diets, poor urban planning and sedentary lifestyles are raising the incidence of diabetes, obesity and other NCDs. Traffic injuries, too, are on the rise as cities become dominated by private transport. Violent crime has also increased, due in part to widening inequality, and particularly affects the urban poor.

Strategies	Entry points	Sample indicators
1. Identifying and addressing gaps in urban services.		
Improved data collection on service access.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Mapping local education and health outcomes, with a particular focus on vulnerable groups such as stateless or migrant children, to identify priority areas for service delivery.</u> 	<p>City profiles and sample surveys of slums and migrant children, using tools like WHO's Urban (HEART) Tool or UN-Habitat's Urban Inequities Survey to identify disparities in urban health and education.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Collection and publication of service access data by district, including informal areas.</i> • <i>Use and application of variables such as political participation or tenure status that contribute indirectly to health and education outcomes.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Development of non-formal, community-based data collection to gain a clear picture of bottlenecks and access shortfalls.</u> 	<p>Community mapping, consultations and open platforms to engage leaders, local health workers, educators and other stakeholders in local assessments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>% of data collection teams resident locally.</i> • <i>% of data collection initiatives preceded by a consultation or substantive local participation.</i>
2. Prioritizing the urban poor's access to health, education and other services.		
Affordable and rights based service provision.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Creation of an overarching rights-based framework to guide public and private sector service delivery.</u> 	<p>Citizen's Charters, OHCHR's Right to Water and Sanitation Toolkit and international covenants such as the MDGs as guidelines, as well as implementation of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>International conventions, national constitutions and local commitments to inclusive delivery.</i> • <i>% of government spending on health/education.</i>

- ✓ Increased affordability of basic services to the urban poor through targeted financial assistance and subsidies. national commitments. Service pricing scales; social insurance to buffer out-of-pocket and emergency spending; other pro-poor delivery mechanisms such as educational stipends, cash transfer and annulment of user fees for basic consumption.
 - *No. of workers newly registered on social security.*
 - *Price of health care, water, education and other services as % of household income, disaggregated.*
 - *Pro-poor pricing policies for water and other services.*
 - *% of municipal expenditure allocated to pro-poor transfers.*

India UNDAF (2008-12)

Capacity of cities to undertake urban governance reform strengthened.

- Child and youth friendly services in place in key urban areas in order to influence JN-NURM policy and services towards children and youth.

Nepal UNDAF (2013-17)

Vulnerable and disadvantaged groups get improved access to basic essential social services and programmes in an equitable manner.

- National WASH programme and finance strategy formulated, approved, implemented and monitored to improve equity, sustainability and efficiency of the sector.
- *% of Joint Sector Review (JSR) policy recommendations and undertakings, including gender, social inclusion, urban issues and equity issues, are implemented in sector's planning cycle.*

Strengthened capacity to ensure local service delivery.

- ✓ Improved capacity and local resources to provide essential services to all urban residents, including poor and marginalized groups. Strategic frameworks, local resource transfers and other decentralization mechanisms, with a particular focus on secondary cities and peri-urban areas.
 - *% of urban households with access to public services, disaggregated for informal settlements, peri-urban areas and smaller cities.*

Indonesia UNDAF (2006-10)

By 2010, pro-poor democratic governance is realized with enhanced accountability, capacity and participation in the poorest provinces.

- By 2010, pro-poor participatory decentralization policies and mechanisms in place with a focus on public service delivery improvement in health, education, and social services.
- *% of people who believe that public facilities have improved with decentralization and UN-Habitat Urban Governance Indicators.*

Pro-poor capacity and service delivery.

- ✓ Qualitative delivery mechanisms, with a focus on inequity and vulnerability, to target at-risk and marginalized recipients and areas, including informal settlements and secondary urban areas. Nutritional support for children and pregnant or breast feeding mothers; inoculation programmes for infants in informal settlements; disabled access in schools; gender friendly sanitation; education for migrant or stateless children; UNAIDS' [Getting to Zero](#) strategy
 - *Maternal mortality, neo-natal mortality, nutritional status, immunization level, tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS rates, disaggregated.*
 - *Early childhood, pre-school, primary, lower secondary and secondary gross and net enrolment ratios and completion rates.*
 - *Literacy levels, by income, gender and disability.*

Bangladesh UNDAF (2006-10)

Institutional capacity and quality of human resources is enhanced.

- Reproductive health, ARH and EmOC services in particularly selected low performing districts poor urban areas and slums are functional and are able to respond.

Mongolia UNDAF (2012-16)

Equitable access to safe water and sanitation services in urban *ger* areas and rural settlements.

- % of population with improved access to basic urban services.
- % of population using an improved sanitation facility (target: 15% Ulaan Bataar *ger* area population).

Pakistan UNDAF (2004-08: extended to 2012)

Eradication, elimination and control of vaccine-preventable diseases through supplementary immunization activities and introduction of new and underused vaccines.

- Measles control through revitalization of routine EPI as well as 'crash programmes' in high-risk, highly populated urban areas.
- % routine immunization coverage rates of children <1.

Improved access to basic services through non-traditional mechanisms and multi-stakeholder partnerships.

- ✓ Innovative and community-led modes of service delivery for education and health, particularly in informal settlements, to increase access in hard-to-reach areas. Mobile libraries, door-to-door health workers, adult learning centres and other non-formal or community-based services delivered through advocacy and outreach, with a focus on decentralized primary health care (PHC).
- ✓ Intersectoral and multistakeholder collaboration between authorities, private operators, academics and local communities to improve access for the poor. Public-private partnerships (PPPs), public-community 'component sharing', trained local health workers, CSO programmes to connect formal services and the informal population.
- % of poor urban population covered by non-formal health or education services, with or without guidance from authorities or agencies.
- % of poor urban population unable to access formal public services.
- Proportion of public service programmes with a non-government partner, by private sector, international organization, CSO and community group.

Iran UNDAF (2012-16)

National capacities in providing holistic, integrated and quality primary health care services in urban areas especially for most at risk groups based on the family practice improved.

- Family practice model in urban areas is promoted.
- No. of trained health staff whose knowledge is increased in the field of family practice in urban areas.
- The family practice model for urban areas enhanced.
- No. of guidelines, standards and knowledge products developed, improved and piloted in accordance with national context.
- National PHC services, with a special focus on suburbs upgraded.
- No. of guidelines, standards and knowledge products developed, with a view to upgrade PHC services in suburbs.
- No of trained staff whose capacity is improved and know in particular how to provide family health services in suburbs.
- National PHC services upgraded with a special focus on suburbs.

Bangladesh UNDAF (2006-10)

Integrated response to meet the needs of urban poor and slum dwellers.

- Healthy cities and towns programmes are implemented.
- Urban slum dwellers in selected areas are provided with basic services including pre-school, quality non-formal education, health and hygiene education, nutritional support, and referral to EmOC through CSOs and City Corporations.

3. Reducing the threat of communicable diseases.

Urban environmental management and upgrading.

- ✓ Better services and urban design to reduce environmental risks, such as waterborne and respiratory illnesses, in informal settlements. Improved sanitation, drainage, solid waste management and shelter upgrading to reduce overcrowding and poor ventilation.
- % of population with clean water, improved sanitation and waste collection, disaggregated.
- No. of windows per room, by income.

Bangladesh UNDAF (2012-16)

Urban poor have better access to improved basic services and social assistance programmes.

- No. of beneficiary households in supported low-income settlements provided with improved access to: water (tubewell and water reservoir) and sanitation facilities (latrine).

Lao PDR UNDAF (2011-15)

By 2015, people in Lao PDR benefit from more equitable promotive, preventative, curative and rehabilitative health and social welfare services.

- Communities in small towns and vulnerable children and women have improved access to water and sanitation.
- No. of small towns with water and sanitation services.

Health education of local communities.

- ✓ Improved 'health literacy' of urban poor through educational drives on basic preventive measures to reduce health risks. Promotion of hand washing, contraception, child inoculations, food and water safety, good nutrition and other positive behaviours to lower the incidence of communicable disease.
- % of under-5 population inoculated against polio, measles, tuberculosis, tetanus and diphtheria.
- % of sexually active population using contraception, by gender and educational level.
- % of children practicing safe hand washing.

Laos UNDAF (2011-15)

By 2015, people in Lao PDR benefit from more equitable promotive, preventative, curative and rehabilitative health and social welfare services.

- Vulnerable and most-at-risk young people in priority urban areas have better access to quality youth-friendly, gender-sensitive, socially-inclusive sexual and reproduction health information and services.
- % of young people aged 15-24 in target areas that received adolescent sexual and reproduction health life skills education.
- % of target areas that have at least two youth-friendly sexual and reproductive health delivery service points.
- % of young people aged 15-24 that accessed youth-friendly services in their area.

4. Developing responses to non-communicable disease, traffic mortality and crime.

Healthy urban planning and urban nutrition to improve health.

- ✓ Increased physical exercise and recreation through better urban planning to reduce obesity, diabetes and other NCDs. Healthy planning features like cycling paths, pedestrian areas, parks and other spaces.
- Inclusion of public health components in national and local urban planning policies and guidelines.
- ✓ Promotion of healthy diets and food security. See Part II, 'Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Rural-Urban Linkages'.

Effective transport management to minimize injuries and fatalities.

- ✓ Lower incidence of traffic-related death and injury through a comprehensive road safety strategy, including pedestrians, cyclists and other non motorized users. Speed limits, traffic calming, helmet wearing, car-free zones, barriers and other [road safety](#) measures.
 - No. of traffic deaths, by cyclists and pedestrians.
 - Urban speed limits, km/h.
 - % of motorcyclists wearing helmet.

Urban management promotes safe planning, community based partnerships and outreach to reduce violence levels.

See Part II, 'Governance', for more information on safety and violence reduction.

2.5: Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Rural-Urban Linkages

Challenges	Context
1. Access to healthy and affordable food is limited, particularly for the urban poor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malnutrition and hunger are still widespread among the urban poor. Unlike in rural areas, slum dwellers often lack access to their own food supplies and therefore depend on bought goods that may be subject to price shocks or bottlenecks. The shift to processed foods has also led to a rise in obesity, diabetes and other NCDs.
2. Urban food systems are extended and complex, making them vulnerable to contamination, loss and waste.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban food supplies are increasingly reliant on industrial production, with complex systems of processing, refrigeration and transportation that are particularly exposed to waste, safety and quality issues. Street food, an important element of informal food supply, is also at risk of cross-contamination in unsanitary urban environments.
3. Connections between rural-urban development are poor, with fragmented regional food systems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination between rural and urban areas is weak. Governance linkages between cities and agricultural regions must therefore be improved, with better cooperation and information sharing to strengthen food systems. Small-scale agricultural producers should also be assisted in bringing their produce to urban markets.
4. The pressures of food consumption and production on water, land and energy are rising in both urban and rural areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While urban areas frequently lack adequate land for agriculture, the expansion of agro-industrial production in rural areas is stressing natural resources. Crisis-related migration from rural areas is also straining urban food and nutrition security. The resilience of urban food systems to shocks such as natural disasters is therefore crucial.

Strategies	Entry points	Sample indicators
1. Ensuring affordable and nutritious urban diets.		

Platforms and frameworks for affordable and accessible urban food supplies.

- ✓ Promotion of rights-based access in cities to healthy and nutritious urban diets, with an emphasis on access, affordability and food security for the most vulnerable. Frameworks such as the [Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food](#) and other initiatives such as the [Zero Hunger](#) campaign; price subsidies, food banks, farmers' markets and targeted transfers for at-risk households.
 - % of underweight/stunted under-5 year olds.
 - % of urban population overweight or obese.
 - Availability of major food items, by income.
 - % of population covered by nutrition programmes.
 - Composition of food items in diets, by income.

Bangladesh UNDAF (2012-16)

Food security and nutrition.

- The urban and rural poor have adequate food security and nutrition throughout the life cycle.
- % of population able to meet minimum daily energy requirements of 2122 kcal
- % of populations with poor or borderline diet diversity score by age group, sex of household head and socio-economic status.

Urban agriculture and husbandry.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| ✓ <u>Provision of sufficient urban and peri-urban space for urban poor to undertake agriculture, husbandry and related activities.</u> | Effective land and resource governance to map and allocate secure land plots for urban agriculture, rooftop gardens, vertical farms and urban forests for 'green cities'. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Area of tenure-secured urban and peri-urban lands available for agriculture, per capita.• Area of urban rooftop used for agriculture.• % of urban consumption produced locally. |
| ✓ <u>Training and skills development for urban agriculture.</u> | Municipal agricultural teams and 'right skilling' programmes with involvement of rural migrants to contribute to the knowledge continuum. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No. of urban residents provided with basic training in urban agriculture, per annum.• % of rural migrants with a livelihood in urban and peri-urban agriculture related activities. |
| ✓ <u>Measures to support the economic sustainability of urban agriculture through market access, credit and services.</u> | Financial and technical assistance for rural, peri-urban and urban farmers, with municipal organization of local markets and improved rural-urban supply chains. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No. of urban food stall areas and farmer's markets.• % of municipal expenditure used in urban and peri-urban agricultural development. |

2. Reducing waste and improving food safety.

Hygiene and efficiency guidelines to minimize food loss and waste and contamination.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| ✓ <u>Efficiency regulations for agro-industrial producers, farmers, traders and vendors to prevent and reduce food loss and food waste.</u> | Frameworks such as FAO's programme Save Food: Global Initiative on Food Losses and Waste Reduction , awareness raising initiatives such as the UNEP/FAO Think.Eat.Save campaign ; development of integrated rural-urban storage, transportation and distribution between smallholders and consumers. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• % of food lost or wasted at different stages of the rural-to-urban food supply chain.• % of urban areas covered by organic waste recycling programmes, including composting.• Policy and regulatory frameworks to optimize resource use of rural-urban food systems, including prevention/reduction of food loss and waste. |
| ✓ <u>Recycling and reuse of resources at every stage of the urban food supply chain.</u> | Subsidies and regulations to encourage grey water recycling and other best practices; initiatives such as food banks, composting and school or urban gardening. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Municipal membership of a recognized food association or federation.• No. of food banks and other initiatives for recovery and distribution of safe and nutritious produce.• Availability and quality of separate collection and networks for recycling of organic waste. |
| ✓ <u>Comprehensive hygiene guidelines and regulations for food producers, vendors and consumers to ensure a safe and healthy supply chain through</u> | Controls on pesticide use in rural and peri-urban areas; urban environmental codes to address land and water contamination; storage and transportation codes; | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Regulations on chemical use in agriculture in rural and peri-urban areas.• Frequency and quality of environmental |

the rural-urban system.

inspections of urban stalls, stores, restaurants, and hospitality facilities; capacity development and guidance for practitioners and private sector promotion of safe and nutritious food preparation guidelines for urban consumers.

assessments of urban water, air and soil quality.

- *Municipal expenditure and stakeholder accountability for street food safety and quality.*
- *Frequency and quality of food inspections in urban areas.*

Bangladesh UNDAF (2012-16)

Food security and nutrition.

- The rural and urban poor have improved knowledge and practices on nutrition, e.g. gender, hygiene, IYCF and food safety.
- *Proportion of targeted households following appropriate basic nutrition, hygiene and sanitation practices by beneficiary category.*

Environmental management to protect soil, water and other natural resources for urban and peri-urban agriculture.

- ✓ Strengthen regulations on water, land and forestry use to support urban agriculture, farms and fisheries, with measures to minimize health risks. [Land](#) and [water](#) use planning, protection of ground waters, improved sanitation and waste disposal, effective treatment of waste water to prevent cholera and parasites, regulation of husbandry to prevent bird flu and salmonella.
- *Natural resource regulations for land, water and forestry use to support agriculture.*
- *Health and health regulations for urban and peri-urban agriculture.*

3. Strengthening rural-urban linkages within the food system.

Improved rural-urban linkages.

- ✓ Mainstream urban-rural linkages into urban planning strategies, with greater coordination between rural and urban stakeholders. City-regional governance platforms for urban and rural stakeholders to develop strategies on food consumption and production, migration and city expansion; regional planning and economic integration between agricultural producers and urban consumers.
- *Food council or other regional governance structures for coordination, knowledge sharing and capacity building.*
- *Existence of a regional or metropolitan development plan.*

4. Improving the resilience and sustainability of urban and peri-urban food chains.

Social, economic and environmental resilience of agri-food systems.

- ✓ Assessment of the environmental and social dimensions of food systems, with up-to-date data and information on urban nutrition security, particularly in low income areas. Monitoring of urban hunger in poor areas and 'early warning' systems, with pilots on the multidimensional aspects of the city-region food system, as well as local dialogues and regional platforms such as FAO's [Food for Cities network](#).
 - *No. of programmes partnering nutrition, environmental and urban planning specialists.*
 - *Fluctuation in the cost/supply of basic food staples in response to droughts and floods.*
 - *Rural-urban migration as a proxy of agricultural stress.*
 - *Existence of a food and nutrition security component in urban DRR planning.*
 - *% of municipal expenditure allocated to food banks, nutritional assistance programmes and related areas.*
- ✓ Mainstreaming food and agricultural security into urban disaster prevention and contingency planning, with a particular emphasis on the poor's capacity to weather supply shocks. Multi-stakeholder platforms such as a city-regional food council or research working group, with the ability to respond to price shocks through stabilization strategies, food banks and safety nets such as subsidies or transfers.

Timor Leste UNDAF (2009-13)

By 2013, vulnerable groups experience a significant improvement in sustainable livelihoods, poverty reduction and disaster risk management within an overarching crisis prevention and recovery context.

- Government and other rural and peri-urban institutions have increased capacities for planning, formulating and implementing livelihoods initiatives, with a focus on agriculture.
- *No. of staff trained in selected districts in planning, formulating, and implementing livelihoods initiatives, with a focus on agriculture.*
- *No. of new livelihood initiatives set-up and run.*

Underdevelopment, underemployment and insecurity in rural areas are adequately addressed to reduce disaster-related migration to cities.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Integratation of rural welfare and development into regional planning to increase opportunities for circular migration and remittance earners.</u> | <p>Progressive registration systems; city-regional platforms to coordinate rural-urban linkages; flexible labour options for temporary workers; welfare frameworks for migrant families.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>% of urban migrants without legal registration.</i> • <i>Municipal employment framework for rural migrants in urban and peri-urban areas</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Social protection and 'reskilling' for arriving migrants to better manage rural-urban movements within a rights-based framework.</u> | <p>Labour protections, social welfare for migrants and their families, training programmes to support integration into urban labour markets, safety nets for family members in rural areas.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>% of children of migrants without access to education.</i> • <i>% of migrants without health insurance.</i> • <i>% of migrants working below minimum wage.</i> |

2.6: Environment, Climate Change and DRR

Challenges	Context
<p>1. <i>Urban development and resource consumption are increasingly unsustainable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cities in the Asia-Pacific are creating unsustainable levels of resource consumption and environmental degradation. Despite some positive examples of urban sustainability and energy efficiency, most are characterized by high levels of air pollution, water depletion, land contamination and unmanaged solid waste.
<p>2. <i>The negative environmental effects of cities are being borne disproportionately by the poor.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental challenges reflect broader social inequities. Slum populations are still growing, typically in the most sensitive urban areas, exposing more people to dangerous and unsanitary conditions. Insecure tenure further reinforces their exclusion from sanitation, waste management and disaster resilience programmes.
<p>3. <i>Asia-Pacific cities are especially vulnerable to natural disasters and climate change.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The region is the most exposed in the world to natural disasters. Combined with the effects of climate change and poorly managed urbanization, its cities are now acutely vulnerable. Their potential exposure in terms of population and assets will multiply significantly in future without effective mitigation and adaptation.
<p>4. <i>Urban development is often exacerbating, not resolving, environmental challenges.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban development in many Asian cities is actively promoting negative environmental outcomes. These include the reduction of green space, the formal development or informal settlement of environmentally sensitive areas, and the promotion of polluting behaviours such as private motorized transport.

Strategies	Entry points	Sample indicators
1. Promoting effective environmental stewardship and sustainable consumption.		
Efficient and renewable resource use.		
✓ <u>Shifting urban energy consumption towards conservation, efficiency and renewable sources in urban areas.</u>	Development of a comprehensive urban energy strategy drawing on best practices , including incentivization of renewable and low emission energy sources through local and global financial mechanisms like carbon markets and eco-budgeting , as well as efficiency measures such as smart planning and public transport.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenhouse gas emissions, tonnes per capita. • Urban expenditure on water treatment, air pollution controls and energy conservation. • Concentration of PM 2.5, SO2, NO2 and CO, no. of days/ year above acceptable levels (as defined by WHO standards).
✓ <u>Promotion of green construction strategies to reduce negative environmental impacts, including reuse and retrofitting of historic buildings.</u>	Building codes, energy efficient guidelines, low carbon building technologies and regulations or subsidies to encourage rehabilitation and retrofitting of existing building stock.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy efficient or retrofitting building regulations and subsidies. • % of historic building stock retrofitted in compliance with environmental standards.
✓ <u>Implementation of the principles of 'reduce, reuse and recycle' into energy and resource use.</u>	Policies, regulations and grants to encourage sustainable and efficient resource use through zoning, demand management, recycling and reuse of 'grey water' and other reusable waste, and conservation measures such as rainwater harvesting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy used for water treatment, waste disposal and other services. • % of municipal waste recycled. • No. and coverage of supportive policies for private and public sector to increase energy efficiency.
✓ <u>Regulation of air, water, land and noise pollution in urban areas.</u>	Effective monitoring of urban air , water and land pollution, 'polluter pays' legislation, fuel efficiency standards, zoning of polluting industry outside residential areas and noise monitoring.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Household distance from polluting industries. • Noise levels in dB in low income districts. • Existence and enforcement of pollution penalties.

Mongolia UNDAF (2012-16)

- Innovative technologies made available for energy efficiency, green growth and the abatement of urban air pollution.
- Decrease in energy / emission intensity of the country's economy and per-capita GHG emissions.

Iran UNDAF (2012-16)

National, sub-national and local capacities enhanced to ensure...effective use of knowledge and tools in prevention, control and response to current and emerging environmental pollutions.

- National capacities strengthened through sharing of information, knowledge and best practices on urban air pollution control measures with emphasis on non-vehicular methods as well as identification of noise and wave pollution deployment technologies.
- Localized (tested and piloted according to national context) urban air pollution measures in place.
- No. of knowledge products, standard operating procedures and best practices disaggregated by sector, function, geography, sex/age, etc.
- No. of trained government staff who have increased knowledge on how to use urban air pollution control methodologies and techniques.

2. Improving urban environments in slums and low income neighborhoods.

Environmental services and upgrading.

- ✓ Upgrading in vulnerable areas, with a major focus on environmental health and safety in slums. [Municipal waste](#) collection and sanitation through grants, tenure regularization, public investment in services and infrastructure, and inclusive community based management strategies.
 - Access to safe water, improved sanitation and waste collection in slums, including connection rates.
 - % of waste disposed of in sanitary landfill, burnt, dumped in open area, recycled or incinerated.

Bangladesh UNDAF (2006-10)

Carrying capacity of the environment and natural resources base is enhanced.

- Solid waste management strategy for urban environments is in place and under implementation.

Nepal UNDAF (2013-17)

Vulnerable and disadvantaged groups get improved access to basic essential social services and programmes in an equitable manner.

- Municipalities adopt and implement effective urban sector policies related to water, sanitation and shelter.
- % of slum-dwelling households in five select municipalities with improved living conditions.

Collective and community-led environment management.

- ✓ Community-owned responses to environmental degradation and disaster risk, including data collection. Social protection measures; education and training in tools like [participatory climate change assessments](#); community upgrading through subsidies, assistance and tenure regularization.
 - No. of participatory environmental programmes.
 - % of vulnerable population with land tenure.
 - Funds allocated to community upgrading.
- ✓ Provision of safe housing alternatives to communities in environmentally sensitive areas within a framework of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). [See Part II, 'Governance', for more details on slum upgrading and pro-poor land access.](#) Relocation, to secure, accessible, well serviced urban land elsewhere, should be the last resort.
 - Adequacy of housing, by durability, density and access to safe water and sanitation.
 - Rights-based land and housing framework.
 - % of urban population living in slums.

Lao PDR (2011-15)

By 2015, the government and communities better adapt to and mitigate climate change and reduce natural disaster vulnerabilities in priority areas.

- Community-based solid waste management and decentralized waste water treatment piloted.
- No. of towns with community-based solid waste management and waste water treatment.

3. Reducing urban vulnerability to natural disaster and climate change.

Disaster preparedness and resilience.

- ✓ Prioritization of environmental resilience in local budgets and development programmes. [Disaster preparedness budgeting](#), creation of a DRR [working group](#), tenure regularization and disaster insurance.
 - Local DRR strategy or task team.
 - Expenditure on DRR and climate mitigation.
 - Insurance and other financial risk reduction measures.

- ✓ Resilience measures for municipal planners, managers and developers to protect services, heritage and housing. [Hazard mapping; disaster insurance; building and planning regulations](#), such as minimum heights for electric outlets; disaster proofing [schools](#), [hospitals](#), sanitation and [urban heritage](#); safety measures for flooding.
 - ✓ Preparation of city level assessments and data collection on environmental vulnerability, including informal settlements, with a particular focus on climate change. [Strategic planning](#) on climate change and regular [risk assessments](#), [vulnerability assessments to climate changes](#), GIS hazard mapping and city resilience profiles, [early warning systems](#), [recovery plans](#), technical support from international networks and programmes.
 - ✓ Knowledge and awareness development on environmental risk and climate change among urban citizens in the formulation of action plans. [Awareness raising](#) through Making Cities Resilient Campaign, local media, school campaigns, training programmes and community groups.
- % of schools, hospitals or heritage sites with disaster management plans.
 - Disaster prevention and mitigation instruments, such as hazard mapping and building codes.
 - % of urban population and housing in low elevation coastal zones (LE CZ) and other vulnerable areas, by gender, income, ethnicity and migrant status.
 - Availability in number and quality of awareness raising materials for different target groups.
 - % of surveyed residents expressing concern about climate change or other environmental issues.
 - Hours per capita spent volunteering on environmental protection in urban areas.

Iran UNDAF (2012-16)

Disaster risk reduction and management concepts and standards integrated into national development policies / programmes and institutional, operational and coordination capacities for effective disaster risk reduction and response strengthened.

- Models and methodologies for retrofitting and enhancement of resilience of infrastructures and communities in all areas, with a focus on urban areas are in place.
- *No. of appropriate models and standards for DRR-based physical and non-physical as well as structural and non-structural retrofitting of the most vulnerable urban areas, taking into account the different needs of most at risk groups.*
Hazard prevention and risk reduction standards and methodologies related to the human environment identified, taking into consideration the different needs of most at risk groups.

Maldives UNDAF (2011-2015)

Conduct research on the needs and capacity of women and young people in the area of disaster risk reduction to inform policy development and planning.

- *No. of studies, surveys and assessments undertaken on emerging population issues, such as the impact of climate change on gender and youth, migration and urbanization.*

Mongolia UNDAF (2012-16)

Reduced risks and consequences of natural and manmade disasters at national and community levels.

- National climate and disaster risk management capacities improved.
- *Safety standards and procedures in place for social services infrastructure and urban planning.*

Nepal UNDAF (2013-17)

Urban populations are better able to prepare for and manage hazard and climate change adaptation risk.

- Municipalities have disaster-resilient/risk-sensitive land-use plans, improved mandatory by-laws and enforcement of building codes.

- *No. of municipalities that have disaster-resilient/risk-sensitive land-use plans, improved mandatory by-laws, and enforcement of building codes*
- *No. of municipalities that incorporate disaster risk management and climate change in their periodic plans and implement eco-city-based pilot projects.*
- *No. of municipalities with emergency preparedness and response plans developed, adopted and capacity-tested.*

Environmental protection and land use regulations.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Protection and rehabilitation of green space, local biodiversity and eco-systems such as forests, mangroves and wetlands in urban areas to mitigate extreme weather events and stabilize the environment.</u> | <p>Biodiversity plans and ecological networks in line with Agenda 21 and as part of disaster resilience; localized assessments such as the City Biodiversity Index; knowledge sharing with ICLEI and other organizations.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No. of projects, budgetary allocation, capacity and partnerships for biodiversity.</i> • <i>Stabilization capacity of urban ecologies, by canopy cover and permeable areas.</i> • <i>Legal protection of urban biodiversity.</i> • <i>Existence of local environmental plans.</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Balanced and sustainable urban expansion through 'smart' planning to minimize unplanned expansion and degradation of agricultural land.</u> | <p>Protected agricultural green belts and environmental zoning, city region planning strategies, regulations to encourage compact housing development and efficient land use.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Annual loss of agricultural land, in km².</i> • <i>Population density in newly expanded areas.</i> • <i>% of urban growth that is planned.</i> • <i>Local urban and environmental management plans</i> |

Afghanistan (2006-08)

By 2008, key stakeholders can better manage environmental problems, distribution and use of environmental resources, and understand the principles of sustainable development.

- Sectoral environmental and natural resource management plans, particularly for poor and vulnerable groups, strengthened in urban and peri-urban areas, including on pollution and waste management issues.
- *No. of programmes developed and implemented to improve environmental conditions in urban/peri-urban areas.*

China UNDAF (2011-15)

Policies and regulations are strengthened to create a green economy.

- Sustainable eco-cities are created through sustainable urban development and planning.
- *No. of sustainable urban development plans developed or updated towards development of sustainable cities.*

Lao PDR UNDAF (2011-15)

By 2015, the government ensures sustainable natural resources management through improved governance and community participation.

- Government has comprehensive participatory development plans for urban wetlands and is able to implement them.
- *Master plan for individual urban wetlands developed.*
- *No. of hectares of urban wetland brought under management plan.*

Green development and liveability.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Public, affordable and low polluting forms of urban transport that enhance, not compromise, the wellbeing of the urban poor.</u> | <p>Cycle paths, walkways, designated bus lanes and best practices in sustainable urban transportation, such as transit-oriented development.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Green space, per capita and % of urban area.</i> • <i>Proportion of daily journeys by transport modes, public, private and non-motorized.</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>City framework for the conservation of heritage, to</u> | <p>Socially inclusive heritage management; UNESCO's</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Existence and implementation of urban policies for</i> |

ensure socially and economically vibrant urban areas for all, including the urban poor.

[Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape](#); initiatives such as the [Creative Cities Network](#).

- *conserving cultural heritage.*
• *% of urban heritage sites that are protected.*

Annex: Additional Tools

A.1: Key Questions for Integrating Urbanization into Country UNDAFs

A.2: Strengthening Urban Data

A.3: Combining Local, National and International Capacity

A.4: Promoting Cross-sectoral Linkages

A.5: Task Team Members and Contact Points

A.6: Development Partners with a Focus on Urbanization

A.7: Selected Reading

A.1: Key Questions for Integrating Urbanization into Country UNDAFs

A.1.1 ROADMAP

Have the full range of stakeholders in urban areas been identified and engaged?

Urban areas typically encompass a wide variety of public, private and civic actors. This presents considerable opportunities for collaboration, but can also make the process of outreach more challenging for country teams. In particular, there must be substantive engagement of municipal authorities, as well as central government, to ensure meaningful local design and delivery. It is also important at this stage to identify the most vulnerable urban stakeholders. Given their frequent marginalization within communities, this requires pro-active measures from the country team to ensure that consultations, dialogues and other participatory processes are truly representative.

Have international, national and local structures been effectively identified by the UNCT?

Many successful urban programmes are delivered through local mechanisms while drawing on national and international support to fill gaps in knowledge and capacity. This can be achieved through a mapping of national policies, programmes and key actors, with a focus too on providing an initial overview of country team capacity. **Annex 3** outlines this phase in more detail, with an illustrative case study of the Child Friendly Movement in the Philippines. At this stage, the UNCT should develop the coordination arrangements and ensure alignment between the preliminary UNDAF outlines and national planning processes.

A.1.2 COUNTRY ANALYSIS

What are the existing knowledge gaps?

This depends on the availability of national and international survey or census data, but even with these basic mechanisms in place the overall picture may be partial or incomplete. Urban data, for instance, may not be disaggregated to reflect specific vulnerabilities related to gender, ethnicity or migrant status. It may also exclude many areas, such as slums or informal settlements, where the need for solid data is most acute. The review of existing analysis and data should highlight any significant gaps.

How can these knowledge gaps be filled?

Effective and reliable data is a prerequisite for urban programming, but country teams should minimize the burden where possible by utilizing existing channels of data collection. Depending on circumstances, country teams may wish to support government-led research or undertake complementary small-scale surveys themselves. In slums or informal settlements, if these have been excluded from existing analysis, this can be achieved through local partners and community collaboration. Alternatively, if capacity is insufficient, the UNCT may choose to undertake a full Common Country Assessment.

What are the key vulnerabilities and rights gaps to be addressed?

The most vulnerable urban groups, such as slum dwellers and migrants, are frequently invisible in official data or policy development. This is a reflection not just of poverty but also of rights gaps. To reduce urban inequalities, these institutional barriers must be addressed.

What are the cross-sectoral linkages and opportunities for urban programming?

At this stage, it is valuable to identify any potential areas of overlap between different sectors to strengthen the resilience and efficiency of urban programming. Urban health interventions, for instance, should consider how nutrition and environmental components may also support better health outcomes. **Annex 4** presents a detailed outline of the major linkages between sectors and can be used to guide discussions.

What are the

UN country teams should evaluate their current capacity for urban

comparative advantages of UN country teams in engaging in urban areas?

programming, either directly with focused projects or through general programming that includes urban or peri-urban areas. Furthermore, they should also consider how much of their existing work in rural areas could be replicated in cities as an initial entry point. This process should include consideration of the successes and failures of previous interventions, as well as the current activities of donors, national organizations and CSOs.

A.1.3 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND THE UNDAF RESULTS MATRIX

What are the key priorities for urban intervention?

Inter-agency platforms, such as Delivering As One United Nations, can be especially useful in determining the most important entry points in a particular context. The specific challenges of urban areas vary from country to country, so UNDAFs should develop a clear set of priorities for interventions. **Part II** provides examples of different UNDAF targets and indicators in urban areas to illustrate how various country frameworks have identified key issues to inform country programming.

How can these be incorporated into existing work?

Country teams should consider how urban priorities can be best achieved, whether through the designation of a specific task team or development programme, on the one hand, or through the integration of urbanization as a crosscutting issue throughout agency activities.

How will the urban intervention support national development strategies and UNDAF programming principles?

Having reviewed national policies and programmes at the roadmap stage, the country team should attempt to identify potential areas of alignment in their own intervention. The outputs should also align with the five core UNDAF programming principles:

Human rights-based approach: Urban poverty and vulnerability is frequently underlined by rights gaps. Mainstreaming a human rights-based approach into programmes is therefore essential to identify and effectively respond to urban inequalities.

Gender equality: This can span gender-based violence in cities, tenure security, public safety, economic participation, access to basic services, food security and other areas. Given the particular complexities of gender inequities in urban areas, all urban programmes should be responsive to the social, economic and environmental aspects of gender inequity in their design.

Environmental sustainability: The density of urban populations, especially in informal settlements and slums, places unique pressures on urban environments. Environmental sustainability, in an urban context, demands detailed consideration of the human interactions that create unsanitary conditions, pollution and other challenges.

Capacity development: To ensure the long term sustainability of urban programming, particularly in technical fields such as planning or disaster management, a component on knowledge transfer to develop national capacity in these areas should be included.

Results-based management: This reflects the ability of UNCTs and partners to effectively plan and assess the costs and impacts of interventions. These processes are supported by an effective system of indicators (see **Annex 3**), with the substantive involvement of local partners or community stakeholders, and reinforced by effective monitoring and evaluation.

What will the

Assessing the expected gains from any urban intervention is essential

advantages be? before initiating the programme. This provides a benchmark to measure against the resources required for delivery, as well as a baseline to compare with final outcomes to support future learning. It is important to involve as wide a range of stakeholders as possible in this assessment to ensure that the corollary effects of the intervention on other sectors, positive or otherwise, are also considered.

How can these best be achieved? This will depend on the particular resources and expertise of the UN country teams. At this stage, UNCTs may wish to engage external support from regional UN country offices to strengthen knowledge and capacity in key areas. Other important considerations are the availability of internal funding (from government, the private sector and other actors) as well as the potential contribution of international donors. **Annex 3** provides an overview of key international, national and local stakeholders.

What role should the UN Country Team play in urban programming? Country teams should consider how their impact can be optimized within the particular constraints of their local context. While the UNCT may have an established operational programme in a priority area, potentially justifying a direct programme delivery role, the teams may be better positioned to contribute technical or advisory support to the national government in the design and development of public programmes. The government itself may already have identified knowledge gaps within its own programmes, such as disaster management, urban planning or public safety, where country teams and regional UN partners can contribute.

Furthermore, having undertaken stakeholder mapping and engagement at the roadmap stage, the country team may have identified an existing CSO, research network or other platform already delivering effectively in one or more of the focus areas. If so, it may be more productive for UNCTs to contribute funding, advocacy or technical assistance to these organizations rather than replicating their work in a new programme.

A.1.4 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

How can indicators be linked to MDGs, national goals and post-2015 targets? While indicators should be tailored to local contexts, they can reference established frameworks such as the Millennium Development Goals, the Habitat Agenda and emerging post-2015 guidelines, as well as national strategies or development frameworks. Some examples of urban data collection are presented in **Annex 2**.

How do indicators measure short and long term change? Urban programmes may deliver both immediate and long term benefits that must be captured in monitoring and evaluation assessments. A nutrition programme, for example, may raise calorie consumption in a target area while also, over a longer period, delivering improvements to educational outcomes. Country teams should, where possible, include both in their assessments.

How can regular monitoring and evaluation be conducted? Country teams should endeavour to regularly assess programme impacts while minimizing the time and resource burden. UNCTs should therefore plan how systems can be set up – for example, by sharing surveys with other agencies – to ensure the process is conducted as efficiently as possible. Given the substantial linkages between different sectors, urban areas offer significant potential for interagency collaboration on data collection. Country teams should also have processes in place to maintain engagement with community-based data collection structures to ensure these remain active for evaluations.

A.2: Strengthening Urban Data

One of the main barriers to effective developmental programming in cities is the paucity of reliable and meaningful data. In general, the limited information that is available tends to obscure rather than illuminate the particular problems of urban poverty. The statistics gathered for inclusion in an UNDAF, Country Development Report and other national or international assessments are typically presented as a comparison between rural and urban outcomes. Since most urban indicators are similar or better, at an aggregate level, this may have the effect of highlighting the disparities between cities and their less developed rural areas. This is both a cause and reflection of the ongoing bias of development assistance towards rural areas, both from states themselves and their international partners.

However, though rural underdevelopment remains a pressing area of focus, this perspective nevertheless overlooks the significant inequalities that exist between different cities within countries – in particular, the gap between a large capital and a secondary city or town – and also, importantly, within them. For a large segment of the urban population across the Asia-Pacific, in fact, cities are creating new patterns of deprivation and disempowerment.

Yet this truth is routinely concealed in overall urban averages. Given that inequalities are especially high in many cities, with a gulf in living standards between richer and poorer households comparable to that between developed and developing countries, national urban figures often have a very limited bearing on the situation of the most marginalized residents, such as slum dwellers.

Finally, urban poverty has distinct characteristics to rural poverty that are still not adequately understood. The particular

barriers, in insecure housing, lack of political rights, unsanitary conditions and violence, mean that it cannot be assessed with the same tools and methodologies as rural poverty. Improved data collection is an important first step towards more effective and targeted programmes in urban areas.

Seven Steps to Developing a MDG City Profile

Step 1: Establish a permanent task team for monitoring MDGs at the local level.

Step 2: Choose the goals and targets that matter most to your city, along with corresponding outcome indicators.

Step 3: Agree on methodologies and definitions that fit the local context.

Step 4: Add specific, locally-relevant indicators.

Step 5: Identify sources of information and collect the baseline data.

Step 6: Use the results to prepare an MDG City Profile.

Step 7: Use the results to identify priorities, formulate an action plan and set specific targets.

Source: [UN-Habitat \(2006\), *Localising the Millennium Development Goals: A Guide for Local Authorities and Partners*](#)

There are a number of broad principles that can be mainstreamed into any information gathering exercise in urban areas, from a small-scale survey or community consultation to a city profile or national census:

Data must be localized and disaggregated

Given the scale of most urban areas, city or country level data is not adequate to target the most serious shortfalls. Urban data should be disaggregated between differently sized cities, but also separated by neighborhood or district to identify outcomes in local areas. However, this is only part of the process. At a local level, even within a small community, it is essential to identify 'who' as well as 'how many' are being left behind. Service gaps result from a lack of rights as well as a lack of

capacity that must also be addressed if the most excluded – including women, children, migrants, minorities or persons with disabilities – are to be reached. Identifying these vulnerabilities can help guide a more qualitative ‘last first’ approach to programming.

Creating a City Profile – the Case of Mumbai

Mumbai is one example of a city that has mapped out a detailed picture of its urban poverty and service access. The *2009 Mumbai Human Development Report*, as well as outlining the city’s current challenges, also disaggregates local data on literacy, health and other developmental outcomes. This has enabled the authorities to track indicators across different wards and identify areas with especially high slum levels or access constraints.¹²⁸ More recently, a similar approach was adopted with India’s first nationwide survey of its informal settlements, the *Slum Census 2011*.¹²⁹

Indicators should be multi-dimensional

Urban poverty can involve a complex range of social, economic, environmental and institutional threats that are not adequately captured if assessed by income alone. This is in line with the general trend towards more holistic measurements, beyond the simple \$1.25 baseline – for example, the Multidimensional Poverty Index now employed in UNDP’s annual Human Development Report – but is particularly necessary in urban contexts where the impacts of shelter, health, livelihoods, service access and other areas are so closely interlinked. Urban poverty measurements must therefore be able to reflect this by using a variety of direct and indirect variables to assess security, resilience and vulnerability.

¹²⁸ Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai (2010), [Mumbai Human Development Report 2009](#).

¹²⁹ Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India (2013), [Report of the Committee on Slum Statistics/Census](#).

The Urban HEART Tool

Urban HEART (Health Equity Assessment and Response Tool) is a research instrument developed by the World Health Organization to identify health disparities within cities. One of the strengths of the tool is the fact that, besides the outcomes of mortality and disease, it also measures indirect or structural factors such as governance, physical environment, economics and human development that also contribute to health outcomes¹³⁰. This enables policy makers and service providers to develop a more comprehensive and multi-sectoral strategy to improve urban health.

Research must be inclusive and participatory

One of the contributing obstacles to effective urban poverty reduction is the fact that, in many cities, authorities do not acknowledge many of their poorest districts. As a result, slums, informal settlements and peri-urban communities located outside the official municipal boundaries are frequently excluded from censuses, household surveys and other records. This perpetuates their vulnerability by rendering it invisible. Data collection must therefore ensure that the most marginalized groups and locations are represented. To achieve this, however, often requires the use of more responsive and localized methods in informal settlements.

Community led approaches such as participatory enumerations and mapping are important ways to establish trust in marginalized urban areas and enable the poor to input into data collection processes, so producing a fuller picture of local poverty.

Community Led Research in Cuttack, India

In Cuttack, India, an association of women’s savings groups partnered with the National Slum Dwellers Federation to profile the

¹³⁰ WHO (2010), [Urban HEART \(Health Equity Assessment and Response Tool\)](#).

environmental vulnerability of more than 300 informal settlements in the city. With technical support from other organizations, it also undertook GIS mapping of these areas. This provided the local government with a valuable information source for their own programming.¹³¹

Methods can be creative and cross-sectoral

Conducting research in urban areas, particularly slums, poses particular challenges to reliable data collection. However, there is also substantial opportunity for innovative approaches, such as the use of proxies – for instance, waste collection as an indicator of effective local governance. In addition, besides small-scale and flexible participatory methods like community mapping, there is potential to combine surveys with other ministries, agencies or CSOs. Urban areas, given the close intersection of different sectors, are well suited to collaborative data collection and sharing of expertise. Food researchers, for instance, would benefit from environmentalists monitoring pollution or health inspectors gathering data on hygiene.

'Piggybacking' and the value of collaboration

One approach to more efficient and cost effective data collection in urban areas is to 'piggyback' another survey. This not only provides the secondary partner with the information they require at a lower cost than would have otherwise been possible, but also may provide the main collecting agency with a larger data field at the end of the process. UN-Habitat has successfully used this method to compile its Urban Inequities Survey in Dhaka

¹³¹Livengood, A. (2012), 'Enabling Participatory Planning with GIS: A Case Study of Settlement Planning in Cuttack, India.' *Environment and Urbanization*, **24**(1). Cited by Satterthwaite, D. Mitlin, D. and Patel, S. (2011). *Engaging with the Urban Poor and their Organizations for Poverty Reduction and Urban Governance: An Issues Paper for the United Nations Development Programme*, pp.8-9.

and other cities through their Demographic and Healthy Surveys¹³². Though this approach needs careful design and implementation, it is one example of how urban data collection can be improved through collaboration.

Some good examples of urban data collection tools are listed here as starting points for more effective urban data collection:

- **UN-Habitat, [Proposed Sustainable Development Goal: Sustainable Cities and Settlements](#).**
In line with the Rio+20 recommendations of 'Sustainable Development Goals', UN-Habitat has proposed an urban sustainability target with 11 targets to guide post-2015 urban programming.
- **UN-Habitat, [Urban Governance Index](#).**
This measures local governance, using a range of indicators on effectiveness, equity, participation and accountability.
- **WHO, [Urban Health Equity Assessment and Response Tool \(HEART\)](#).**
HEART assesses intra-urban disparities in health, with a variety of direct and indirect indicators, including variables in economic and governance.
- **UNICEF/Global City Indicators Facility, [UKID Urban Index of Child Development](#).**
This set of measures is designed to gauge the child friendliness of an urban area across four categories: a good start to life; protection from harm; education and knowledge; and standard of living.
- **UN-Habitat, [Habitat Agenda Indicators](#).**
These were developed to monitor the 'Cities Without Slums' target more holistically, with 20 additional indicators to the MDGs that provide a more holistic assessment of slum dweller lives.
- **Council for the Welfare of Children, [Child 21](#).** This tool comprises a set of 24

¹³² UN-Habitat (2010), *Monitoring Security of Tenure in Cities*, p.21.

indicators, created in the Philippines to support national and local authorities in implementing 'Child Friendly' cities.

- **[The Global City Indicators Facility](#).**
This is a comprehensive database of 115 urban indicators in 20 different 'themes'.

- **UN-Habitat, [City Prosperity Index](#).**
The index measures productivity, infrastructure, quality of life, equity and environmental sustainability for a more holistic assessment of urban economic development.

A.3: Combining Local, National and International Capacity in Urban Programming

Though urban programs are in general best delivered locally, there is considerable opportunity for national and international guidance or support to inform design and delivery. Well integrated cooperation between municipalities, governments and international agencies or networks can improve outcomes and ensure efficient resource use. A general overview of the key frameworks, actors and tools that can be leveraged in urban programmes is provided in the box below. This mapping of urban stakeholders at different levels should be undertaken by policy makers and service providers to identify potential areas of collaboration.

Some of the most successful urban programmes have been delivered through cooperation and knowledge sharing between global, national and local partners, resulting in highly localized delivery that is nevertheless informed by international best practice and the most effective tools available. The table below of the Child Friendly Movement in the Philippines gives an overview of how, by combining international specialist research, clear national leadership and a strongly decentralized model of urban governance, stakeholders were able to meaningfully adapt the guidelines of the Convention of the Rights of the Child to the particular context of each municipality.

Stakeholders and Resources at a Global, National and Local Level

Global

Frameworks and Guidelines: International human rights conventions, regional agreements, MoUs.

Actors and Partners: International organizations, regional platforms such as city-to-city partnerships and knowledge sharing networks, global solidarity groups, private companies and investors.

Funding and Technical Assistance: International development assistance, trade agreements, foreign direct investment, development agency programmes, technical support programmes, foundations.

National

Frameworks and Guidelines: State constitutions, legal codes and statutory acts, national urban or municipal policies, [Universal Periodic Reviews](#)

Actors and Partners: Executive office and government ministries (including finance, environment, health, education, trade and others), national urban task teams, advisory committees or working groups, national research units and universities, private service operators and developers, philanthropic foundations.

Funding and Technical Assistance: National and ministerial budgets, research programmes, private sector funding, technical assistance.

Local

Frameworks and Guidelines: Municipal laws and procedures, citizen's charters and other municipal commitments, local service agreements.

Actors and Partners: Municipal authorities, local Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) (such as women's groups and saving federations), academic researchers, local businesses, community stakeholders

(including elected local representatives), vulnerable/ marginalized groups (including women, youth, migrants and minorities).

Funding and Technical Assistance: Municipal budgets, local tax revenue (including land and property levies), community consultations, participatory data collection and programme design.

The Child Friendly Movement in the Philippines – International, National and Local Components in Successful Urban Programming

	<i>Global</i>	<i>National</i>	<i>Local</i>
<i>Framework for Action</i>	<p>United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989).</p> <p>UN Special Session on Children (2002).</p> <p>Millennium Development Goals.</p> <p>Child Friendly Cities initiative.</p>	<p>2000 Philippine National Development Plan for Children ('Child 21'): the framework for the design of local child-friendly development plans.</p> <p>Child Friendly Movement (CFM): launched by government and UNICEF to support communities in development of child friendly urban policy.</p> <p>Medium-Term Development Plan for the Philippines (1999-2004).</p> <p>Fifth UNICEF Country Programme for Children (1999-2003).</p>	<p>Local Development Plans for Children (LDPCs): developed by cities and municipalities to deliver child friendly communities, in line with the CFM.</p> <p>League of Cities and the League Provinces: regional associations of urban and provincial administrations to articulate local governance concerns, including CFM.</p> <p>1991 Local Government Code: this established code on decentralized urban governance enabled the subsequent rollout of the CFC movement in municipalities.</p>
<i>Actors and Partners</i>	<p>UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre: Secretariat of the Child Friendly Cities initiative.</p> <p>UNICEF Headquarters (New York).</p>	<p>The Philippine government: oversaw development of national CFM framework.</p> <p>Council for the Welfare of Children (CWC): set up and funded by the government to supervise CFC programmes.</p> <p>UNICEF country team: supported mobilization and coordination of CFM.</p> <p>Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University: provided essential research assistance to CFM programme.</p>	<p>City mayors and municipal councils.</p> <p>CFC assessment committees (CFCs): made up of officials from <i>barangays</i>, the smallest units of government, for localized CFM programmes.</p> <p>Barangay Councils for the Protection of Children (BCPCs): set up by some municipalities to protect women and children's welfare.</p> <p>'Youth councils' and child participants.</p> <p>Local NGOs, CSOs and media: includes civic, religious and youth groups</p> <p>Local academics and researchers.</p>
<i>Resources and Funding</i>	<p>Guidance and research from UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre and partners.</p>	<p>President's Social Fund allocations from the national government for the implementation of Child 21 by CWC.</p> <p>Supportive technical assistance and enabling legal environment from the national government to facilitate local rollout.</p> <p>Guidance and coordination from academics and UNICEF Philippines.</p>	<p>Creation of local CFM municipal bodies to guide policy and funding towards child friendly outcomes.</p> <p>Development of child charters and other local CFM frameworks.</p> <p>Training, dialogues, community surveys and local CFC assessments.</p> <p>CFM's accreditation system, with 24 priority indicators.</p>

A.4: Promoting Cross-Sectoral Linkages

Many organizations operating in development and technical assistance have been moving towards greater integration to encourage a more multidimensional approach in their work. The United Nations, for instance, through its 'Delivering as One' initiative, has been developing cooperative inter-organizational frameworks in a number of pilot countries to improve efficiency by leveraging the combined strengths of each agency. This form of collaboration is especially well suited to urban areas, given the close interaction between different dimensions of poverty, and there have been many examples of successful partnerships in Asia-Pacific cities.

Working together for better cities – some examples of shared urban programmes within the UN

The Sustainable Cities Programme (UNEP and UN-Habitat): Beginning in the 1990s, this joint programme enabled UNEP and UN-Habitat to combine their respective expertise in environmental management and urban planning to support local authorities in the sustainable governance of their cities. With donor and technical support from UNDP, ILO, the World Bank and various national development agencies, the initiative continued until 2008, with pilot projects in secondary cities in China, India and Vietnam¹³³. Building on these achievements, their 2008-13 Partnership Framework committed to continued cooperation to achieve greater urban sustainability.¹³⁴

Safe and Friendly Cities for All (UN Women, UNICEF and UN-Habitat): This partnership, initiated in 2011, is developing programmes across the world to promote the protection and wellbeing of women, youth and children in urban areas. Among other cities, it is planning to launch pilot projects in Metropolitan Manila in the Philippines.¹³⁵

Hidden Cities (World Health Organization and UN-Habitat): This joint publication was the result of collaborative research between WHO and UN-Habitat to develop a comprehensive analysis of the current context of urban health. It is now one of the definitive sources on the health threats of unmanaged urbanization and the benefits that can be achieved at all levels through 'healthy' urban planning.¹³⁶

Heritage Cities Preservation and Rehabilitation, MoU (UNESCO and World Bank): One of the main components of the MoU signed between UNESCO and the World Bank in 2011 was the protection and restoration of urban heritage and culture. This will serve as a platform for both organizations to work together to rehabilitate historic cities while developing their economic potential through sustainable tourism.¹³⁷

This section presents a detailed overview of the overlapping challenges and opportunities between different UNDAF pillars to illustrate how these fields can strengthen or undermine outcomes in other sectors, depending on how effectively they are integrated into programme design. This can serve as a preliminary map for country teams to see how, for example, health programmes may be compromised by food insecurity or poor environmental management, as well as the ways that these different areas can be mutually supportive.

¹³³ UN-Habitat, [Sustainable Cities Programme](#).

¹³⁴ UNEP and UN-Habitat (2008), [Urban Environment: Partnership Framework 2008-13](#).

¹³⁵ UN Women, UNICEF and UN-Habitat (2011), [Safe and Friendly Cities for All](#).

¹³⁶ World Health Organization and UN-Habitat (2010), [Hidden Cities: Unmasking and Overcoming Health Inequities in Urban Settings](#).

¹³⁷ The World Bank (2011), [The World Bank and UNESCO – Expanding Opportunities for Collaboration on Culture and Sustainable Development](#). July 1, 2011.

A.4.1: Promoting Cross-Sectoral linkages: Governance

Poverty Reduction and Employment

<i>How can governance undermine sector?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclusion and eviction of slum dwellers exacerbates poverty. • Profit-led urban development can lead to ‘jobless’ growth and impact negatively on the poor. • Insecure tenure in slums undermines business and asset development. • Limited protection and rule of law in poor and informal areas weakens economic growth and job creation.
<i>How can sector undermine governance?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban poverty increases pressure on resources and reduces the tax base. • Unemployment and underemployment, particularly among youth, as well as social inequality, can encourage social unrest.
<i>How can governance contribute to sector goals?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition and targeting of vulnerable groups, especially in slums. • ‘Right skilling’ of youth, women, rural migrants and other groups to increase market access. • Land regularization to strengthen economic security. • Heritage management to create livelihoods in tourism and creative industries.

Basic Services

<i>How can governance undermine sector?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak or inequitable governance leads to service gaps for poor households. • The poor may be denied rights to service access due to political marginalization. • Ineffective governance can lead to monopolization of service delivery by private organizations and criminal gangs.
<i>How can sector undermine governance?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service shortfalls weaken the ability of the poor to politically participate and undermine the credibility of local authorities. • Problems (such as unsanitary conditions) and shortfalls (inaccessible health care) can together lead to urban crises (such as epidemics).
<i>How can governance contribute to sector goals?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective decentralization and urban subsidies to improve services. • Rights-based approaches to support delivery of ‘last mile’ to urban poor. • Development of community partnerships to develop non-formal mechanisms of service delivery to hard-to-reach communities.

Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Rural-Urban Linkages

<i>How can governance undermine sector?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of dynamic protective mechanisms leads to price shocks and bottlenecks. • Poor rural-urban linkages weaken coherence of food system and other markets. • Underdevelopment and insecurity in rural areas encourages urban migration. • Ineffective regulation, poor implementation capacity and lack of accountability can lead to compromised or unsanitary urban food chains.
<i>How can sector undermine governance?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural underemployment and low agricultural productivity can trigger migration to cities, placing added stress on resources. • Urban hunger and malnutrition can undermine education and health, increasing the long term burden on governance systems.
<i>How can governance contribute to sector goals?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthened rural-urban linkages to support city-region food system • Mapping and allocation of secure urban land for agriculture and husbandry. • Implementation of tools to prevent and reduce food losses and food waste. • Improved security and services in rural areas to reduce unmanaged migration.

Environment, Climate Change and DRR

<i>How can governance undermine sector?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak regulation encourages pollution, dumping and other behaviours. • Poor urban planning facilitates land degradation and privatizes transport. • Insecure tenure undermines public and community adaptation and mitigation. • Marginalization of slum dwellers raises poverty-related exposure to natural disasters, pollution and other issues.
<i>How can sector undermine governance?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsidence, contamination and natural disasters can lead to social dislocation in cities and rural-urban migration. • Environmental instability damages infrastructure and undermines capacity.
<i>How can governance contribute to sector goals?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthened planning and environmental management guidelines. • Education and capacity development of local communities and city residents. • Increased resilience of populations in sensitive areas through land regularization and subsidies.

A.4.2: Promoting cross-sectoral linkages: Poverty Reduction and Employment (PRE)

Governance

How can PRE undermine sector?

- Inequality in cities increases social tensions, including crime, that can weaken urban governance.
- Insecure housing tenure places many poor households outside formal governance structures.
- Increasing informalization of urban employment erodes the tax base of cities.

How can sector undermine PRE?

- Eviction or exclusion of slums from basic services can intensify poverty.
- Weak governance limits opportunities for low income groups to guide pro-poor strategies.
- Absence of employment rights and protections increases the vulnerability of urban workers.

How can PRE contribute to sector goals?

- Land upgrading to strengthen governance in informal settlements.
- Access to skilled, formal sector employment to raise tax revenue and reduce welfare needs.

Basic Services

How can PRE undermine sector?

- Poor urban households are less likely to enjoy service access due to marginalization, particularly in informal settlements.
- Affordability can be a major constraint for poor urban households dependent on services from private operators.

How can sector undermine PRE?

- Unsafe water, sanitation or waste disposal weakens health and productivity.
- Lack of services increases the time and energy burden of water collection, waste disposal and other duties, reducing the opportunities for decent employment and poverty reduction, particularly for women.

How can PRE contribute to sector goals?

- Land regularization and other rights-based poverty reduction policies to strengthen the political access of urban poor to basic services.
- Job security and higher incomes increase household ability to pay service costs.

Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Rural-Urban Linkages

How can PRE undermine sector?

- The urban poor rely on monetized exchange for food and so fluctuations in real income may sharply increase food insecurity, while undermining their ability to invest in businesses or services such as education and health care.
- Rural poverty and underemployment can trigger migration of low skilled workers, further straining labour markets and poverty reduction in cities.
- Lack of electricity and energy for cooking and nutrition may impact on ability to access education and learning.

How can sector undermine PRE?

- Hunger or malnutrition from price shocks, bottlenecks or loss of income may undermine health, education and productivity, further reinforcing poverty.
- Food security affects household members unequally, with women and girls particularly impacted.

How can PRE contribute to sector goals?

- Regular, decently paid employment to provide the urban poor with a reliable income to purchase nutritious food for their households.
- Promotion of agricultural employment in rural and urban areas to improve food security and provide a cushion during price shocks.

Environment, Climate Change and DRR

How can PRE undermine sector?

- Poverty-related pollution and lack of waste management create unsanitary environments in slums and other low-income areas.
- Lack of resources and marginalization results in settlement of sensitive areas by vulnerable groups such as migrants.

How can sector undermine PRE?

- Negative environmental aspects threaten health and reinforce urban poverty.
- Natural disasters can destroy homes, businesses and other assets.
- Climate change increases energy use for heating and cooling, placing a greater strain on household costs.

How can PRE contribute to sector goals?

- Slum upgrading with a component on improved environmental management.
- Land regularization to support the growth of community-resilience in slums.
- Microfinance and asset development to strengthen post-disaster recovery.

A.4.3: Promoting cross-sectoral linkages: Basic Services

Governance

How can basic services undermine sector?

- Service constraints can increase tensions and pressure on limited resources.
- Service shortfalls enable other actors, including criminal gangs, to control delivery in slums.
- Lack of access to health care, safe water and sanitation is costly and time consuming, reducing the capacity of the poor for political participation.

How can sector undermine basic services?

- Weak governance structures are unable to service growing populations, especially in peri-urban areas outside formal city boundaries.
- Squatters, migrants and illegal settlers are often ignored by authorities, leading to service gaps.

How can basic services contribute to sector goals?

- Strengthened governance and credibility of local authorities through improved delivery of public services.
- Empowerment of poor to participate in political processes through education, improved health and time savings from accessible water and sanitation.

Poverty Reduction and Employment

How can basic services undermine sector?

- Lack of access to education is a primary determinant of urban poverty that impacts on long term life prospects.
- The higher cost of private operators such as water vendors in slums diverts scarce household resources.
- Poor health care reduces productivity and absorbs household savings.
- Water collection, sanitation and other time-consuming basic needs reduce the ability of the urban poor, particularly women, to work.

How can sector undermine basic services?

- Low income households cannot afford private services and are less likely to be supported by public providers due to social and political marginalization.
- Informal employment typically lacks protections such as health insurance and may compromise educational opportunities for child workers.

How can basic services contribute to sector goals?

- Education, health care, water, sanitation and other services to the urban poor improve safety, wellbeing and potential income by reducing time consuming duties such as water collection.

Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Rural-Urban Linkages

How can basic services undermine sector?

- Service gaps in rural areas may contribute to unmanaged urban migration, weakening regional food systems.
- Lack of water and sanitation undermines safe and productive urban agriculture, while raising the likelihood of food contamination.

How can sector undermine basic services?

- Hunger and malnutrition can undermine health and adversely impact on children's learning outcomes.
- Unmanaged rural migration into peri-urban areas strains local services and infrastructure.

How can basic services contribute to sector goals?

- Food education and awareness, communicated by teachers and health workers, to improve nutritional outcomes.
- Opportunities for local farmers to partner on institutional feeding programmes at schools and hospitals.
- Better access to water and sanitation to support improved food safety and healthy behaviours such as hand washing.

Environment, Climate Change and DRR

How can basic services undermine sector?

- Lack of services such as sanitation and waste management result in dumping, open defecation and other poverty-related behaviours.

How can sector undermine basic services?

- Unsanitary urban environments cause a variety of health issues and constrain access to other services, including education.
- Natural disasters damage infrastructure and services in vulnerable areas.
- Climate change disrupts water supply and raises the risk of water-borne disease.

How can basic services contribute to sector goals?

- Effective sanitation and waste disposal to improve urban environments.
- Mainstreaming of disaster resilient design and other adaptive measures into water, sanitation, health and education services.
- Awareness raising of environmental issues through teachers and health workers.

A.4.4: Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Rural-Urban Linkages (FSAR)

Governance

How can FSAR undermine sector?

- Growing complexity of rural-urban linkages undermines traditional governance.
- Migration due to rural decline and underemployment strains urban resources.

How can sector undermine FSAR?

- Weak land governance and territorial planning undermines agriculture.
- Fragmented rural-urban coordination, including regulatory inconsistencies between different sectors, weakens city-region food systems.
- Limited regulation of food production chains can lead to safety issues.
- Lack of knowledge and tools to prevent and minimize food losses and waste can impact on availability, access, utilization and stability of supply.

How can FSAR contribute to sector goals?

- Agriculture and food systems as a strong economic basis for improved city-region linkages, boosting urban food security and rural development.
- Well managed city-region food systems support rural livelihoods and reduce unmanaged migration to urban areas.
- Urban and peri-urban agriculture as an important component in land governance strategies.

Poverty Reduction and Employment

How can FSAR undermine sector?

- Food comprises a large part of household expenditure for the urban poor, raising their vulnerability to price hikes.
- Urban agro-industrial systems use more energy than traditional models.
- Movement of unskilled migrants to cities increases pressure on labour markets and strains resources in informal settlements.
- Malnutrition and hunger may impact on health, education and productivity.
- Food/nutrition security impacts on productivity and intellectual development.

How can sector undermine FSAR?

- Urban agriculture may be weakened by a lack of local skills or knowledge.
- Lack of awareness or resources may lead to unhealthy diets in poor households.

How can FSAR contribute to sector goals?

- Well managed regional food systems to reduce unmanaged migration to urban areas for employment.
- Urban agriculture to create jobs, particularly for rural migrants with limited opportunities in cities, and reduce food insecurity and household expenditure.
- Food and wood energy from urban forests, alleviating urban poverty.

Basic Services

How can FSAR undermine sector?

- Malnutrition and hunger can undermine educational and health outcomes.
- Urban diets high in sugar and fat raise the prevalence of obesity and diabetes.
- Extended supply chains and unsanitary environments pose potential hazards.
- The use of pesticides and fertilizers can be hazardous to peri-urban residents.

How can sector undermine FSAR?

- Inefficient water consumption and unsafe waste disposal or sanitation can compromise food hygiene and impact on agricultural livelihoods.
- Limited educational outcomes can lower awareness about food nutrition issues.

How can FSAR contribute to sector goals?

- Improved urban nutrition to strengthen health and educational outcomes, including food programmes at schools and hospitals.
- Urban agriculture to support recycling of liquid and solid waste.

Environment, Climate Change and DRR

How can FSAR undermine sector?

- Agro-industrial systems consume unsustainable levels of land, water and energy.
- Use of pesticides and toxins in peri-urban areas pollutes local environments.
- Migration triggered by problems in the city-region food system strains urban areas, particularly settlements in environmentally sensitive locations.

How can FSAR undermine sector?

- Natural disasters and climate change-related impacts such as drought may affect urban food supplies, especially in secondary cities.
- Contaminated land or water can affect the safety of urban agricultural produce.

How can FSAR contribute to sector goals?

- Urban forests and roof gardens as green space to cool the environment and offset emissions.
- Peri-urban agriculture and green belts for urban disaster resilience.
- Efficient and regulated food systems to protect urban and rural environments.
- Urban agriculture to support liquid and solid waste recycling.

A.4.5: Environment, Climate Change and DRR

Governance

<i>How can environment undermine the sector?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural disasters and climate change can threaten urban stability. • Slum environments reinforce exclusion from formal structures. • Rural migration triggered by drought or floods may strain municipal resources.
<i>How can the sector undermine environment?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak urban governance contributes to a range of environmental issues, including poor waste management, pollution and inappropriate land use. • Inequitable governance increases the effects of disasters on vulnerable groups. • Inappropriate development can impact negatively on urban environments.
<i>How can environment contribute to sector goals?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrading programmes to engage marginalized groups in local governance. • Environmental management as a key dimension of effective governance, including basic services and security.

Poverty Reduction and Employment

<i>How can environment undermine sector?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental risk impacts disproportionately on slums and informal settlements due to their vulnerable locations and lack of services. • Drought can raise biomass fuel and food prices, hurting the urban poor. • Extreme weather may damage infrastructure and disrupt livelihoods while also undermining foreign investment and tourism. • Environmental problems in rural areas trigger migration, increasing urban poverty, employment demand and slum populations.
<i>How can sector undermine environment?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poorly managed urban growth is a primary driver of environmental destruction. • Poverty-related issues, such as service and knowledge gaps, may lead to negative practices such as waste dumping and open defecation.
<i>How can environment contribute to sector goals?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resilience programmes to boost the social and political security of the urban poor. • Slum upgrading and effective urban planning to increase access to livelihoods and markets, particularly for women and persons with disabilities. • Livelihood creation through green economy and environmental practices such as solid waste recycling.

Basic Services

<i>How can environment undermine sector?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural disasters can destroy or disable urban services and infrastructure. • Air and water contamination, worsened by climate change-related scarcity, may raise the incidence of respiratory conditions and water-borne disease. • Slum environments may discourage authorities from investing in services.
<i>How can sector undermine environment?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of sanitation or waste management may exacerbate environmental issues. • Limited access to education or information may result in negative behaviours such as dumping.
<i>How can environment contribute to sector goals?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental management and slum upgrading, including sanitation and waste disposal, to improve health outcomes. • Urban planning to increase access to health and education, particularly for women, youth and other disadvantaged groups. • Disaster resilient design for schools, hospitals and infrastructure to sustain capacity in post-emergency contexts.

Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Rural-Urban Linkages

<i>How can environment undermine sector?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change and environmental vulnerability may lead to drought and floods, threatening food supply in cities while also triggering unmanaged migration. • Urban pollution may compromise local agriculture and food quality.
<i>How can sector undermine environment?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agro-industrial production consumes large amounts of water, land and energy, threatening the sustainability of city-region food systems. • Use of pesticides and other toxins destroys wildlife and natural resources.
<i>How can environment contribute to sector goals?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stronger peri-urban planning to protect agricultural land from development. • Better environmental stewardship for safer and more productive food production in urban and rural areas. • Improved environmental management in rural and peri-urban areas to strengthen city-region food systems and stabilize migration to cities.

A.5 Task Team Members and Contact Points

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)

Since its foundation in 1978, [UN-Habitat](#) has played a leading role in guiding UN policy in the field of housing, shelter and urban development. With regional headquarters in Fukuoka, Japan, and with its branch office in Bangkok, the agency has an active presence in countries across the Asia-Pacific. Its current programmes include the [Cities and Climate Change Initiative](#) and the [Safer Cities Programme](#).

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP)

[UNESCAP](#) is the regional development arm of the United Nations, with a broad remit covering trade, transport, social development and disaster risk reduction. In particular, its [Sustainable Urban Development Section](#) in the Environment and Development Section focuses on the linkages between environment and poverty in cities across the region to support capacity and knowledge development on housing, infrastructure, climate change adaptation and other fields.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

[FAO](#) has a number of global programmes directly addressing the issue of urban food and nutrition security, including its [Growing Greener Cities](#) initiative in Africa and Latin America, and is currently supporting these activities in the Asia-Pacific through regional workshops on [urban agriculture](#), [food safety](#) and other issues. FAO's other focus areas include the [Trees for Cities](#) programme on urban forestry and its initiatives on [Food for the Cities](#).

International Labour Organization (ILO)

[ILO](#) works in a variety of fields of particular importance to urban areas, including migration, youth employment, working conditions and local poverty reduction. Besides undertaking detailed policy research on employment in selected Asia-Pacific cities, including [Jakarta](#) and [Ahmedabad](#), it has also supported decent work programmes in a range of urban and peri-urban areas across the region, such as its [Better Factories](#) initiative in Cambodia.

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)

OHCHR's commitment to human rights and equality is reflected in its work on [adequate housing](#) and [tenure security](#). Its [Land and Housing Rights Programme](#) in Cambodia, for example, protects the poor from eviction in a context of rapid urban development. More generally, it provides a critical framework for a rights-based approach to urban governance and service delivery, reflected in key documents such as the [2013-17 Nepal UNDAF](#), with its emphasis on disadvantage and vulnerability.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

[UNDP](#) is committed to delivering sustainable human development for people in cities. Focusing on integrated, inclusive planning and policies, UNDP works to promote a range of development needs within and across institutions in rural, peri-urban and urban areas. More recently, it has strengthened its collaboration with UN-Habitat and other organizations through projects such as the [Urban Partnership for Poverty Reduction](#) (UPPR) project in Bangladesh and the Urban Vulnerability Assessment to Climate Change in Makassar, Indonesia. In 2013 UNDP published a [Strategy Paper on Sustainable and Inclusive Urbanization](#) in Asia-Pacific which outlines the organization's current and future policies in the region.

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

As part of its work to strengthen environmental sustainability, [UNEP](#) has undertaken a range of urban-focused activities. In addition to the [Sustainable Cities](#) programme, running from the early 1990s to 2008 in partnership with UN-Habitat, its [Urban Environment Unit](#) is a participating member of Cities Alliance and has supported a variety of urban projects across the region. These include an [eco-housing](#) project for the Asia-Pacific and a public transit programme in [Jakarta](#), Indonesia.

United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF)

[UNICEF](#) supports children in urban areas across the region through a variety of programmes, from life skills development for [migrant children in China](#) to cash transfers for [slum children in Bangladesh](#). In particular, its [Child Friendly Cities](#) framework has been implemented by governments in countries such as Indonesia, Malaysia, Vietnam and the Philippines. It has also partnered with UN Women and UN-Habitat on the [Safe and Friendly Cities for All](#) programme. In addition, with the Global City Indicators Facility (GCIF), it has developed the [UKID Index of Urban Child Development](#) as a multi-dimensional measure of child rights and protection in cities.

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

Among other activities, [UNIDO](#) supports programmes in waste management, eco-cities and the green economy. In particular, partnering with other UN agencies on the ONE UN programme, it has supported solid waste management and the development of green industry in [Hoi An](#), Vietnam. It has also rolled out, in collaboration with GIZ, the Ministry of Environment and other organizations, an eco-tourism programme in the Indian cities of Tirupati and Shimla.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

(Contact Point: [Julia Davies](#) – UNESCO Bangkok, Programme Officer, Culture)

[UNESCO](#)'s work in urban areas focuses on education, cultural heritage and disaster preparedness. Its [Creative Cities Network](#) supports the development of local creative economies such as crafts and design in a number of cities across Japan, South Korea and China. Its other activities include the promotion of the [right to the city](#), the protection of urban environments through the [Man and Biosphere](#) programme, and the conservation of [historic landscapes](#), the protection of community through disaster preparedness and early warning system.

United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)

[UNOPS](#) specializes in disaster recovery, post-conflict stability and environmental sustainability. In addition to hosting the [Cities Alliance](#), it has contributed to the [Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme](#) for urban communities in Bangladesh and developed urban infrastructure in [Kalmunai](#), Sri Lanka.

United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women)

[UN Women](#) has focused on improving safety for women in urban areas across the region through a range of initiatives, including (in partnership with UNICEF and UN-Habitat) the [Safe and Friendly Cities for All](#) programme. Furthermore, the [Safe Cities for Women and Girls](#) global campaign has been piloted in New Delhi, India and Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea to reduce the incidence of gender violence in these cities.

World Food Programme (WFP)

(Contact Point: [Jeffrey Marzilli](#) – Official title)

In its work on food security and emergency preparedness, WFP has responded with targeted programmes to the increasing incidence of hunger and vulnerability in urban and peri-urban areas. Examples included food assistance to urban poor in [Afghanistan](#) in the wake of rising food prices, targeted school nutrition programmes (in partnership with UNICEF) to schools in urban slums in [Bangladesh](#), and climate change resilience strengthening programmes (with UN-Habitat) in cities in the [Philippines](#).

World Health Organization (WHO)

In addition to global initiatives such as the [‘1000 cities, 1000 lives’](#) campaign, WHO has undertaken a range of programmes on the impacts of urbanization on public health. In particular, the [Centre for Health Development](#) in Kobe, Japan has developed a substantial body of research on urban health. The [Regional Office for South-East Asia](#) has also focused on a variety of related issues in its programmes, including the risks of unplanned urban growth and health issues among the urban poor.

A.6: Development Partners with a Focus on Urbanization

Urbanization is not just gaining focus among UN agencies, but also within other development partner organizations and government agencies. The following section provides an overview of some of their urban strategies, with a special focus on the Asia-Pacific.

Asian Development Bank (ADB)

The [Asian Development Bank](#) formulated its first sector strategy on urban areas in the late 1990s. In response to the rapidly changing nature of urbanization in the Asia-Pacific region, the initial strategy has been revised to better address the dynamics within the urban sector. The [Review of the Urban Sector Strategy](#), published in 2006, reflects on the rapidly changing nature of urbanization in the Asia-Pacific. Under [ADB’s Strategy 2020](#), cities constitute a key focus—specifically in terms of promoting liveable cities that are competitive, socially inclusive, and environmentally attractive—and have a sound fiscal base. The [Urban Operational Plan \(UOP\) 2012-2020](#), sets out the future direction and approach for the urban sector operations of ADB and a number of innovative financial products are proposed including [Green Cities](#) Initiatives.

Department for International Development (DfID)

National agencies and private foundations have also made urban development an important element of their programming. [DFID](#) has acknowledged the importance of cities and supports a number of urban programmes in the Asia-Pacific. DfID’s urban development strategy envisions the reduction of urban poverty and improvement of the poor’s livelihood. The 2001 published strategy, called [Meeting the Challenge of Urban Poverty](#), focuses strongly on a participatory approach that includes the urban poor in the decision-making process and strengthens the capacity of local and national governments to deliver pro-poor urban development. [Future Proofing Cities: Risks and Opportunities for inclusive urban growth in developing countries](#) published in 2012 aims to improve knowledge of the environmental risks and solutions relevant to cities in developing countries and to better identify the opportunities to support sustainable urban development in the face of environmental challenges such as climate change.

Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) Germany

The [Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development](#), through their implementing agency [GIZ](#), has recently conducted several urban-focused initiatives in the Asia-Pacific. Their

strategic approach is strongly based on inclusiveness and public participation. BMZ, in 2014, published its urban strategy entitled [Managing Urbanization – Towards Sustainable Cities](#). Amongst others, the areas to be addressed include basic urban services, social violence and environmental sustainability.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs Sweden

The Swedish Government's recent [strategy for Asia](#), published in 2010, includes a focus on urban planning which is closely linked to ensuring the delivery of sustainable communal services. It emphasizes the importance of integrated urban planning, as well as regional cooperation to ensure the sharing of experiences.

United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

[USAID](#) published in 2013 a draft of its [Sustainable Urban Services Policy](#). The strategy paper outlines ways to enable local governments to improve the delivery of urban services. The policy envisions the strengthening of urban governance and institutional capacity; the improvement and innovation of service delivery, as well as the promotion of public and private investment; and a pro-poor model for developing underserved urban areas.

The World Bank

The [World Bank](#) has a long history of engagement in urban development. The organization's 2010 [Urban and Local Government Strategy](#) is based on five pillars, including governance, pro-poor policy, economic growth, land market reform and environmental sustainability. In addition to this 10-year global strategy, the World Bank published its latest [urbanization policy framework](#) in 2013. This aims to assist cities to ensure a sustainable urbanization process and is structured around three policy pillars: planning, connecting and financing.

A.7 Selected Reading

General

Rio+20 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (2012), [‘Sustainable Cities’](#)

UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2010), [State of Asian Cities Report 2010/11](#)

UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda: UN-Habitat (2012), [Sustainable Urbanization: Thematic Think Piece](#)

UNDP (2013), [Strategy Paper: Sustainable and Inclusive Urbanization in Asia Pacific](#)

Governance

Decentralization and Local Governance

UNDP (2009), [A Users' Guide to Measuring Local Governance](#)

UN-Habitat (2006), [Localising the Millennium Development Goals: A Guide for Local Authorities and Partners](#)

Participation

UN-Habitat (2001), [Tools to Support Participatory Urban Decision Making](#)

UN-Habitat (2012), [Young People, Participation and Sustainable Development in an Urbanizing World](#)

Planning

UN-Habitat (2007), [Inclusive and Sustainable Urban Development Planning: A Guide for Municipalities](#)

UN-Habitat (2010), [Citywide Strategic Planning](#)

UN-Habitat (2012), [Urban Planning For City Leaders](#)

UN-Habitat and UNDP (2014) [The Impact of Decentralization and Urban Governance on Building Inclusive and Resilient Cities](#)

Public Safety

Jagori, UN Women et al. (2011), [A Draft Strategic Framework for Women's Safety in Delhi](#).

Jagori, UN Women et al (2012), [Building Safe and Inclusive Cities for Women – A Practical Guide](#)

UN-Habitat (2007), [Enhancing Urban Safety and Security – Global Report on Human Settlements 2007](#)

UN-Habitat (2008), [Global Assessment on Women's Safety](#)

UN-Habitat (2011), [Introductory Handbook on Policing Urban Space](#)

UN-Habitat (2011), [Building Urban Safety Through Slum Upgrading](#)

UN-Habitat, Women in Cities and SIDA (2009), [Women's Safety Audits: What Works and Where?](#)

UN Women, [Virtual Knowledge Centre to End Violence Against Women and Girls](#)

Women in Cities International (2010), [Urban Safety Toolkit for Asia-Pacific](#)

Gender

UN-Habitat (2008), [Gender Mainstreaming in Local Authorities – Best Practices](#)

UN-Habitat (2008), [Gendering Land Tools: Achieving Secure Tenure for Men and Women](#)

UN-Habitat (2012), [Gender and Urban Planning: Issues and Trends](#)

Women in Cities International et al (2011), [Ten Point Guide to Creating Gender Inclusive Cities](#)

Children and Youth

UN-Habitat (2012), [State of the Urban Youth Report 2012/13](#)

UNICEF (2012), [State of the World's Children 2012: Children in an Urban World](#)

UNICEF (2013), South-South Cooperation for Child Rights in Asia and the Pacific - Focus on: Adolescents, Early Childhood Development, and Children in Urban Settings

UNICEF, [Building a Child Friendly City](#) (website). This includes a [Framework for Action](#), [Building Blocks](#), [Tools](#) and [Indicators](#).

Migrants and Refugees

UNESCO/ UCLG (2010), [Creating Better Cities for Migrants: Urban Policies and Practices to Build More Inclusive Cities](#)

UNHCR (2009), [UNHCR Statistical Yearbook 2012](#)

Private Sector Engagement

UN-Habitat (2009), [Good Urban Governance: Towards an Effective Private Sector Engagement](#).

Land Governance

[Global Land Tool Network](#) website

OHCHR, [Right to Adequate Housing Toolkit](#)

UN-Habitat (2010), [Count Me In: Surveying for Tenure Security and Urban Land Management](#)

UN-Habitat (2011), [Securing Land Rights for Indigenous Peoples in Cities](#)

UN-Habitat (2012), [Monitoring Security of Tenure in Cities](#)

UN-Habitat (2012), [Innovative Urban Tenure in the Philippines: Summary Report](#)

World Bank (2011), [The Land Governance Assessment Framework: Identifying and Monitoring Good Practice in the Land Sector](#)

Housing Finance

UN-Habitat and UNESCAP (2008), [Housing the Poor in Asian Cities](#)

UN-Habitat (2008), [Housing for All: The Challenges of Affordability, Accessibility and Sustainability](#)

UN-Habitat (2009), [Guide to Preparing a Housing Finance Strategy: Human Settlements Financing Tools and Best Practices](#)

UN-Habitat (2009), [Public-Private Partnerships in Housing and Urban Development](#)

UN-Habitat (2009), [Guide to Municipal Finance](#)

UN-Habitat (2009), [Social Investment Funds](#)

UN-Habitat and UNDP (2014) [Promoting Resilient Housing and Secure Tenure in a Changing Climate Heritage](#)

UNESCO (2003), [Partnerships for World Heritage Cities](#)

UNESCO (2003), [Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage](#).

UNESCO et al (2008), [Historic Districts for All: A Social and Human Approach for Sustainable Revitalization](#)

UN-Habitat (2008), [Best Practices on Social Sustainability in Historic Districts](#)

UNESCO (2010), [Managing Historic Cities](#)

UNESCO (2011), [Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape](#)

Employment / PR / energy

Pro-poor Policies

Satterthwaite, D. et al. (2011), [Engaging with the Urban Poor and Their Organizations for Poverty Reduction and Urban Governance: An Issues Paper for the United Nations Development Programme](#)

UNDP (2005), [Pro-Poor Urban Governance: Lessons from LIFE](#)

Job creation

UN-Habitat (2009), [Promoting Local Economic Development Through Strategic Planning](#)

Culture and Creative Industries

UNESCO (2005), [Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions](#)

UNESCO, [Creative Cities Network](#)

Energy

UNEP (2011), [Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction](#)

UN-Habitat (2009), [Sustainable Urban Energy Planning: A Guidebook for Cities and Towns in Developing Countries](#)

UN-Habitat (2012), [Sustainable Urban Energy: A Sourcebook for Asia](#)

Basic Services

Health

UNESCAP, ADB, UNDP et al (2012), [Accelerating Equitable Achievement of the MDGs: Closing Gaps in Health and Nutrition Outcomes](#)

University College London and the Lancet (2012), [Shaping Cities for Health: Complexity and the Planning of Urban Environments in the 21st Century](#)

WHO (2008), [Our Cities, Our Health, Our Future: Acting on Social Determinants for Health Equity in Urban Settings](#)

WHO (2010), [Urban HEART \(Health Equity Assessment and Response Tool\)](#)

WHO (2010), [Why Urban Health Matters](#)

WHO (2011), 'Bangkok Declaration on Urbanization and Health', in [Report of the Twenty-Ninth Meeting of Ministers of Health of Countries of the South-East Asia Region](#)

WHO and UN-Habitat (2010), [Hidden Cities: Unmasking and Overcoming Health Inequities in Urban Settings](#)

Education

UNESCO (2012), [Youth and Skills: Putting Education to Work](#)

UNESCO (2014) [Education For All: Global Monitoring Report \(Teaching and learning: Achieving quality for all\)](#)

Food, nutrition and agriculture

Urban Agriculture

FAO (2005), [Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security](#)

FAO (2010), [Growing Greener Cities](#)

FAO (2011), [Food, Agriculture and Cities: Challenges of Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Ecosystem Management in an Urbanizing World](#)

FAO (2011), [‘Ensuring Resilient Food Systems in Asian Cities’](#) workshop.

FAO (2011), [Global Food Losses and Food Waste: Extent, Causes and Prevention](#)

FAO (2012), [Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forest in the Context of National Food Security](#)

FAO (2012), [Growing Greener Cities in Africa](#)

FAO (2013), [Food Wastage Footprint: Impacts on Natural Resources](#)

FAO (2013) [Toolkit: Reducing the Food Wastage Footprint](#)

FAO, [Urban Forestry Community](#) and its [forestry guidelines](#).

FAO, [Food for the Cities](#) network.

FAO, [Sustainable food consumption and production](#)

FSSAI, FAO and FICCI (2011), [Improving Safety and Quality in Food Retail Chain](#)

World Health Organization, Mahidol University and FAO (2011), [Regional Consultation on Safe Street Foods](#)

Rural-urban Linkages

IFPRI, [Rural-Urban Linkages](#) programme.

IIED (2012), [‘Rural Urban linkages’](#)

ODI and DFID (2002), [Rural-Urban Linkages](#).

World Bank (2013), [Rural-Urban Dynamics and the Millennium Development Goals](#)

Environment

ICLEI and UN-Habitat (2007), [Tales of Two Cities: Partnerships for Urban Sustainability](#)

UNDG (2009), [Mainstreaming Environmental Sustainability in Country Analysis and the UNDAF: A Guidance Note for United Nations Country Teams and Implementing Partners](#)

Environmental Management

UNDP (2012), ‘Building Greener Cities’, in [One Planet to Share: Sustaining Human Progress in a Changing Climate](#)

UNEP (2012), [Sustainable, Resource Efficient Cities: Making It Happen!](#)

UNEP (2012), [Global Initiative for Resource Efficient Cities](#)

UNEP (2013), [Integrating the Environment in Urban Planning and Management](#)

Climate Change

ICLEI and UNDP (2012), [Climate Change and Vulnerability of People in Cities of Asia](#)

UNDG (2010), [Integrating Climate Change Considerations in the Country Analysis and the UNDAF: A Guidance Note for United Nations Country Teams](#)

UNDP (2012), [Mainstreaming Climate Change in National Development Processes and UN Country Programming: A Guide to Assist UN Country Teams in Integrating Climate Change Risks and Opportunities](#).

UN-Habitat and UNDP (2013) [Urbanization and Climate Change](#)

UN-Habitat and UNDP (2014) [Designing Climate-linked Social Protection in Asia Pacific Cities](#)

UNDP, UNCDF and UNEP (2010), [Local Governance and Climate Change: A Discussion Note](#)

UN-Habitat (2004), [Local Leadership for Climate Change Action](#)

UN-Habitat (2010), [Participatory Climate Change Assessments: A Toolkit Based on the Experience of Sorsogon City, Philippines](#)

UN-Habitat (2011), [Cities and Climate Change: Global Report on Human Settlements 2011](#)

UN-Habitat (2011), [Planning for Climate Change: A Strategic, Values-Based Approach for Urban Planners](#)

UN-Habitat and IIED (2012), [Developing Local Climate Change Plans: A Guide for Cities in Developing Countries](#)

World Bank (2008), [Climate Resilient Cities: A Primer on Reducing Vulnerabilities to Disasters](#)

Disaster Resilience

UNEP and UN-Habitat, Urban Air Quality Management [Handbook](#) and [Toolkit](#)

UNISDR (2012), [How to Make Cities More Resilient: A Handbook for Local Government Leaders](#), with an accompanying [Local Government Self-Assessment Tool](#) and [checklist](#).

Eco-Budgeting and Carbon Markets

UNEP and Gwangju City (2012), [Cities and Carbon Finance: A Feasibility Study of an Urban CDM](#)

UN-Habitat and ICLEI (2012), [Making Carbon Markets Work for Your City: A Guide for Cities in Developing Countries](#)

UN-Habitat, UNEP and ICLEI (2008), [EcoBudget: Introduction for Mayors and Municipal Councillors](#)

Green Development / Sustainable Development

Asian Development Bank (2012), [Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2012. Special Chapter: Green Urbanization in Asia](#).

DfID, Atkins, UCL (2012) [Future Proofing Cities: Risks and Opportunities for Inclusive Urban Growth in Developing Countries](#).

UNEP (2012), [A 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns](#).

UNESCAP, UNECLAC and UN-Habitat (2011), [Guidelines for Developing Eco-efficient and Socially Inclusive Infrastructure](#)

UNESCAP and UN-Habitat (2011), [Strategic Planning Tools for Eco-Efficient and Socially Inclusive Infrastructure](#)

UN-Habitat (2012), Urban Patterns for a Green Economy: [Working with Nature](#), [Leveraging Density](#), [Optimizing Infrastructure](#), [Clustering for Competitiveness](#)

UN-Habitat (2009), [Low-Cost Sustainable Building Materials and Construction Technologies](#)

UN-Habitat (2012), [Sustainable Housing for Sustainable Cities](#)

UN-Habitat (2012), [Sustainable Urbanization in Asia: A Sourcebook for Local Government](#)

Solid Waste Management

UN-Habitat (2011), [Collection of Municipal Solid Waste in Developing Countries](#)

UN-Habitat (2012), [Collection of Municipal Solid Waste: Key Issues for Decision-Makers in Developing Countries](#)

Water and Sanitation

UN-Habitat (2010), [Local Actions for Sustainable Development: Water and Sanitation in Asia-Pacific Region](#)

Transport/Urban Mobility

UNESCAP / CityNet (2012), [Sustainable Urban Transportation Systems: An Overview](#)

WHO / World Bank (2004), [World Report on Road Traffic Injury Prevention](#)

UN-Habitat (2013) [Planning and Design for Sustainable Urban Mobility: Global Report on Human Settlements](#)

A GUIDE FOR UNITED NATIONS COUNTRY TEAMS

