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Policy Studio Presentation outline

- Studio & project objectives
- Kenya National Slum Upgrading & Prevention Policy (2013)
- Case studies
  - Kenya – KENSUP & KISIP
  - Brazil – Favela Barrio
  - Thailand – CODI
  - India – Mumbai
  - Tanzania – Dar & national policy
  - General lessons/insights from all cases
- Policy Analyses
  - Governance & institutional coordination
  - Financing
  - Implementation & Evaluation
- Next Steps – collaboration, deliverables, etc.
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Studio Objectives

- Continue & build on 5 yrs collaboration & exchange
- Scale-up: from village to valley to Nat’l policy
- Policy – opportunity & part of social change work
- Broaden civil society & gov’t partners
- Explore ‘insights’ from other places
- Add value to on-going policy process in Kenya
- Creative sharing of findings/public engagement with policy – social media
Upgrading: Relational Approach

process
Community organizing & savings federations

physical planning
Housing, infrastructure, environment & land use

place
Valuing the economic, social, environmental, health & other community assets

partnerships
Government, service providers & international donors

policy
Advocating for new national strategies for the urban poor

power
Building networks with other NGOs & scaling-up work to city & nation
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Participatory process
MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURES

- Rent: 1,245 KSH
- Water: 437 KSH
- Latrine Access: 184 KSH
- School Fees: 1,602 KSH
- Security: 1,450 KSH
- Electricity: 337 KSH
- Transport: 1,523 KSH
- Health Care: 792 KSH
- Food: 6,538 KSH

Total Average Monthly Expenditure: 14,108 KSH

Source: 2011 Makoko Valley Survey, Mushenene, University of Nairobi, UC Berkeley
Kenya: National Slum Upgrading & Prevention Policy - Goals & Objectives

Prof. Peter Ngau & Dr. Mbathí Musyimi

- Provide a legal and institutional framework
- Design institutional and organizational framework for the implementation of slum mainstreaming programs
- Provide a framework securing right to housing, reasonable levels of sanitation and other relevant rights
- Empower and enable poor households living in slums to access housing units, services and infrastructure
- Encourage integrated approaches in slum improvement programs and community participation
- Implement urban local economic, social and environmental development
Guiding Approach & Principles for Policy Studio

- January workshop
- Agreement on work plan
- Independent work
- Berkeley workshop - today
- Draft report
- Stakeholder engagement
- Other outputs...
## Our approach to case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Slum Upgrading</th>
<th>Integrated Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty reduction</td>
<td>Ad hoc; income focused</td>
<td>Specific strategy; community defined; multi-dimensional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy framework</td>
<td>projects/short programs</td>
<td>Multiple supporting policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Separate activity</td>
<td>Part municipal &amp; nat’l dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Gov’t resist; consultation</td>
<td>Equal partners w/gov't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Central state</td>
<td>Decentralized, civil society &amp; private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time horizon</td>
<td>Short (5ys)</td>
<td>Long; multiple phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing</td>
<td>Capital; one-time; int’l donors; focus on cost recovery</td>
<td>Capital &amp; maintenance; savings groups, gov’t &amp; donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Little attention; single model; housing</td>
<td>Physical &amp; social Infrastructure; context/place specificity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Gov’t &amp; development bank</td>
<td>Muni, civil society &amp; utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, safety, health &amp; env’t</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Explicit &amp; central</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our approach to case studies
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Key Takeaways

- Donor initiated program
- Highly centralized
- Focus on housing provision
Context: Kenya Slum Upgrading Program (KENSUP)

- Country-wide, long-term strategy from 2005-2025 with urban focus; jointly run by the Government of Kenya and UN-HABITAT:
- Aims to improve livelihoods of 5.3mn slum dwellers (1.1mn households) by 2020 at estimated cost of $13bn
- Initial $300,000 grant from UN-HABITAT to fund pilot project
- Kenya Slum Upgrading, Low Cost Housing and Infrastructure Trust Fund (KSULCH&IT or KENSUF)
- First phase targets upgrading of informal settlements in Nairobi, Mavoko, Mombasa and Kisumu; pilot project focused on Kibera, Kenya’s largest slum
KENSUP Goals

- Shelter improvement and provision of physical and social infrastructure/amenities
- Health, environment and waste management
- Community mobilization, organization and participation
- Preparation of city development strategic and land use master plans
- Employment generation & integration of micro financing and credit systems
KENSUP: Structure

- **Multi-Stakeholder Support Group (MSSG):**
  - Comprises of representatives of development partners, civil society, government, local authorities, and communities among others

- **Settlements Project Implementation Units (SPIUs)**
  - The organs linking the Program secretariat, PIU and the community

- **Project Implementation Unit (PIU)**
  - These are established within Local Authorities to facilitate the formation of SPIU

- **Settlement Executive Committee**
  - Link between the Program Implementation Unit and settlement community
KENSUP Outcomes: Kibera Soweto

- Mapping
- Kibera Decanting Site
  Housing Scheme
- Formation of housing cooperatives
- Transport infrastructure
- Pilot project: Soweto East
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KENSUP: Challenges and Opportunities

- Long-term strategies built into program
- Formation of Slum Upgrading department
- Formation of community saving cooperatives

Challenges

- Prioritizing housing (ownership)
- Scale & pace of construction?
- Lack of attention to livelihoods
- Civil society engagement not clearly defined
- Displacement & resettlement

Prof. J. Corburn: jcorburn@berkeley.edu - UC Berkeley, Kenya Slum Policy Studio 19 April 2013
Kenya Informal Settlement Improvement Project (KISIP)
Kenya Informal Settlement Improvement Program (KISIP) - Takeaways

- Driven by World Bank
- Highly prescribed implementation process
- Included KMP – attention to capacity building
- Limited coordination with KENSUP
- Flawed selection process (exaggerated population estimates, most beneficiaries not slum dwellers)
- Limited community and civil society participation
KISIP: Context

- 5 year Project covering 15 municipalities (2011 June – June 2016), devised & funded largely by the World Bank

- Kenya Vision 2030 launched in 2008

- National Land Policy 2009

- New constitution 2010 guarantees the right to housing

- Failures of Kenya Slum Upgrading project
## KISIP Components and Financing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening institutions and program management</td>
<td>Institutional capacity building (MoH, MoL, municipal government) – office equipment, financial management, monitoring and evaluation systems, policies and slum inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing tenure security</td>
<td>Mapping/surveying, issuance of letters of allotment/titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in infrastructure and delivery of services</td>
<td>Roads &amp; walkways, street &amp; security lighting, lighting, solid waste management, water &amp; sanitation systems, street vending platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for urban growth</td>
<td>Planning, Infrastructure services, Land tenure, affordable housing, slum Prevention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KISIP: Implementation Framework

World Bank

Government of Kenya

Ministry of Housing & Ministry of Lands

Municipal Councils

- Oversight
- Minimal Funding
- Executing agency
- Implementing

Service Providers

Civil Society

Settlement Committees

Funding
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KISIP: World Bank Site Selection Criteria

- **Existing land tenure status** – on government land/clear ownership status (formal settlements are eligible)
- **Settlement location in relation to environmental suitability**
- **Scale of potential displacement of residents**
- **Size & density** - larger and denser settlements receive priority
- **Proximity to trunk infrastructure** – integration with citywide infrastructure networks and maintenance systems
- **Community preparedness** and readiness to participate and to identify priority activities
Insights from KENSUP & KISIP

- Government-built housing is challenging & limits investments in other upgrading issues
- Int’l donors too strong a role; greater reliance on local experts
- Unclear & uncoordinated stakeholder involvement
- Lack of conflict resolution mechanisms
- Need for increased gov’t agency transparency
- Limited community ownership over projects (e.g Kibera)
- Lack of affordability of upgrading for communities
- Integration of existing and new programs
A CASE STUDY OF FAVELA BAIRRO SLUM UPGRAADING

TRANSFORMING SLUMS IN NEIGHBORHOODS IN RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL

CHRISTINA GOSSMANN

MELODY TULIER
Favela Bairro – Key Takeaways

- Community participation
- Flexibility
- Place-based along with people based strategies
- Leveraging assets and multiple policies
Context: Why Brazil & Favela Bairro?

- Population: 6.3 M in 2010
  - Favela: 1.4 M (22%)
  - +28% population since 2000
  - +3.4% Rio as whole
# Favela Bairro – Key Components

| Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) | • Provide 60% funding  
• Focus on Upgrading  
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| National Government                   | • New Federal Constitution of 1988  
• Focus on devolution of power  
• Push on urban reform |
| Municipal Government                  | • Oversight, funding and implementation  
• At times contract with NGOs  
• Lead from Secretaria Municipal de Habitação (SMH); coordination with other Ministries |
| Community Residents                   | • POUSOs - community-anchoring facility  
• Residents’ associations - 1st point of contact & maintenance  
• Mechanism and magnitude of local control not clear in documentation |
Goals and Key Components

- Integrated urbanization via urban infrastructure social service projects
- Social program planning at the community level
- Regularization and control of urban development via expanding the POUSO network
  - support community participatory processes, land regularization, mapping and registration of properties to reinforce inclusion
- Institutional development by enhancing the capacity of staff and departments in the program
Accomplishments

- First phase (1995-2000) output-focused:
  - 284 projects completed (90%), 38 of 54 favelas received some intervention

- Second phase (2000-2005): Indicators on youth education, health, housing value and integration into city introduced

- Increased residents’ construction/investment

- Broad scale of impact: 1 billion invested; aim of reaching 500,000 of 1.7m in slums in 3 phases
Related Policies & Programs

- **Units of Pacifying Police (UPP)**
  - New security policy successful at disarming traffickers & re-conquering territories

- **UPP Social**
  - Complement UPP with social services (education, housing, rubbish collection)

- **Growth Acceleration Program (PAC & PAC)**
  - Launched in 2007 by Lula da Silva: management initiatives and public works; larger than FBP

- **Bolsa Familia Program (BFP)**
  - Minimum level of income to the poorest families and financial incentives
  - Cause of one-sixth of the country’s poverty reduction, costs .5% of the GDP

- **Morar Carioca** - “to live as a resident in Rio de Janeiro”
  - Continuing with strong infrastructure but also expanding on social infrastructure

- **SUS (System Unified Salude)**
  - New national health care – prevention, decentralization w/municipal control, Health Councils (1988 w/new Constitution)
Challenges

- Residents’ involvement
  - Architects assumed lack of residents’ capacity
  - Interference of drug dealers
  - Uneven nature of POUSOS

- Goal Setting
  - Goals do not match vision

- Impact Evaluation
  - Evaluation scheme developed after program
Insights for Kenya

- Establish clear mechanisms for community participation within policy; physical structures as community anchors
- Focus on place based and people based strategies, recognizing that not all can happen immediately or through one policy
- Allow for a constant feedback loop of implementation and learning, encouraging flexibility and adaptation
- Set clear authority and ownership structures while integrating other institutions/ministries to respond to leanings
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS
DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE (CODI)
THAILAND

MARK ANDERSON
SIDDHARTH NADKARNY
CODI – Key Takeaways

- Critical role of central government in initiating slum upgrading by supporting communities and NGOs, through policy trial and error over twenty years
- Provide access to easy and affordable credit to communities, using finance as incentive for cooperation between cities and communities
- Establish flexible national level policy that recognizes neighborhood context
- Role of clear land title
Context

- 1970s: Eviction/demolition by government agencies, mobilization against eviction by NGOs and communities
- 1980s: Government agency’s resettlement program, NGOs and community-led in-situ upgrading
- 1992: Formation of UCDO (Urban Community Development Office) – CODI’s predecessor model
- 2000: Formation of CODI
Goals

Two Track Low Income Housing Strategy

1. Baan Mankong

- CODI (Community Development Organizations Institute) provides housing loans and infrastructure subsidies for upgrading communities, incentivizes cities and communities to work together.

2. Baan Ua Arthorn:

- NHA (National Housing Authority)
- Constructs and sells apartments to low income households on “rent-to-own” basis
- Payments of $25-$37 per month
UCDO STRUCTURE

COMMUNITY/SAVINGS GROUPS

COMMUNITY/SAVINGS GROUPS

COMMUNITY/SAVINGS GROUPS

COMMUNITY/SAVINGS GROUPS

COMMUNITY/SAVINGS GROUPS

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

INITIAL $50M FUND, SUPERVISION

UCDO

SOFT LOANS, TECHNICAL HELP
PROJECT PLAN, REQUEST FOR FUNDS

INTERNATIONAL DONORS

MUNICIPAL/CITY GOVERNMENT
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Learning from UCDO

- Neighborhood – Central government link, without involving municipal government
- Slow progress of projects due to lack of capacity amongst community groups
- Minimal involvement of community networks
- Necessity of expanding reach beyond urban areas to exurban and suburban areas as well
CODI HIERARCHY
BAAN MANKONG PROGRAM HIERARCHY
Challenges

- Reliance on central government agency to break deadlocks
- Long process of upgrading
- Concerns in dealing with private land
Insights from Case Studies

- Land tenure – Bang Bua
- Re-blocking - Charoenchai Nimitmai
- Upgrading - Samaki Ruam Jai
- Relocation - Klong Touey
- Rebuilding - Bon Kai
- Landsharing - Klong Lumnoon
MUMBAI: A CASE STUDY OF SLUM UPGRAADING

KRISTEN A. JOHNSON
SIDDHARTH NADKARNY
Takeaways

Unfavorable upgrading policy subverted to bring benefits to communities

- **State role:** State retreat from upgrading to allow for the market
- **Private Sector:** Incentives for developers to work with slum dwellers in upgrading
- **Land:** Land tenure for informal settlements established through legalization cut off date
- **Community Capacity:** Encourages demand driven upgrading through community housing co-operatives
Context/History

- Upgrading between 1950’s-1980’s
  - Slum clearance with no re-housing (1956)
  - Evictions require re-housing, “cutoff date” (1971)
  - In situ-resettlement and upgrades (1985)

- Slum upgrading policy enacted at state level, implemented at municipal level and guided by judiciary at national level
Goals/Components

- Slum Rehabilitation Scheme (SRS)
  - Communities have legal claim to land titles if occupied before 1995
  - Private developers rehouse communities on 50% of land, and use 50% to sell as real estate
  - Incentivizes market based slum upgrading
  - Communities encouraged to form housing co-operatives
Accomplishments/ Case Studies

Suryoday Housing Society

Ganesh Nagar D
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Accomplishment: NGO Support

- **SPARC/NSDF**: 1970s and 1980s mobilized against evictions, set up savings schemes, formed co-operatives in informal settlements.

- Enables formation of housing cooperatives in informal settlements, using NSDF’s mobilizing power.

- SPARC creates a development entity, ‘Nirman’ that is the ‘developer’ on paper for any SRS projects it initiates.

- Negotiates community involvement in slum upgrading.

- Same financial model used as conventional developers, difference is that focus is on ‘breaking even’ and priority is rebuilding.
Challenges

- Profit motive of developers conflict with low-cost projects
- Exclusion of informal settlements in low value areas
- Issues with scaling up
- Loosely defined standards for redeveloped housing
- Loosely defined guidelines on land sharing with developers
Insights for Kenya

- Importance of clear land title and tenure
- Private sector incentives, but community cooperatives/NGOs as developers
- Role of judiciary in guaranteeing rights
- Rental housing for new stock - Rajiv Awas Yojana
SLUM UPGRADING IN TANZANIA

STRATEGIES FOR COMMUNITY, CITY AND NATIONAL LEVEL UPGRADING

KRISTEN A. JOHNSON
CHRISTINA GOSSMANN
Takeaways

- Community, city and national scales for upgrading
- Cross-cutting outcomes
- Community ownership of upgrading
- Evaluation built into implementation
Context

- Over 70% of Dar es Salaam 5 million live in slums
- **History of Upgrading:** 1960's – 2000
  - Slum Clearance (1960’s)
  - Slum Upgrading until World Bank funding stops (1970’s-1980’s)
  - World Bank sites and services approach dominates
- **Major political shifts:**
  - Shift from centralized to decentralized government
  - Ujamaa Villagization Policy (1980’s)
  - Land rights through National Land Policy 1995
- **Environmental issues:** floods and associated health and housing problems
- National Human Settlements Development Policy (NSDP), 2000 sets new tone for informal settlements policy
Community Level:
Hanna Nassif Upgrading Project

Objectives:
- Pilot a community-based, employment-intensive, infrastructure upgrading project
- Enhance the capacity for the Dar-es Salaam City Council to respond to community-based upgrading proposals and implementation
- Provide a support mechanism for community-based initiatives

Outputs:
- storm water drainage
- safe drinking water
- passable access roads
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Accomplishments:
Multiple Outcome Areas

- **Physical:**
  - water supply: water vending kiosks
  - sanitation (solid-waste management): solid-waste management teams
  - Increased vehicular accessibility
  - decline of waterborne diseases

- **Social and Economic:**
  - Technical and nontechnical skills, more registered micro-enterprises, improved property values & tax collection, enhanced civil society participation
City Level: Citywide Strategy for Upgrading Unplanned and Unserviced Settlements, 2007

- First comprehensive set of action plans to build on mandates from the 2000 NHSDP

Goals:
- Upgrade 50% of all existing unplanned and unserviced areas by 2020
- Prevent the formation of new settlements in Dar es Salaam

| Land          | • Increase revenue from land taxation  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide affordable land plots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Services</th>
<th>• Increased water, sanitation, roads, waste management, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Housing        | • Access to quality housing  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to housing finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Capacity Building | • Establish institutional procedures that allow communities to pursue further upgrading |

Prof. J. Corburn: jcorburn@berkeley.edu - UC Berkeley, Kenya Slum Policy Studio

19 April 2013

- Led by Ministry of Lands and Human Settlement Development
- Prioritizes “ground-up” upgrading by NGOs and CBOs
- Affirms governments role as a facilitator and not main driver
- Policy issues:
  - Linking informal and urban economy
  - Environmental sustainability
  - Public-private partnerships
  - Government as facilitator in housing provision
Challenges

- Lack of construction management and technical capacity
- Long community mobilization process
- Scaling up from settlement to city-wide plans
- Maintenance and monitoring
## Insights for Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Level</th>
<th>City Level</th>
<th>Country Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals originate from community</td>
<td>Clear short term and long term indicators of success</td>
<td>Integration of cross-cutting issues in urban settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community ownership of project (labor, financial, managerial)</td>
<td>Scales up from settlement planning to city level</td>
<td>Push for CBO and NGO driven upgrading with government facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment intensive process with large social and economic impact</td>
<td>Establishes a Strategic Plan according to the National Policy</td>
<td>Strong attention paid to economic and financial factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some general lessons across all cases

1. **Spatial Urbanism**: National, municipal strategies for all slums, but allow for context specific upgrading; slums as destinations.

2. **Deep democracy**: civil society leaders in all aspect of policy, financing & implementation.

3. **Scaling-up**: as much coordination b/t different sectors & institutions, as spatial; policy entrepreneurs.

4. **Integration**: slum to city; city to slum; prevention.

5. **Equity** – not enough to improve segregated spaces; change relative inequality (e.g., financing); focus on slum assets, not just deficits.

6. **Coordinate**: Multiple supporting policies; staged implementation.

7. **Learn & Adjust**: monitor what is/isn’t working; adjust policy as you go; not get it all right 1st time.
From Case Studies to Policy Analysis

Three themes emerged for analyzing Kenyan NSUPP:

- **Governance** - governmental & non governmental Institutions, norms & practices that shape public decisions; participation not as add-on, but demands framework for policy formulation, implementation & tracking.

- **Financing** – capital to improve communities & change chronic poverty; policy as opportunity to change relationship b/t poor & powerful.

- **Implementation & evaluation** – policy change not = implementation; indicators of success.
GOVERNANCE & INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION
Guiding Principles

- Need for power balance between actors
- Clearly defined actor roles
- Civil society and community participation
- Timely involvement of Stakeholders
- Need for financial leveraging from all actors
Key government policies toward slum upgrading

- **Devolution** - Constitution, 2010
- **Right to accessible and adequate housing** - Constitution, 2010
- **Cities & municipalities to operate within the framework of integrated development planning** - Urban Areas and Cities Act, 2011
- **Framework for community participation** - County Governments Act, 2012
- **Framework for government role in slum upgrading** - National Housing Policy, 2004
Programs & Projects

KENSUP

- Ministry of Housing & UN-HABITAT
- Focus on shelter improvement, infrastructure, services, land tenure

KISIP

- Ministry of Land & World Bank
- Focus on governance and institutional strengthening
Lessons From Other Case Studies

- **Thailand:**
  - Government facilitation of land tenure
  - Strong role of civil society
  - Integration of informal settlement planning into city-wide planning

- **India:**
  - Government facilitates land tenure acquisition & engages communities

- **Tanzania:**
  - Human Settlements Development Policy

- **Brazil:**
  - Slum upgrading as part of a broader set of social policies
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Proposed National Slum Upgrading Policy

- Need for power balance between actors
- Clear role of all actors
- Clear role of civil society organizations
- Timely involvement of all actors
- Financial leveraging from all actors
FINANCING

Christina Gossmann and Siddharth Nadkarny
Assumptions and Goals

- 3 general categories:
  - Public sector
  - Private sector
  - Community level

- Financial model should:
  - Fund large investments in infrastructure
  - Be financially sustainable
  - Encourage local decision-making
# Case Studies: Financing at Every Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>Mobilization</th>
<th>Enumeration</th>
<th>Plan of Action: Preparation</th>
<th>Land Acquisition</th>
<th>Construction Planning</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Community Savings Scheme</td>
<td>Community Savings Scheme</td>
<td>Community Savings Scheme</td>
<td>Central Government (CODI): Low interest loan</td>
<td>UNDP, EUF, Ford Foundation (UNCHS, UNV associated agencies)</td>
<td>Community Savings Scheme</td>
<td>Community Savings Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>CSO Funds</td>
<td>CSO Funds</td>
<td>CSO Funds</td>
<td>State Government: Land title transfer</td>
<td>Resident contributions/Coop membership fees</td>
<td>State Government: Land title transfer</td>
<td>Private Bank loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania (Hanna Nu)</td>
<td>Community-managed Upgrading (CDC) Project, initiated by Community Development</td>
<td>Community-led</td>
<td>UNDP, EUF, Ford Foundation (UNCHS, UNV associated agencies)</td>
<td>Secure tenure not designed into upgrading, most of the land owners in Hanna Nu did not have</td>
<td>UNDP, EUF, Ford Foundation (UNCHS, UNV associated agencies)</td>
<td>Private Bank loan</td>
<td>Private Bank loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>IADB + government: state and municipality level</td>
<td>IADB + government: state and municipality level</td>
<td>IADB + government: state and municipality level + community-level participation (POUSOs)</td>
<td>NI Aavele Barmo one of few slum upgrading programs operating without land tenure</td>
<td>Government: state-level, Fundo de Amanhã, O Trabalhador</td>
<td>IADB + government: state and municipality level</td>
<td>IADB + government: state and municipality level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya: KISIP &amp; KENSUP</td>
<td>UN Habitat and government of Kenya (KENSUP); World Bank, SIDA, MD and government of Kenya (KISIP)</td>
<td>UN Habitat and government of Kenya (KENSUP); World Bank, SIDA, MD and government of Kenya (KISIP)</td>
<td>KISIP preferred settlements on government land or with clear ownership status, land tenure not part of upgrading program</td>
<td>UN Habitat and government of Kenya (KENSUP); World Bank, SIDA, MD and government of Kenya (KISIP)</td>
<td>UN Habitat and government of Kenya (KENSUP); World Bank, SIDA, MD and government of Kenya (KISIP)</td>
<td>UN Habitat and government of Kenya (KENSUP); World Bank, SIDA, MD and government of Kenya (KISIP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Institutions</th>
<th>National/State/Local Government</th>
<th>International Government Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pvt. Institutions</td>
<td>Private banks</td>
<td>International development banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Institutions</td>
<td>Community groups</td>
<td>Civil Society organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of Types of Finance

- The Community Level:
  - Community Saving Schemes and Microfinance

- The Private Sector:
  - International Market Bonds
  - Social Impact Bonds
  - Low-Interest Loans with Intermediaries
  - Tax Incentives

- The Public Sector:
  - Grants
  - Loans
Developing a Hybrid Model

- Role of different forms of financing at different stages
- Finance as critical aspect of agency in decision making for communities
- Right balance between large scale finance but localized decision making
- Role of private sector financing
IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

Kristen A. Johnson and Melody Tulier
Core Principles

- Community-driven and transparent processes for data collection, tool development, analysis and action based on results

- Processes that engage all stakeholders

- Evaluation is integrated into project implementation to inform strategy, refine implementation, and identify trends and opportunities
## Outcome Areas in Kenyan National Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. UN Habitat Pro-poor Land Management, 2004</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. National Housing Bill, 2009</td>
<td>Housing, Finance, Land, Infrastructure, Legal Frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Housing Sector Incentives Bill, 2011</td>
<td>Housing, Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Urban Areas Bill, 2011</td>
<td>Planning, Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. UN Habitat Building Safety through Slum Upgrading, 2011</td>
<td>Safety, Community, Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Graph 1: Outcome Areas in National Kenyan Policies
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Policy Questions for NSUPP

1. How can we incorporate implementation and evaluation process and outcome methods from the start and adapt as programs evolve?

2. How and what kinds of multi-level, multi-source data can be collected and used in a way that reflects key values?

3. How can NSUPP target outcome areas which are not strongly addressed in the current national policy context and capitalize on others areas which have a strong policy backing?

4. What specific indicators identify outcomes for NSUPP goals? What are some relevant outcomes that are cross-cutting throughout various thematic areas?
Next Steps

- Comments
- Collaboration
- Deliverables
- Others…