
Understanding Urban Poverty; What the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers tell us

Diana Mitlin

This document is an output from a project funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) for the benefit of developing countries. The views expressed are not necessarily those of the DFID. It is one of two papers prepared with the support of the UK Department for International Development under a research contract for "Seeking more accurate and inclusive measures of urban poverty" (contract No: 8131). The other paper is on *The Under-estimation of Urban Poverty in Low and Middle-income Nations* by David Satterthwaite and, like this one, is available as a published working paper from www.earthprint.org or electronically at www.iied.org/urban/downloads.html.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Diana Mitlin is an economist with the Human Settlements Programme of the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) in London and teaches part time at the Institute for Development Policy and Management (IDPM), University of Manchester. She also works on urban poverty issues within the Centre for Chronic Poverty and the Centre on Regulation and Competition at IDPM. She is a member of the editorial board of Environment and Urbanization and is the editor of HiFi News, a newsletter on innovations in housing finance.

Address: Human Settlements Programme,
IIED
3 Endsleigh Street
London WC1H ODD, UK

Tel: (44) 207 388 2117
Fax: (44) 207 388 2826
E-mail: Diana.mitlin@iied.org

ISBN: 1 84369 512 X

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Measuring Urban Poverty.....	3
III. Measuring Poverty in the PRSPs	6
a. Types of definitions linked to understandings of types of poverty	6
b. Income/expenditure-based measures.....	8
c. Basic needs-based measures.....	10
d. Other measures	11
IV. Perceived Incidence of Urban Poverty.....	12
a. Poverty analysis based on numbers.....	12
b. Emerging issues: understanding urban poverty	14
V. Conclusion.....	17
REFERENCES.....	18

TABLES

Table 1: How to identify the poor	7
Table 2: Urban poverty in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers.....	9
Table 3: Changes in food and non-food expenditures, calorie consumption and inequality in Ethiopia	13
Table 4: Urban and rural poverty lines in those countries with separate indices.....	14

OTHER IIED PUBLICATIONS ON URBAN ISSUES	21
---	----

Understanding Urban Poverty – What the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers tell us

Diana Mitlin

SUMMARY

This paper reviews 23 Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) to consider how they define and measure urban poverty and thereby assess the extent to which they consider urban poverty. Nearly all PRSPs have a strong emphasis on the relative importance of rural poverty. However, many appear concerned that their poverty estimates do not fully represent the situation with respect to urban poverty. Their narrative texts complement their quantitative estimates in a number of ways, suggesting that there may be serious “pockets of poverty” within urban areas, that urban poverty may be increasing and that inequality may be higher in urban areas than in rural areas.

Part of the difference in opinions regarding the scale and depth of urban poverty in the PRSPs relates to the differences in how poverty (including urban poverty) is measured. Most PRSPs still rely primarily on income-based poverty lines to define who is poor. In many nations, a single poverty line is used, with no attempt to take account of the higher monetary income needed to avoid poverty in some areas, such as the larger or more prosperous cities. For nations that include basic-needs measures in their definition of poverty, some use indicators relating to people’s proximity to services, without considering whether these people can actually use these services.

I. Introduction

There is a growing awareness of the emerging significance of urban poverty. Haddad, Ruel and Garrett (1999, 2) suggest that: “Many analysts believe that the locus of poverty and undernutrition is gradually shifting from rural to urban areas.” In their own study, they disaggregate data between urban and rural areas for eight countries, each with information for two points in time, and conclude:

“In five out of the eight countries, the absolute number of urban poor and the share of poor people living in urban areas is increasing over time (Bangladesh, China, Ghana, India and Nigeria). For seven of the eight countries the share of poor people in urban areas is increasing” (*ibid*, 8).

However, is it accurate to say that most analysts believe that the locus of poverty is shifting from rural to urban? To many working on urban poverty, this would appear to be an overstatement. More specifically, the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) for Cambodia suggests that statistics are used to play down the significance of urban poverty, in part due to prejudice:

“Both the authorities and the better-off city dwellers tend to blame the [urban] poor for their wretched conditions and stigmatise the [urban] poor as socially undesirable, criminally inclined, even mentally defective. The usual response for middle-class people and from officials is that the urban poor should be sent back to the rural areas where they belong. Unlike the rural poor, who constitute the vast majority of the poor in Cambodia and who are considered to be innocent victims of poor administration and underdevelopment … the urban poor are deemed to be responsible for their predicament. They are given a much lower priority for assistance because, on paper at least, they are much better off than their rural peers in terms of income, nutrition and

proximity to basic services such as education and health. Even well-informed personnel in donor agencies ironically downplay the privations of the urban poor by using crudely conceived statistical comparisons with the rural poor to justify anti-urban grant and lending policies. By so doing, the donor community often reinforces prevailing local confusion and prejudices against the urban poor" (pages 85-6).

More generally, we can recognise that urban poverty has been relatively ignored by development specialists. As suggested by Maxwell, Levin Armah-Klemesu, Ruel, Morris and Ahiadeke (2000, 2) and the editorials in the special issues of *Environment and Urbanization* on urban poverty in 1995, poverty analysis has suffered from the acceptance of the concept of "urban bias" and a feeling that there was no need to consider urban poverty. At a country level, there have been contradictory reports. In Zimbabwe, for example, Alwang, Mills and Taruvinga (2002, 15) argue that: "In 1990, virtually no poverty existed in urban areas..." In the same country, and referring to a similar period, Kanji (1995, 42) reports that the number of urban households eating only one or two meals a day increased from 29 per cent in 1991 to 37 per cent just one year later. For Kenya, Sahn and Stifel (2002, 30) suggest that only 1.2 per cent of Kenya's urban population could be considered poor in 1998, yet the Kenyan Bureau of Statistics suggested that 49 per cent of Kenya's urban population were in absolute poverty in 1997 (APHRC 2002, 5). Finally, De Haan (1997, 3) draws attention to a similar discrepancy in the case of Indonesia, with national government statistics suggesting that urban poverty levels exceeded rural poverty levels, while World Bank figures document the reverse relationship.

This paper seeks to understand how development agencies and governments are now considering the extent of urban poverty, through a study of completed Poverty Reduction Strategies (known as PRSPs – Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers).¹ The Strategies have been developed to be "... a professedly comprehensive "country-driven" approach to poverty...ultimately linked to other budgetary and debt-related frameworks" (Craig and Porter 2003, 53). They have emerged from a desire by the international financial institutions to allocate aid more effectively and to ensure greater national ownership of the pro-poor public sector investment that is required for HIPC debt relief (Highly Indebted Poor Countries) (Craig and Porter 2003, 58).

This paper reviews a set of completed PRSPs to take stock of how donor agencies and national governments are measuring and considering urban poverty. It should be noted that the specific recommendations and proposals in the Strategy Papers themselves are not considered here. The sections below simply examine how the Strategies define poverty, and explore the implications for the identification of the urban poor. However, as recognised by the Bank's own review of the Strategy process by staff of the World Bank and IMF (2002, 29): "[T]horough and comprehensive poverty diagnostics form the PRSP's foundation." To the extent that the discussion here considers the adequacy of the PRSP processes in their understanding of urban poverty, it offers some insights into the likely validity of the emerging proposals for poverty reduction.

Section II discusses urban poverty measurement, suggesting a number of reasons why figures may be inaccurate. Section III reports on the Strategies that are included in this study, and on the approaches that they use in measuring poverty and their subsequent figures for urban poverty. In considering the different methods of measurement separately, the discussion

¹ A companion working paper to this one is on *The Under-estimation of Urban Poverty in Low and Middle-income Nations* by David Satterthwaite and, like this one, is available as a published working paper from www.earthprint.org or electronically at www.iied.org/urban/downloads.html.

highlights the specific ways in which urban poverty has been analysed. Section IV moves on from numbers, and reports on the discursive analysis in the Strategy Papers. While there is a general conclusion in favour of the relative severity of rural poverty, there are a number of general areas that emerge across the Strategies that, together, suggest the analysis of urban poverty may be lacking. Section V offers some conclusions.

II. Measuring Urban Poverty

There is an ongoing – if muted – debate about the measurement of urban poverty. Jonsson and Satterthwaite (2000, 1) argue that aggregated international and national figures underestimate the degree of poverty in urban areas:

“If the term poverty is taken to mean human needs that are not met, then most of the estimates for the scale of urban poverty in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean appear too low. For instance, a publication by the Overseas Development Council in the USA in 1989 decided that only 130 million of the Third World’s ‘poorest poor’ lived in urban areas. This means that more than nine out of ten of its urban population were not among the poorest poor (Leonard 1989). ...The 1999/2000 World Development Report (World Bank 1999) suggested that there were 495 million ‘urban poor’ by the year 2000, which means that three-quarters of the urban population are ‘not poor’.

These figures do not fit with the many national and city studies which show that one-third to one-half of a nation’s urban population or a city’s population have incomes too low to allow them to meet their needs. National studies in many of the poorest African, Asian and Latin American countries suggest that more than half the urban population are below the poverty line.”

Among monetary measures of poverty, the Millennium Development Goal Standard of one US dollar a day has become an important benchmark by which the extent of poverty is assessed. However, it pays little attention to differences in the expenditure patterns of different groups of the poor or to the cost differences faced by different groups.² There appear to be several reasons that suggest that urban dwellers both earn more and spend more on necessities. First, some goods are more expensive in urban areas, especially in larger and/or more prosperous cities. There is extensive evidence to suggest that, in general, prices are higher in urban areas (although the price of specific items may be lower). Second, some goods that are essentials for everyone have to be purchased in urban areas but may not be marketed in rural areas (for example, fuel, water and shelter). Many empirical studies have shown the high costs paid by particular urban groups (or those living in particular settlements) for non-food essentials such as housing, water and fuel. Finally, different livelihoods require different costs, and these may not be adequately taken into account in a standardised bundle of “basic needs” goods and services. For example, the nature of urban labour markets may require expenditure on transport

² Deaton (2001, 138) notes that: “...in the World Bank’s calculation of the number of poor in the world, separate urban and rural [price] indexes are used only for India and China. In other countries, a single index does service for everyone, an expedient that must overstate rural relative to urban poverty.” As the recent debate between Pogge and Reddy (2002a, 2002b) and Ravallion (2002) shows, the issue is even more complex when considered internationally. Pogge and Reddy (2002a, 8–11) argue that whatever poverty lines are used, the PPP conversion is misleading because it is not based on a “basket” of goods consumed by the poor but on general consumption. Ravallion (2002) raises the issue of what might be considered to be the “right” basket. The discussion here suggests that different baskets might be required for urban and rural areas.

and clean smart clothes for work. The following paragraphs consider each of these issues in turn.

Irrespective of whether or not the correct “bundle” of goods has been used, the price levels are significant (Srinivasan 2001, 161). The evidence suggests that price levels differ between rural and urban areas, **and** that price levels differ between urban centres. For example:

- Deaton and Tarozzi (2000, 21) suggest that prices in urban areas are 15.6 per cent higher than in rural areas. They add: “...For all India, the ‘official’ urban prices are higher than rural prices by 40.8 per cent... and the official urban premium varies across states from a high of 65.2 per cent in Andhra Pradesh to a low of only 15.3 per cent in West Bengal, and is actually negative in Assam.”
- The cost of living in Cebu, a major city in the Philippines, is 89 per cent that of Metro Manila (World Bank Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Sector Unit, East Asia and Pacific Region 2001, 91–2).
- Glewwe and McKay (quoted in Jonsson and Satterthwaite 2000, 28) suggest that prices in smaller cities in Côte d’Ivoire are 16–30 per cent lower than in Abidjan.
- Kironde (1995, 83) notes that, in 1991, the income required for 2000 calories a day was 19.7 per cent higher in towns outside of Dar es Salaam and 98.2 per cent higher in Dar es Salaam than in rural areas.

This suggests that generalised price indices may be misleading us as to the extent of urban poverty, if they are used to calculate the numbers with below poverty line incomes in diverse areas with the implicit assumption that price levels do not vary. Even separate urban and rural price indices that aggregate across regions and cities may not be helpful, given the suggested differences in price levels between cities.

Turning to the items purchased by the urban poor, it is accepted by many that urban dwellers spend a smaller proportion of their income on food because they have other essential costs (see, for example, Rakodi 2002, 11). Once more, examples illustrate the issue:

- Dhanani and Islam (2002, 1218) quote a Central Bureau of Statistics survey (1996) in Indonesia that showed: “...urban households in the neighbourhood of the poverty line spent 37 per cent of their total consumption on non-food items, while the corresponding figure for rural households was 31 per cent.” Dhanani and Islam (2002, 1217) themselves estimate that rural non-food costs are only 81 per cent of urban non-food costs.
- In India, urban food expenditure (averaged across all households) was estimated to be 67.6 per cent of total expenditure in the 43rd round (1987/88), falling to 63.4 per cent in the 50th round (1993/94), while rural food expenditure was 74.6 and 70.7 respectively; this is: “...to be expected if urban areas are somewhat better off, and because of the relatively greater importance for urban consumers of items such as housing and transportation” (Deaton and Tarozzi 2000, 19).
- Government of Mozambique (1998) (quoted in Jonsson and Satterthwaite 2000, 28) finds that poor rural dwellers spend 30 per cent of their income on non-food items, while for urban dwellers the figure is 38 per cent. Low-income households spend a higher proportion of their income on housing, energy, household items, education, health care, personal items and transport in urban areas.

Both urban and rural households have to spend money on housing and basic services, but markets that are not commoditised in rural areas may be commoditised in urban locations.

Competition for scarce resources may also increase prices. Urban households may face particularly high costs related to:

- Housing – housing markets can be expensive and low-income households may spend a considerable proportion of their income on rent (UNCHS 1993, 1996). Even those who squat on land illegally may need to make payments to community leaders who manage the land, or to local “strongmen”.
- Transport – a recent study of a number of low-income areas in Karachi found average monthly incomes to be between US\$ 25–42 (Urban Resource Centre 2001, 224–6). Seventy per cent of household heads interviewed spent between 10–20 per cent of income on transport services. Another study in three low-income settlements in Dar es Salaam found that the overwhelming reason to travel was for livelihoods. Household surveys found that in Mabibo (8 km from the centre), 20 per cent of income was spent on bus costs; and in Charambe (20 km from the centre), 14 per cent of income was spent on bus costs (Kombe 2002).
- Basic services – in many urban contexts, prices for water for those who lack official connections, and for sanitation for those with no toilets in their home and who have to use pay toilets, are high (UN-Habitat 2003). For example, low-income communities in Cebu City (the Philippines), due to a lack of piped supplies, generally buy vended water at P3–35 per cubic metre (US\$ 0.02–0.80) and spend an average of 9 per cent of their income on water (Etemadi 2000, 71).
- Undertaking informal enterprises may require bribes and/or fines when the activities are discovered. As illustrated in Bangalore, informal vendors may have to make numerous illegal payments to the police and officials who have “control” over public urban space (Benjamin and Bhuvaneswari 2001, 131–8).
- Direct expenditure on health can be high, in part because of the high levels of ill-health or injury and in part because of the high costs of treatment. One study of low-income settlements in Dhaka reported that: “[F]or the majority of households, some kind of expenditure on health care each month is the norm ... and healthcare was found to be the largest expenditure in most households after food and house rent” (Kabir, Rahman, Salway and Pryer 2000, 711).

Although national capitals and larger cities are likely to be among the most expensive locations for the urban poor, this is not always the case. There may be large cities with relatively low prices (cities with declining economic bases or cities with innovative and effective governments that ensure efficient provision of infrastructure and services and land delivery systems) and some small cities or towns with relatively high prices (for instance, many tourist resorts or small cities with relatively prosperous economies).

Moving away from financial measures of poverty, there is an active debate across urban and rural areas about the importance of supplementing income/expenditure measures with a more focused assessment of basic needs and civil rights.

Boltvinik (no date) argues that implicit in the poverty line approach is the assumption that if a group meets its nutritional requirements (above the poverty line for food), then it is above the minimum standards for other basic needs. However, in numerous Latin American countries, this has been seen not to be the case. Boltvinik (no date) and Minujin (1995, 5) argue in favour of a measure of poverty that combines a monetary poverty line with an assessment of unsatisfied basic needs. The resultant measure of poverty would include both those households whose per capita income is below the per capita poverty line and/or have one or more unsatisfied basic need. As can be seen in Section III, such ideas have been positively received

by a number of the Strategy Papers. In a study of the Côte d'Ivoire, Grimm and Guenard (2002, 1074) suggest that urban poverty increased by both lack of income and unsatisfied basic needs during 1985–93. Significantly for those seeking to understand poverty, they conclude: “... this study highlights the fact that poverty measured by subsistence conditions can have a different dynamic than monetary poverty” (page 1088).

Satterthwaite (1997 and 2001, 146) summarises a number of authors to argue in favour of an even broader interpretation of poverty that includes measures of exclusion.³ He identifies eight aspects of urban poverty: inadequate income; inadequate unstable or risky asset base; inadequate shelter; inadequate provision of public infrastructure; inadequate provision of basic services; limited or no safety net; inadequate protection of poorer groups' rights through the operation of law; and poorer groups' voicelessness and powerlessness.

This summary suggests that measurements of urban poverty need to be sensitive to:

- differences between the cost of living in different urban (and rural) areas;
- differences in the basket of goods required to remain healthy in a state of well-being;
- access to basic infrastructure and services; and
- levels of civil and political rights.

III. Measuring Poverty in the PRSPs

The following analysis is based on 23 Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) that have been completed in Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean (this paper does not include those for the transitional economies). Of these 23, 15 are for African countries. In part, this reflects the role of the Strategies within the HIPC process, the motivation of national governments to agree the Strategy and the donor support that is available. The Strategies are all included in, and have been downloaded from, the World Bank's website in June 2003.⁴ The following Strategies have been included in this analysis:

Africa: Benin, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia.

Asia: Cambodia, Sri Lanka, Vietnam and Yemen.

Latin America: Bolivia, Guyana, Honduras and Nicaragua.

a. Types of definitions linked to understandings of types of poverty

At the heart of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers lies the identification of the poor. As noted in Section II, there has been some discussion over the relative merits of different approaches. Table 1 summarises the approaches used in the Poverty Reduction Strategies.

The PRSP processes⁵ accept that there are multiple definitions of poverty. Table 1 gives an indication of the significance of income (or expenditure) and/or basic needs measures. Twenty-two of the 23 PRSPs use income/expenditure measures. In four cases, basic needs measures

³ Those previously discussing this issue include Moser, Herbert and Makonnen (1993), Amis (1995), Chambers (1995), Wratten (1995), Baulch (1996), Moser (1996) and Moser (1998).

⁴ See: <http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/strategies>. This does not appear to include all completed Strategies (perhaps due to a time delay in scanning and loading the documents). For example, I understand that Kenya has completed their Strategy, but it was not on the website in June 2003.

⁵ On balance, it seems more accurate to refer to processes rather than process. While all PRSPs are part of a clear group, there is some diversity of approach in the documents and the way in which they have been compiled.

may be considered to have more or less equal priority. The Strategy Paper for Mali does not yet have income/expenditure data and makes use of basic needs indicators alone.

As indicated, the preferred approach is that of an income/expenditure estimate. In five countries (notably in Latin America), major emphasis is also placed on basic needs approaches. Typically, the monitoring of basic needs includes access to water, sanitation, health and education services. It may also include housing quality.⁶

Finally, a number of Strategy Papers also collect information from elsewhere, notably from participatory assessments; participatory poverty assessments were popularised during the 1990s (McGee 2002, 108–110). In the Strategy Papers analysed, relatively little weight appears to have been given to participatory assessments, although other Strategy Papers than those indicated included participatory assessments.

Table 1: How to identify the poor

	Income/expenditure	Basic needs	Other
Major means of identification	Benin, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Bolivia, Guyana, Honduras, Nicaragua, Cambodia, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Yemen	Mali, Tanzania, Bolivia, Guyana, Honduras	
Minor means of identification	Mali	Benin, Mauritania, Mozambique, Rwanda, Zambia, Nicaragua	Burkina Faso (PPA), Ghana (health), Mali (potential poverty – lack of assets), Mozambique (PPA), Niger (PPA), Rwanda (dependency, PPA), Zambia (capabilities, health indicators such as children's stunting), Bolivia (malnutrition indicators, national dialogue)

What is notable from Table 1 is the heavy dependence of PRSPs on income/expenditure-based methods of assessment. This finding is supported by Craig and Porter's (2003, 61) study of the PRSP process in Uganda. They suggest that: "...power and control-centred conceptions of poverty are typically crowded out by the predominant money-metric and 'social gap' approaches of the PRSPs." The discussion in Section II raises specific questions about the adequacy of income/expenditure poverty lines and the price indices that underlie them. The sub-sections below look, in turn, at the assessment of urban poverty within income/expenditure-based measures, basic needs measures and, finally, participatory measures.

⁶ The fact that most Latin American nations have regular censuses with detailed data collected on housing quality and access to basic services may help explain this; some Asian nations and many African nations have not had regular censuses, and even for those that have, the data on housing quality are often not available.

b. Income/expenditure-based measures

Section II outlines the importance of taking into account the different cost of living (or cost of necessities) in different types of settlement for an accurate understanding of the scale of urban poverty. The following lists – “national only” and “urban/rural” – indicate the PRSPs that use a single poverty line and those that use a differentiated urban/rural or small towns/capital/rural approach. It should be emphasised that these lists use the definitions as reported on in the Strategies. It is possible that some may have amended the poverty lines used to take account of differences in the cost of living, and not specified this in the Strategy Paper. However, in most cases, the wording is very precise. Despite this, we should recognise that there are also ambiguities such as the case of PRSP for Mozambique:

“In the National Assessment, basic minimum conditions were identified in terms of an absolute poverty line, constructed as the sum of a food poverty line based on nutritional standards of approximately 2,150 calories per person per day, plus a modest amount of non-food expenditure based on consumption by households that suffer from food insecurity. In monetary terms, the national poverty line was fixed at 5,433 MT per person per day, after weighting the various provincial poverty lines and adjusting them to reflect variations in the cost of living. (Note 5)

Note 5: For example, a person living in Maputo City needs to spend 2.5 times more on daily consumption (for the basket of goods chosen for the poverty line) than a person who lives in a rural area in Nampula.”

In this case, it is difficult to say if a single poverty line has been used (as is stated) or if the recognised regional price differences have been taken into account (as the Note implies). In the case of Tanzania, the Strategy uses the results of six studies completed between 1983 and 1998. It is possible that one or more of these studies included multiple poverty lines; however, actual definitions have not been given. For this reason, Mozambique and Tanzania are not included in the lists below. Mali is also not included because it does not use an income measure in its analysis.

Single national poverty level: Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Malawi, Mauritania, Niger, Rwanda,⁷ Senegal, Uganda, Zambia, Guyana, Honduras, Nicaragua and Sri Lanka.

Differentiated poverty level for rural and urban areas: Benin, Gambia (divided between Banjul and “other cities”), Niger, Bolivia (divided between “cities” and “other urban”), Cambodia (divided between Phnom Penh and “other cities”), Vietnam and Yemen. Table 2 gives the figures for urban poverty from these income/expenditure poverty lines.

The diversity of approaches is somewhat surprising. If it is widely accepted in some countries that the cost of living differs in urban and rural areas, then why is it not accepted in others? If, as also commonly accepted, it is understood that the cost of living differs between the capital city and other urban centres, then why is this not more widely reproduced in poverty lines?

⁷ Rwanda’s Strategy notes that the poverty line is deflated by a regional price index. It is not clear if this is further divided between urban or rural (see page 14).

Alternatively, is it just that this detail is not reported in the Strategy Papers but is contained within the detailed situational analysis of poverty levels? This may be possible, but the question still remains of why the different poverty lines used in different places have not been reported.

Table 2: Urban poverty in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers

Country	Date	Percentage of the urban population that is poor *	Percentage of the rural population that is poor	Reference page
Benin	1999	23.2	33	12
Burkina Faso	1998	16.5	51	7
Ethiopia	1999/00	37	45	5
Gambia	1998	32.5(13.3)	51.1	24
Ghana	1998/99	17.3	36	14
Malawi	1998	54	65.5	6
Mauritania	1996	26.8	68.1	5
Mozambique	2000	62	71.3	22
Niger	1993	52	66	21
Rwanda	2000	22.6	67.9	14
Senegal	2001	44–59	72–88	9
Uganda	no data			
Zambia	1998	56	83.1	22
Cambodia	1999	42.4 (14.6)	56.1	32
Sri Lanka	1995/96			
Vietnam	2000	7.8	19.7	19
Yemen	1998	10	19.9	35
Bolivia	1992	53	95	32
Guyana		Cannot be read		
Honduras	1999	37	58	10
Nicaragua	1998	30.5	68.5	8

*Figures in brackets are those for the capital city.

Given the analysis in Section II, and with such a high proportion of countries failing to recognise the higher level of costs in urban areas, there should be major concerns about the adequacy of poverty data. The World Bank's own guidance reflects the need to take cost of living into account: "The cost of basic needs might vary between areas... Nominal expenditures or incomes need to be made comparable in spatial terms by adjusting for different price levels in different parts of the country".⁸ The Chapter on Urban Poverty in the World Bank's PRSP Sourcebook stresses that it is important that: "...quantitative measures take adequate account of major differences in the minimum essential 'consumption basket' and the differential prices faced for goods and services" across very different kinds of settlements (Baharoglu and Kessides 2001, 8).

⁸ www.poverty.worldbank.org/files5467_chap1.pdf, page 32

The same chapter in the Sourcebook also suggests that different kinds of data can be used to complement each other in estimating poverty levels, and makes a number of suggestions for specific indicators. Mozambique's Strategy refers to ongoing work to compare different methodologies to measure poverty (page 20). Looking specifically at income/expenditure measures, the Strategy concludes that the “cost of basic needs” approach is more robust than the “food intake equivalent”. As significantly, they emphasise that the choice of method for measuring poverty influences relative poverty levels between different geographical regions. In this conclusion, they are in agreement with Grimm and Guenard (2002, 1088) (whose findings are noted in Section II above) and with Coudouel, Hentschel and Wodon (2001, 8).

c. Basic needs-based measures

While I did not anticipate that basic needs measures might also be questioned for their adequacy and accuracy with respect to assessing levels of urban poverty, close examination suggests otherwise. Basic needs measures of poverty in the Strategy Papers are generally a composite index that includes access to basic services such as water, sanitation, health and education. When measuring access to basic services such as health and education, some Strategy Papers use distance to a facility. This implies that proximity is equivalent to access. However, we know that in many situations this is not the case because of the direct and indirect costs attached to access. Both Mali and Honduras outline their methodologies in some detail. In other cases, it is harder to assess precisely how access to services meeting basic needs has been measured.

Mali's Strategy Paper uses proximity to socioeconomic infrastructure and services. The measure of basic needs poverty aggregates the distance to services for education, health, water, food security (cereal bank) and finance (village bank). Different points are given for a distance of 0 km, 0–5km and over 5 km. There is a maximum score of 20.

Honduras also has a composite unsatisfied basic needs index, although it makes no assumptions about proximity and access. The index is an aggregate of six indicators, and there is differentiation between urban and rural standards:

- Water: urban standard is access to potable water within the property; rural standard is access to water from a piped system or a well.
- Sanitation: urban standard is having a toilet other than a simple pit latrine; rural standard is having at least a simple pit latrine.
- Education is having primary school-age children enrolled in school.
- Subsistence capacity is head of house having three years of primary school education and being employed; if not, at least one employed member for every three dependants.
- Crowding is measured by no more than three people per room (excluding bathrooms).
- Housing: urban standard is not improvised or built from scrap materials and not having an earth floor; rural standard is not being improvised or built from scrap materials.

Tanzania, Bolivia and Guyana do not specify their indices in detail. Bolivia measures basic needs poverty using a composite index that is based on: “...the availability of basic services, housing quality and education levels” (page 16). Tanzania does not appear to have a single measure of non-income poverty. Analysis is based on educational status, infant mortality, malnutrition, access to clean drinking water, vulnerability to unpredictable events, and peace and stability. Guyana simply states that it uses a living conditions survey (page 5).

While Honduras makes no assumption about distance from services, the index in Mali assumes that proximity to services is an adequate measure of access to services. A similar argument appears in the Strategy for Zambia: “In urban areas, 99 per cent of households are within 5 km of a health facility, compared to 50 per cent in rural areas” (page 84). This suggests that coverage is good. However, the analysis in the Zambian Strategy Paper goes on to emphasise: “Before the introduction of user fees in 1993, there was a significant decrease in the utilisation of health services. Several studies in the mid-1990s concluded that user fees play a big role in this” (page 85).

The problem of affordability is further illustrated in Ghana, where: “Nearly 70 per cent of the sample population (especially among the rural and urban poor) cited cost as one key reason for non-use of medical services” (page 18). However, in Ghana’s Strategy, measures of proximity to education and health services (less than 30 minutes away) are also given as indicative of access to services, without considering actual use of those services (page 14).

Hence, in Mali and elsewhere that measures basic needs by proximity to services, there is some reason to assume that urban poverty may be erroneously judged to be low because services are physically close. In urban areas, provision may appear good because of the high population densities and (in some cases) investment in services. However, and as indicated above, in many circumstances you need money to access the services and, if there are no funds, then effectively the services are not there. From the information in the Strategy Papers themselves, it is evident that proximity to services cannot be equated with access.

d. Other measures

As noted in Table 1, a number of the Strategy Papers augment their qualitative analysis with participatory assessments. In the Strategy Papers for Burkina Faso, Gambia, Senegal and Zambia, these specifically distinguish the views of urban and rural residents. While not bearing on the adequacy of poverty measurements, some comparative perspectives are summarised here.

In Burkina Faso, the analysis of participatory assessments was disaggregated for urban and rural residents (page 13). What differences did the poor perceive?

- The 10 most significant factors causing poverty in urban areas were, with the most significant first: climate-related hazards, low purchasing power, old age, large family, lack of initiative/laziness, mediocre government, physical handicap, theft, death of a spouse and chronic poverty.
- And the 10 most significant factors causing poverty in rural areas were: lack of initiative/laziness, permanent failure, physical handicap, social decay, chronic poverty, low purchasing power, social and cultural barriers, absence of NGO or project assistance, large family size and planning problems.

In Gambia, both urban and rural dwellers perceive poverty in terms of being unable to provide for basic living requirements. In rural areas, there is a greater stress on the means of production rather than on wage labour (pages 54–55). “In urban areas the sick and unemployed are the most vulnerable, as are those with very low wages and large families” (page 55).

In Senegal, the Strategy Paper distinguishes between urban and rural residents’ views of the “breaking points” of poverty. Many residents highlight “natural” factors such as droughts, coastal erosion (and associated salinisation), soil degradation, fires, flooding and pests. “Other

breaking points, particularly in urban areas, are also the outcome of natural processes, and include the death, retirement or loss of employment of the principal income earner, and physical incapacity resulting from old age or a disabling sickness” (page 14).

In Zambia, those living in low-income urban areas prioritised “having food, money and employment” (page 31). In terms of what it takes to have a “good life”, rural dwellers emphasised agriculture as a source of income, while urban dwellers identified employment and business. Apart from this, characteristics of a good life were similar, involving food, education, clothing and health.

In Rwanda (page 16), the assessment does not appear to have been completed in urban areas. In Ghana (page 28), the urban–rural dimension is only briefly considered. Both areas highlighted hunger, malnutrition, ill-health, high infant mortality rates, low life expectancy, increase in school dropouts, low levels of education, increase in crime, personal conflicts and loss of integrity as some of the consequences of poverty. Urban residents also stressed the importance of crime, children living on the streets and sex workers. In Nicaragua, Niger, Tanzania and Yemen, there were very brief reports of assessments that had been recently undertaken, but they did not differentiate the views of urban and rural residents. In Cambodia, there were participatory assessments in villages and with selected groups in need, such as street children (page 11). The findings illustrate the analysis in the form of quotes, but there is no separate analysis of the participatory assessment.

This analysis of the participatory assessments highlights, as might be expected, the greater vulnerability of the urban poor to labour markets and the price of goods and services.

This section has summarised the major findings in the Strategy Papers about the incidence of poverty in urban areas, and has discussed how the incidence has been assessed. The next section considers how the Strategy Papers themselves augment their quantitative analysis of urban poverty, and offers insights into the nature and extent of urban poverty.

IV. Perceived Incidence of Urban Poverty

This discussion of the perceived incidence of urban poverty is divided into two sub-sections. The first considers the “first impression” that arises from the analysis discussed above. It concludes that the Strategy Papers overwhelmingly emphasise the problem of rural poverty. The second sub-section then draws more completely on the analysis throughout the Strategy Papers, to investigate further the emerging understanding of urban poverty and its nature and severity.

a. Poverty analysis based on numbers

The emerging conclusions in the Strategy Papers are that poverty is predominantly rural. Selected country comments are given below to illustrate these conclusions. In general, they draw directly from the numerical estimates of poverty given in Table 2.

Gambia: “Though there has been increased urbanisation over the last decade, and many of those resident in urban areas face very difficult circumstances, extreme poverty is concentrated in rural areas” (page 24).

Ghana: “The rural nature of poverty has not changed much from the early 1990s. It suggests that poverty is also primarily an agricultural phenomenon, and largely in the informal sector” (page 28).

Mauritania: “Monetary poverty is primarily a rural phenomenon” (page 1).

Niger: “Poverty is primarily a rural phenomenon, and 86 per cent of poor people... live in the countryside” (page 21).

Tanzania: “In the rural areas, poverty is more widespread and deeper than in urban centres” (page 6).

Uganda: “At the level of the household, poverty is related to rural residence (specifically to living in the north or the east), to land shortage, to low levels of education, to being headed by a female widow or by someone old, and to limited access to markets” (page 8).

Bolivia: “... extreme poverty is prevalent in rural areas, and that indigenous people and peasants – and particularly women in both groups – suffer most acutely from social exclusion” (page 13).

Guyana: “The incidence of poverty was highest in rural areas, particularly in interior locations” (page 6).

Nicaragua: “In relative terms, poverty and extreme poverty remain overwhelming rural... Two out of every three people in rural areas were poor, compared to one in three in urban areas...” (page 6).

Cambodia: “The poverty map... reflects that actual poverty concentrates generally in the rural areas, but not all” (page 30).

Sri Lanka: “Between 25 and 39 per cent of the population can be classified as poor, depending on whether poverty is measured with a low or a twenty per cent higher poverty line. Poverty is *predominantly a rural phenomenon*, with nearly 90 per cent of the poor residing in rural areas” [original emphasis] (page i). The reference to different poverty lines reflects the analysis in the report.

Vietnam: “Poverty is a widespread phenomenon in rural areas; over 90 per cent of the poor live in rural areas” (page 19).

Yemen: “Poverty in Yemen takes on a rural attribute, especially as the Yemeni people are, to a large extent, mostly rural dwellers despite the rapid growth of urbanization” (page 35).

Perhaps surprisingly, the emphasis on rural poverty seems to remain, even in specific cases where the evidence suggests that urban poverty deserves attention. In the case of Ethiopia, for example, further analysis (see Table 3) indicates falling food consumption in urban areas.

However, the discussion in the Strategy Paper suggests that this data should not divert attention away from rural areas:

“Between 1995/96 and 1999/00, per capita calorie intake apparently increased in rural areas and declined in urban areas. ... However, it must be underlined that an increase in the calorie content of the consumption basket does not necessarily indicate an increase in food quality. A high proportion of the budget being allocated to basic food consumption is still an indication that people in rural areas are food insecure” (page 5).

Table 3: Changes in food and non-food expenditures, calorie consumption and inequality in Ethiopia

	1995/96			1999/00		
	Rural	Urban	National	Rural	Urban	National
Real food expenditure per capita (birr)	577	790	607	609	631	612
Real non-food	466	625	488	392	830	451

expenditure per capita (birr)						
Real total expenditure per capita (birr)	1,035	1,411	1,088	995	1,453	1,057
Kcal consumed per day per adult	1,938	2,050	1,954	2,723	1,861	2,606
Gini coefficient*	.27	.34	.29	.26	.38	.28

* The Gini coefficient (measured between 0 and 1) offers a measure of inequality; the higher the index, the more unequal the income distribution.

Source: Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia and Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (2002), *Ethiopia Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Programme*, Table 1.2, page 6.

b. Emerging issues: understanding urban poverty

The quotes given above suggest that most PRSPs emphasize rural rather than urban poverty. While this is a major theme, some of the contextual analysis within the Strategy Papers points to a somewhat different story. As the analysis becomes more refined, it is evident that there is significant concern about urban poverty. The remainder of this section explores some issues relating to urban poverty that are highlighted within the Strategy Papers themselves.

Purchasing power. As noted in Section II, there is reason to believe that, in many cases, costs are higher in urban areas. Table 4 outlines the differences in poverty lines in urban and rural areas for those countries that distinguish between the two. In each country, except Yemen, urban poverty lines have been set higher than rural poverty lines, in recognition of the higher cost of living.

Table 4: Urban and rural poverty lines in those countries with separate indices

Country	Date	Urban Poverty lines	Rural poverty lines	Currency	Ratio of urban to rural	
Benin	1999	91,705	51,413	Cfaf	1.78	per person per year
Ethiopia	1999/2000	1,453	995	Birr	1.46	per capita per year
Niger	1993	75,000	50,000	Cfaf	1.5	
Cambodia*	1999	2,093–2,470	1,777	Riel	1.18-1.39	per person per day
Vietnam**	2000	90,000	55,000–70,000	VND	1.28-1.64	per person per month
Yemen	1998	3,195	3,215	Yr	0.99	per person per month
Bolivia	1999	29	23	US\$	1.26	per person per month

* Higher level is for Phnom Penh and lower level for other urban centres.

** Rural areas have two price levels.

The lack of use of different indices in many Strategy Papers suggests that the problems faced by the poor in urban areas where money is a required commodity are not sufficiently taken into account.

Even countries that do not use separate poverty lines acknowledge the higher cost of urban living. For example:

- The Strategy Paper for Malawi recognises that the urban poor spend more on non-food costs than the rural poor, 42.4 per cent compared 19.1 per cent. In particular, urban poor households face higher costs for housing and utilities (page 9).
- The Strategy Paper for Senegal notes that: “In the towns, the poor pay more for drinking water than the rich. The fact is that poor households, who essentially have to go to public standpipes for water, pay 3–4 times as much as households with private connections in their home” (page 20).

The Strategy for Rwanda reports that home consumption (as a percentage of total housing food expenditures) is 0.64 in rural homes but 0.46 nationally (page 108). This points to urban households’ greater dependence on market purchases of food. While the discussion in the Strategy points to the low level of commercialisation of rural areas, there is little consideration of the consequences of high levels of commercialisation for the urban poor.

In Niger, which does use different income-based poverty lines for rural and urban areas, the Strategy Paper also acknowledges that urban households generally spend more on food, housing and transport (page 22).

High costs reinforce the importance of labour market participation in securing an income. The participatory assessment in the Gambia suggests that: “In urban areas, the sick and unemployed are the most vulnerable, as are those with very low wages and large families” (page 55). The participatory assessments discussed in Section IIIc above noted the need for employment income in urban areas. For example, in Burkina Faso, the assessment highlights the problem of “low purchasing power”.

Pockets, including peripheries, are not well represented. There appears to be a widespread understanding that aggregate statistics may not be helpful in understanding the problems of urban poverty. It is recognised that there may be pockets of urban poverty that are hidden by the larger mass, with those living on the periphery of cities being particularly vulnerable. There is also concern that the figures do not adequately represent the situation of those living in the smaller towns. Although this might be expected to emerge from the statistics, a number of the Strategy Papers stress that a low percentage in poverty in urban areas does not mean that there is not a problem with respect to urban poverty. The following comments, from a range of countries, illustrate this.

Ghana: “Greater Accra showed the lowest incidence of poverty, although it too has its share of pockets of extreme poverty that are not well reflected in the aggregate statistics” (page 28). “Aggregate regional statistics are bound to obscure the plight of small communities in the periphery of urban areas. It is not unreasonable to guess that what we would find in the peri-urban areas is that their situation would be more like those in rural than in urban settings” (page 29).

Guyana: “The lowest incidence of poverty is in urban areas, where fewer than one in six are poor, although there are urban pockets of poverty where the incidence is higher than the norm” (page 6).

Mauritania: “In general, rural areas are lagging considerably behind in terms of access to infrastructure and basic services. However, poverty in its various manifestations also affects the large cities, which have large areas of precarious housing in which the supply of basic infrastructure is generally poor and underemployment high” (page 4). And: “[A]lthough

poverty is much less pronounced in urban areas overall, it nonetheless represents nearly one-quarter of the poverty in the country and accounts for a considerable fraction of the population living in extreme poverty. Pronounced differences exist also among the different urban centres. These differences point up the existence of a disadvantaged marginalised group within the urban populations that lives in under-equipped neighbourhoods, without skills and jobs, under precarious housing and hygienic conditions” (page 10).

Senegal: “Vulnerable groups live in rural areas and on the fringes of cities. ... Vulnerable groups: children, old, women, disabled, young people, displaced people and refugees” (page 49).

Sri Lanka: “While the poor are now largely concentrated in rural areas, a rapid shift of households to an urban environment will likely increase the ranks of the urban poor. Already large concentrations of the poorest households are to be found in the urban slums and shanties, where poverty, inadequate services and psychological insecurity are serious concerns” (page 83).

In addition to the problem of “pockets of urban poverty”, there are also concerns about the capacity of aggregated figures to portray the situation in smaller towns.

Mauritania: “Large differentials are also observed within the urban population. The incidence of poverty is almost two times lower in Nouakchott...than in other cities...” (page 5).

Bolivia: The national dialogue that accompanied the drafting of the Strategy highlighted the problems of poverty in “marginal urban districts” (page 45).

Trends not well represented. A third set of concerns is that the simple quantifications do not represent well the trends that are taking place. A number of the Strategy Papers highlight a concern that urban poverty is increasing. The Strategy Paper for Burkina Faso notes that urban poverty doubled as a proportion of total poverty between 1994 and 1998, rising from 3.1 to 6.1 per cent (with the proportion of urban dwellers below the poverty line increasing from 10.4 to 16.5 per cent (page 7)). Similar findings are noted in a number of other countries (or regions of countries), including Ethiopia and Mali. In Zambia, the Strategy Paper notes that:

“There was, in fact, a positive change in the poverty status of the population in the rural areas and in the country as a whole between 1993 and 1996, but this was compensated by the change that occurred between 1996 and 1998. In particular, there was a 10 per cent increase in overall poverty in urban areas” (page 23).

“...the prevalence of stunting, which currently stands at 42 per cent, has varied between 38 and 60 per cent in rural areas and between 33 and 45 per cent in urban areas, with a national average of between 41 and 53 per cent since the early 1970s. Disturbingly, urban areas have been experiencing a faster rate of increase in severe forms of stunting in the 1990s” (page 86).

Inequality. In recent decades, there has been relatively little attention paid to inequality in the context of development. However, figures on inequality are reported in a number of the Strategy Papers. Inequality appears to be higher in urban than in rural areas for most of the countries for which Strategy Papers are available (and in some cases is increasing), although this is obviously related to the structure of the economy, and this finding cannot be generalised. Some illustrative examples are given below.

Ethiopia: The Strategy Paper concludes that economic growth led to increasing inequality in urban areas (pages 25–6). As shown in Table 3 above, inequality fell slightly in rural areas between 1995/96 and 1999/00, but increased significantly in urban areas.

Malawi: Inequality is worse in urban areas, with a Gini coefficient of 0.52 compared to 0.37 in rural areas (page 5).

Senegal: The Strategy Paper argues that: “The Gini Index was 0.50 in 1996 in Dakar, which denotes a significantly high level of inequality. It is estimated at 0.30 for the country as a whole” (page 15).

Vietnam: Discussing the widening income and living standards gaps, the Strategy Paper reports that: “...the gap also seems to increase within the same region/area, especially in urban areas where urban poverty is spreading widely has become severe (sic)” (page 32).

Nicaragua: The Strategy Paper suggests that the disparity in rural areas is slightly lower than in urban areas. The discussion notes that in urban areas, the richest 20 per cent have a level of consumption more than nine times higher than the poorest 20 per cent; this difference falls to less than seven times in rural areas (page 9).

However, different conclusions emerge in other countries. In Honduras, for example, the Strategy Paper concludes that inequality is becoming slightly less in urban areas but has increased in rural areas (page 33).

V. Conclusion

This paper does not seek to argue that “urban poverty” is equally or more important than “rural poverty”. Rather, the underlying theme is that urban poverty needs to be recognised and understood. A second point is that the approaches to measuring poverty that have been developed do not appear to adequately acknowledge the context of the urban poor and many of the factors that contribute to their poverty.

Turning first to the measuring of poverty using income/expenditure in the Strategy Papers, it is evident that there are considerable differences in approach. This is particularly so with regard to the number of poverty lines used in any country, and the capacity of single poverty lines to account for differences in the cost of living. As argued in Section II, there are reasonably good grounds for believing that costs of living are higher in many urban areas, in part because the poor have to use the market to secure their basic needs – although it should be recognised that costs of living are not higher in every urban area compared to every rural area, and that not all urban areas are equally expensive.

While it is beyond the scope of this study to provide counter-factual evidence for each of the Strategy Papers considered, the issues that are raised can be illustrated in the case of Accra. The Ghana Strategy Paper reports that extreme poverty is 2 per cent in Greater Accra (these figures appear to be from 1998/99) (page 15). However, Maxwell, Levin Armah-Klemesu, Ruel, Morris and Ahiadeke (2000, 2) conducted a study of poverty in Accra at around the same time and found that:

“In terms of calorific intake, roughly 40 per cent of households in Accra could be classified insecure (page 2). An estimated 23.6 per cent of Accra’s population is food insecure, consuming less than 80 per cent of their calorie requirements but spending more than 50 per cent of their budget on food. Of the quintile with the lowest expenditures, 62.2 per cent are food insecure... [and] 80 per cent of the households fall below 80 per cent of the calorie requirement. Twenty-two per cent of children in food

insecure households are stunted. There is a strong relationship between expenditures and calorie adequacy.”

Simply put, it is difficult to believe that these two findings relate to the same city.

With respect to measurements of access to basic needs, care needs to be taken that proximity to services such as health and education is not equated with access. The increasing tendency to charge for access to services is a significant deterrent for the poorest families in both urban and rural areas. Clearly, the extent to which distance to basic services is a good representation of how well basic needs are met is not exclusively an “urban” problem. Lack of access to financial resources will also prevent rural dwellers from accessing services, whatever their proximity. However, the higher densities in urban areas increase the likelihood that urban dwellers will be physically close to services. For a long time, there has been an argument that urban communities are better served but that services are generally open only to those with money to pay for at least part of the service.

With respect to measurements in participatory poverty assessments, the message is similar to those of income and expenditure. Notably, the poor in urban areas are dependent on wage labour, and poverty is sensitive to the cost of living.

The Strategy Papers themselves suggest that the simple quantitative estimates based on poverty lines are failing to pick up issues relating to the urban poor in three areas, in addition to differential costs of living:

- aggregate figures are “hiding” urban poverty in “pockets” in the city, peripheral areas and small towns;
- in some countries, underlying trends suggest a growing problem of increasing urban poverty; and
- in some countries, inequality in urban areas appears to be greater than in rural areas.

Why does this matter? It matters because it bears fundamentally on the strategies that countries use to reduce poverty. As noted by the World Bank in the Introduction to this paper, measuring poverty is the foundation on which the analysis in the Strategy Papers rests. Whatever progress is made in the more accurate measurement of poverty, the argument of this paper is that the urban poor deserve better than this apparent confusion of approach, methodology and analysis.

REFERENCES

- Alwang, Jeffrey, Bradford F. Mills and Nelson Taruvinga (2002), *Why Has Poverty Increased in Zimbabwe?*, World Bank, Washington DC.
- Amis, Philip (1995), “Making sense of urban poverty”, *Environment and Urbanization* Vol 7, No 1, pages 145-157.
- APHRC (2002), *Population and Health Dynamics in Nairobi’s Informal Settlements*, African Population and Health Research Centre, Nairobi, 256 pages.
- Baharoglu, Deniz and Christine Kessides (2001), “Urban poverty” in World Bank, *PRSP Sourcebook*, World Bank, Washington DC. <http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/strategies/sourcetoc.htm>
- Baulch, B. (1996), “The new poverty agenda: a disputed consensus”, *IDS Bulletin* Vol 27, No 1, pages 1-10.
- Benjamin, Solomon and R. Bhuvaneswari (2001), *Democracy, Inclusive Governance and Poverty in Bangalore*, Urban Governance, Partnership and Poverty: Working Paper 26, University of Birmingham, Birmingham.
- Boltinik, Julio (undated), *Poverty in Latin America: A Critical Analysis of Three Studies*.

- Chambers, Robert (1995), "Poverty and livelihoods; whose reality counts?", *Environment and Urbanization* Vol 7, No 1, pages 173-204.
- Craig, David and Doug Porter (2003), "Poverty reduction strategy papers: a new convergence", *World Development* Vol 31, No 1, pages 53-69.
- De Haan, Arjan (1997), "Rural-urban migration and poverty: the case of India", *IDS Bulletin* Vol 28, No 2, pages 35-47.
- Deaton, Angus (2001), "Counting the world's poor: problems and possible solutions", *The World Bank Research Observer* Vol 16, No 2, pages 125-147.
- Deaton, Angus and Alessandro Tarozzi (2000), *Prices and Poverty in India*, Research Programme in Development Studies, Princeton University, Princeton.
- Dhanani, Shafiq and Iyanatul Islam (2002), "Poverty, vulnerability and social protection in a period of crisis: the case of Indonesia", *World Development* Vol 30, No 7, pages 1211-1231.
- Environment and Urbanization* (1995a), "The under-estimation and misrepresentation of urban poverty", Editorial, Vol 7, No 1, pages 3-10.
- Environment and Urbanization* (1995b), "Urban poverty – from understanding to action", Editorial, Vol 7, No 2, pages 3-10.
- Etemadi, Felisa U. (2000), "Civil society participation in city governance in Cebu City", *Environment and Urbanization* Vol 12, No 1, pages 57-72.
- Grimm, Michael, Charlotte Guenard and Sandrine Mesple-Somps (2002), "What has happened to the urban population in Cote d'Ivoire since the 1980s? An analysis of monetary poverty and deprivation over 15 years of housing data", *World Development* Vol 30, No 6, pages 1073-1090.
- Haddad, Lawrence, Marie T. Ruel and James L. Garrett (1999), *Are Urban Poverty and Under-nutrition Growing? Some Newly Assembled Evidence*, Food Consumption and Nutrition Division, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington DC.
- Jonsson, Åsa and David Satterthwaite (2000), *Income-based Poverty Lines; How well do the levels set internationally and within each country reflect (a) the cost of living in the larger/more prosperous/more expensive cities; and (b) the cost that the urban poor have to pay for non-food items*, Paper prepared for the Panel on Urban Population Dynamics, Committee on Population, National Research Council/National Academy of Sciences, Washington DC.
- Kabir, Md Azmal, Ataur Rahman, Sarah Salway and Jane Prysor (2000), "Sickness among the urban poor: a barrier to livelihood security", *Journal for International Development* Vol 12, pages 707-722.
- Kanji, Nazneen (1995), "Gender, poverty and economic adjustment in Harare, Zimbabwe", *Environment and Urbanization* Vol 7, No 1, pages 37-55.
- Kironde, Lusugga, J.L. (1995), "Access to land by the urban poor in Tanzania: some findings from Dar es Salaam", *Environment and Urbanization* Vol 7, No 1, pages 77-96.
- Kombe, W., A. Kyessi, J. Lupala and E. Mgonja (2003), *Partnerships to Improve Access and Quality of Public Transport: a Case Report - Dar es Salaam, Tanzania*, Partnerships and Public Transport Series, WEDC, Loughborough University, Loughborough, 116 pages.
- Maxwell, Daniel, Carol Levin, Margaret Armah-Klemesu, Marie Ruel, Saul Morris and Clement Ahiadeke (2000), *Urban Livelihoods and Food and Nutrition Security in Greater Accra, Ghana*, <http://www.ifpri.org/pubs/abstract/abstr112.htm>.
- McGee, Rosemary (2002), "Participating in development" in Uma Kothari and Martin Minogue (editors), *Development Theory and Practice: Critical Perspectives*, Palgrave, Basingstoke.
- Minujin, Alberto (1995), "Squeezed: the middle class in Latin America", *Environment and Urbanization* Vol 7, No 2, October, pages 153-165.
- Moser, Caroline O.N. (1993), *Urban Social Policy and Poverty Reduction*, Working Paper, Urban Development Division, TWURD WP # 10, October, 16 pages.
- Moser, Caroline O.N. (1996), *Confronting Crisis: A Summary of Household Responses to Poverty and Vulnerability in Four Poor Urban Communities*, Environmentally Sustainable Development Studies and Monographs Series No 7, The World Bank, Washington DC, 19 pages.
- Moser, Caroline O.N. (1998), "The Asset Vulnerability Framework: Reassessing Urban Poverty Reduction strategies", *World Development* Vol 26, No 1, pages 1-19.

- Moser, Caroline O.N., Alicia J. Herbert and Roza E. Makonnen (1993), *Urban Poverty in the Context of Structural Adjustment; Recent Evidence and Policy Responses*, TWU Discussion Paper DP #4, Urban Development Division, World Bank, Washington DC, 140 pages.
- Pogge, Thomas W. and Sanjay G. Reddy (2002a), *How Not to Count the Poor*, Colombia University, New York.
- Pogge, Thomas W. and Sanjay G. Reddy (2002b), *How Not to Count the Poor – A Reply to Ravallion*, Colombia University, New York.
- Rakodi, Carole (2002), “A livelihoods approach – Conceptual issues and definitions” in Carole Rakodi with Tony Lloyd-Jones (editors), *Urban Livelihoods: A People-centred Approach to Reducing Poverty*, Earthscan Publications, London, pages 3-22.
- Ravallion, Martin (2002), “How Not to Count the Poor? A reply to Reddy and Pogge”, *World Bank Development Research Group*, Washington DC.
- Sahn, David E and David C. Stifel (2002), “Progress towards the Millennium Development Goals in Africa”, *World Development* Vol 31, No 1, pages 23–52.
- Satterthwaite, David (1997), “Urban poverty: reconsidering its scale and nature”, *IDS Bulletin* Vol 28, No 2, pages 9-23.
- Satterthwaite, David (2001), “Reducing urban poverty: constraints on the effectiveness of aid agencies and development banks and some suggestions for change”, *Environment and Urbanization* Vol 13, No 1, pages 137-157.
- Srinivasan, T.N. (2001), “Comment on ‘Counting the World’s Poor’ by Angus Deaton”, *World Bank Research Observer*, Vol 16, No 2, pages 157-168.
- Staffs of the World Bank and IMF (2002), *Review of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) Approach: Early Experience with Interim PRSPs and Full PRSPs*, International Development Association and International Monetary Fund, Washington DC.
- UNCHS (1993), *Support Measures to Promote Rental Housing for Low Income Groups*, United Nations Centre for Human Settlements, HS/294/93E, Nairobi.
- UNCHS (1996), *An Urbanizing World: Global Report on Human Settlements, 1996*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.
- UN-Habitat (2003), *Water and Sanitation in the World's Cities; Local Action for Global Goals*, Earthscan Publications, London, 274 pages.
- Urban Resource Centre (2001), “Urban poverty and transport: a case study from Karachi”, *Environment and Urbanization* Vol 13, No 1, pages 223-234.
- World Bank Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Sector Unit, East Asia and Pacific Region (2001a), *Philippines Poverty Assessment: Volume 1*, World Bank, Washington DC.
- Wratten, Ellen (1995), “Conceptualizing urban poverty”, *Environment and Urbanization* Vol 7, No 1, pages 11-36.

**PUBLICATIONS - THE CASE STUDIES AND OTHER BOOKS
AND PAPERS ON URBAN ISSUES**

a. The Working Papers series on poverty

Alimuddin, Salim, Arif Hasan and Asiya Sadiq (2001), *Community-driven Water and Sanitation: The Work of the Anjuman Samaji Behbood and the Larger Faisalabad Context*, Working Paper 7. IIED, London.

Baumann, Ted, Joel Bolnick and Diana Mitlin (2002), *The Age of Cities and Organizations of the Urban Poor: The Work of the South African Homeless People's Federation and the People's Dialogue on Land and Shelter*, Working Paper 2. IIED, London.

Boonyabancha, Somsook (2003), *A Decade of Change: from the Urban Community Development Office (UCDO) to the Community Organizations Development Institute (CODI) in Thailand. Increasing community options through a national government development programme*, Working Paper 12. IIED, London

Cain, Allan, Mary Daly and Paul Robson (2002), *Basic Service Provision for the Urban Poor; The Experience of Development Workshop in Angola*, Working Paper 8. IIED, London.

Dávila, Julio D (2001), *Urban Poverty Reduction Experiences in Cali, Colombia: Lessons from the Work of Local Non-profit Organizations*, Working Paper 4. IIED, London.

Díaz, Andrés Cabanas, Emma Grant, Paula Irene del Cid Vargas and Verónica Sajbin Velásquez (2001), *El Mezquital - A Community's Struggle for Development*, Working Paper 1. IIED, London.

Mitlin, Diana (2004) Understanding Urban Poverty; What the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers tell us, Working Paper 13. IIED, London

Patel, Sheela and Diana Mitlin (2002), *The Work of SPARC and its Partners Mahila Milan and the National Slum Dwellers Federation in India*, Working Paper 5. IIED, London.

Schusterman, Ricardo, Florencia Almansi, Ana Hardoy, Cecilia Monti and Gastón Urquiza (2002), *Poverty Reduction in Action: Participatory Planning in San Fernando, Buenos Aires*, Working Paper 6. IIED, London.

Stein, Alfredo (2001), *Participation and Sustainability in Social Projects: The Experience of the Local Development Programme (PRODEL) in Nicaragua*, Working Paper 3. IIED, London.

Satterthwaite, David (2002), *Reducing Urban Poverty: Some Lessons From Experience*, Working Paper 11. IIED, London.

Satterthwaite, David (2004), *The Under-estimation of Urban Poverty in Low and Middle-income Nations*, Working paper 14. IIED, London.

HOW TO OBTAIN THESE: Printed versions can be obtained from <http://www.earthprint.com/> for US\$ 9 each plus postage and packing (for the UK, US\$ 5 for first item, US\$ 2.50 for additional items; for Europe, US\$ 6 for first item, US\$ 3 for additional items; for elsewhere, US\$ 10 for first item, US\$ 5 for additional items). Electronic versions may be obtained at no charge from IIED's web-page: <http://www.iied.org/urban/downloads.html>. If you have any difficulties obtaining these, e-mail us on humans@iied.org with details as to which working paper you want.

b. Other publications from this research programme

Shorter versions of the working papers on PRODEL and on El Mezquital have been published in IIED's journal *Environment&Urbanization*:

Stein, Alfredo (2001), "Participation and sustainability in social projects: the experience of the Local Development Programme (PRODEL) in Nicaragua", *Environment&Urbanization* Vol 13 No 1, pages 11-35.

Díaz, Andrés Cabanas, Emma Grant, Paula Irene del Cid Vargas and Verónica Sajbin Velásquez (2001), "The role of external agencies in the development of El Mezquital in Guatemala City", *Environment&Urbanization* Vol 13, No 1, pages 91-100.

Díaz, Andrés Cabanas, Emma Grant, Paula Irene del Cid Vargas and Verónica Sajbin Velásquez (2000), "El Mezquital - a community's struggle for development in Guatemala City", *Environment&Urbanization* Vol 12, No 1, pages 87-106.

HOW TO OBTAIN THESE: These papers may be obtained electronically from the web at www.ingentaselect.com; <http://www.ingentaselect.com/titles/09562478.htm> takes you straight to *Environment&Urbanization* On-line. Access to these papers is free.

c. Other publications on urban poverty

Mitlin, Diana and David Satterthwaite (editors), *Empowering Squatter Citizen: Local Government, Civil Society and Urban Poverty Reduction*, Earthscan Publications, London, April 2004. This can be obtained from www.earthscan.co.uk.

Civil Society in Action: transforming opportunities for the urban poor: The October 2001 issue of *Environment&Urbanization* was prepared with Shack Dwellers International (SDI), a network of community organizations in Africa, Asia and Latin America. It includes articles by members on strategies and approaches that have been found to be of particular importance - for example; the use of savings and credit as a means of building strong local organizations, and an illustration of how the process has taken hold in a number of new countries. It also includes perspectives from a range of development professionals and agencies on the significance of SDI and a description of new relations with local authorities and state agencies that the grassroots organizations have been able to negotiate. Photo-essays on community site development and construction show some of the work of urban poor federations in the Philippines and Cambodia.

Rethinking Aid to Urban Poverty Reduction: Lessons for Donors: The April 2001 issue of *Environment&Urbanization* includes evaluations of urban projects or programmes funded by

US AID, the World Bank, DFID, Sida, NORAD and UNICEF, along with papers considering the constraints on donor effectiveness. There are also papers on participatory budgeting in Brazil, a fund for community initiatives in Uganda, poverty-mapping in Argentina, mapping infrastructure deficiencies in Salvador, community-based watershed management, and links between poverty and transport.

Poverty Reduction and Urban Governance: The April 2000 issue of *Environment&Urbanization* includes 12 papers which examine the links between poverty and governance in particular cities. Among the interesting points of commonality or contrast are: the great range of political structures, with some cities having governments that are clearly more accountable and responsive to urban poor group than others; the very limited powers, resources and capacities available to urban governments to raise revenues; the complex political economies within all the cities that influence who gets land for housing, infrastructure and services; and the capacity of anti-poor local government policies and practices to harm the livelihoods of many low-income groups within their jurisdiction.

HOW TO OBTAIN THESE: The printed version of these back issues of *Environment and Urbanization* can be obtained from <http://www.earthprint.com/> for US\$18 plus postage and packing (for the UK, US\$ 5 for first item, US\$ 2.50 for additional items; for Europe, US\$ 6 for first item, US\$ 3 for additional items; for elsewhere, US\$ 10 for first item, US\$ 5 for additional items).

The papers from both issues may be obtained electronically from the web at www.ingentaselect.com; <http://www.ingentaselect.com/titles/09562478.htm> takes you straight to *Environment&Urbanization* On-line. Access to the papers is free.

d. Urban publications with Earthscan

McGranahan, Gordon and Frank Murray (editors) (2003), *Air Pollution and Health in Rapidly Developing Countries*, Earthscan Publications, London, 227 pages.

McGranahan, Gordon, Pedro Jacobi, Jacob Songsore, Charles Surjadi and Marianne Kjellén (2001), *The Citizens at Risk: From Urban Sanitation to Sustainable Cities*, Earthscan Publications, London, 200 pages.

Hardoy, Jorge E, Diana Mitlin and David Satterthwaite (2001), *Environmental Problems in an Urbanizing World: Finding Solutions for Cities in Africa, Asia and Latin America*, Earthscan Publications, London, 470 pages.

Bartlett, Sheridan, Roger Hart, David Satterthwaite, Ximena de la Barra and Alfredo Missair (1999), *Cities for Children: Children's Rights, Poverty and Urban Management*, Earthscan, London, 305 pages.

Satterthwaite, David (editor) (1999), *The Earthscan Reader in Sustainable Cities*, Earthscan Publications, London, 472 pages.

Satterthwaite, David, Roger Hart, Caren Levy, Diana Mitlin, David Ross, Jac Smit and Carolyn Stephens (1996), *The Environment for Children*, Earthscan Publications and UNICEF, London and New York, 284 pages.

Hardoy, Jorge E and David Satterthwaite (1989), *Squatter Citizen: Life in the Urban Third World*, Earthscan Publications, London, UK, 388 pages.

HOW TO OBTAIN THESE: These are available from Earthscan Publications, 8-12 Camden High Street, London NW1 0JH, UK, e-mail: earthinfo@earthscan.co.uk; web: www.earthscan.co.uk. Also available in bookstores. Earthscan books are available in the USA from Stylus, 22883 Quicksilver Drive, Sterling, VA 20166-2012, USA, e-mail: styluspub@aol.com. In Canada, Earthscan books are available from Renouf Publishing Company, 1- 5369 Canotek Road, Ottawa, Ontario K1J 9J3, Canada, e-mail: orderdept@renoufbooks.com. The Earthscan web site also has details of Earthscan representatives and agents in all other countries.

e. Other Working Papers series

There are three other Working Papers series in addition to the Series on Poverty Reduction in Urban Areas:

1. Working Papers on Rural Urban Interactions and Livelihood Strategies, with case studies from Tanzania, Mali and Nigeria and briefing papers which will be available on the IIED website.
2. Working Papers on Urban Environmental Action Plans and Local Agenda 21s, with case studies from Colombia, Ghana, Indonesia, Malaysia, Namibia, Peru, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda and the UK.
3. Working Papers on Urban Change: By late 2001, this will include papers on: Bangladesh, Colombia, Egypt, Ghana, Mexico, Pakistan and South Africa.

HOW TO OBTAIN THESE: Printed versions can be obtained from <http://www.earthprint.com/> for US\$ 9 each plus postage and packing (for the UK, US\$ 5 for first item, US\$ 2.50 for additional items; for Europe, US\$ 6 for first item, US\$ 3 for additional items; for elsewhere, US\$10 for first item, US\$ 5 for additional items).

Electronic versions may be obtained at no charge from IIED's web-page: <http://www.iied.org/urban/downloads.html>. If you have any difficulties obtaining these, e-mail us on humans@iied.org with details as to which working paper you want.

f. Other IIED publications on urban issues

Environment&Urbanization: Now in its 16th year, this is one of the most cited and widely distributed international journals on urban issues. Each issue has a special theme and includes: 9-14 papers on that theme; a guide to the literature on the theme and profiles of innovative NGOs (in some issues) and Book Notes (summaries of new books, research reports and newsletters, and how these can be obtained (including those in Spanish, French and Portuguese).

Frequency:	Twice yearly (April and October of each year)
Volume numbers:	Volume 14 (2002), Volume 15 (2003), Volume 16 (2004)
Subscription prices:	One year: institutions - £78 or US\$ 130; individuals £28 or US\$ 47 Two year: institutions - £132 or US\$ 220; individuals £48 or US\$ 80 Three year: institutions - £192 or US\$ 320; individuals £68 or US\$ 113

Half-price subscriptions available to subscribers from Latin America, Asia (except Japan, Singapore and Hong Kong) and Africa, and to students (xerox of current student card needed as proof).

Postage for subscriptions: The above prices include air mail post; subscriptions can start at any point in the year.

World Wide Web: The contents page of the latest issue and the summaries of all papers in French, Spanish and English, the editorial and the Book Notes section are on <http://www.iied.org/eandu/>. This site also includes details of subscription prices and the price of back issues.

Environment & Urbanization On-line: The full text of the current issue and many back issues are available on the web at <http://www.ingentaselect.com/titles/09562478.htm>. All issues published from 1995 to the present, except for the three most recent issues, are available free. Institutional subscribers get free access to all on-line issues; to do so, they must register at www.ingentaselect.com.