Metropolitan Localized Data in Greater Belo Horizonte, Brazil: A Participatory Guide to Better Governance

April 2019

Local Data Action Solutions Initiative 2018-2019 Microgrant Program
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Written by Cid Blanco Jr., architect and urban planner in collaboration with Claudia Pires, architect and urban planner, and Marcelo Amaral, civil engineer. Editing by Sandra Ruckstuhl, Jessica Espey, and Jay Neuner. Design by Micha Dugan, Ryan Swaney, and Jay Neuner.

Project Logo

Project Team

METRO SDG OBSERVATORY

Newton

NossaBH
ABOUT

The Local Data Action Solutions Initiative (LDA-SI) was established as a joint effort between the Sustainable Development Solutions Network’s Thematic Research Network on Data and Statistics (SDSN TReNDS) and the U.S.A. Sustainable Cities Initiative as a program with one primary objective: to identify and promote replicable methods for sub-national Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) monitoring that facilitate local action in support of the “leave no one behind” principle. A growing number of subnational actors are attempting to implement the SDGs locally and are confronting specific questions related to data collection and monitoring. With this has grown the need for real, practical lessons and guidance that can be applied to different contexts worldwide.

For this reason, LDA-SI launched a microgrant initiative to support learning from existing subnational SDG data initiatives, harnessing this tacit local knowledge and informing a learning exchange. In 2018, five grantees were chosen both for their proven ability to support SDG implementation in a specified location and for their model’s relevance and potential benefit for other sub-national SDG initiatives in the world. Each grantee has prepared a guidance brief that describes SDG localization challenges in the place where they are operating and the data solutions they have designed to support efforts toward SDG achievement.
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**ABSTRACT**

In Brazil, like many other Latin American countries, more than 80 percent of the population is concentrated in urban areas characterized not by individual cities, but by metropolitan areas. Metropolitan planning and management became an important issue in Brazil after the approval of the Metropolitan Statute (Federal Law 13,089) in 2015. The experience of the Metropolitan Area of Belo Horizonte (RMBH) is considered a national reference for metropolitan planning and governance. Despite this vaulted status, Greater Belo Horizonte’s management structure lacks an official metropolitan-level monitoring system to track its policies and investments and help planning and decision-making procedures. Brazil has turned to the United Nations’ Agenda 2030—also known as the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)—for guidance. For RMBH, SDG 11 (“make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable”) is particularly relevant. This brief describes how the RMBH’s SDG in Action project, a partnership between Metropolitan SDG Observatory (METRODS), University Newton Paiva, and Movimento Nossa BH, developed and tested an indicator framework to monitor the achievement of SDG 11 targets.

**PROBLEM**

Brazil lacks a significant amount of official data relevant to sustainable development at local and metropolitan levels; for example, the most recent national census data are outdated, as the census was last published in 2010. Brazil also experienced an economic and political crisis in the wake of President Dilma Rousseff’s impeachment in August 2016. This event hindered national government-civil society interaction and Agenda 2030.
planning in the country. Further, due to the economic downturn the development context has grown increasingly challenged. For example, although the UN removed Brazil from its World Food Programme (WFP) Hunger Map in 2014, WFP General Director José Graziano reports that current conditions of crisis may trigger its reinstatement.

Consequently, the Brazilian Commission on Sustainable Development Goals has not yet established an official national SDG indicator framework or a set of national goals to be pursued in the follow-up to Agenda 2030. While Brazil was still able to present voluntary national reviews (VNRs) to the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) based on existing data, this data did not express the real impact of the concurrent economic crisis on the goals.

In order for policymakers to respond effectively to these evolving circumstances and to ultimately meet development goals, Brazilian authorities need to update public data before the next scheduled census in 2020. The 10-year gap between censuses hinders smart policy and investment that can yield equitable development outcomes in Brazil and across the metropolitan areas, including Greater Belo Horizonte.

The absence of needed data led civil society organizations to produce their own versions of indicators for the country. In the last two years, the Brazilian Civil Society Working Group for the 2030 Agenda developed “Spotlight Reports” in opposition to the Brazilian VNRs. In addition, in May 2017, a group of institutions and organizations from civil society, the public and private sectors, and academia founded the Metropolitan SDG Observatory (METRODS) to identify, disseminate, and monitor indicators related to SDG 11 in metropolitan areas of Brazil.
Greater Belo Horizonte is one of the country’s most important metropolitan areas\textsuperscript{7}. The RMBH Development Agency is a technical organization founded in 2009 that is in charge of promoting the joint management of public policies of common interest, such as public inter-municipal transportation, land use, and basic sanitation in the Metropolitan Area of Belo Horizonte. It is responsible for coordinating the implementation of the Integrated Development Plan of the RMBH (2011), encompassing the 34 cities under RMBH jurisdiction\textsuperscript{8}. Originally, the agency planned to establish a monitoring and evaluation observatory to guide and inform planning and decision-making processes in the metropolitan area, but to date it has not done so. Current investment discussions under the Metropolitan Plan are missing critical, real-time data on the situation in the metropolitan area. Additionally, funding for the implementation of the Metropolitan Plan faces barriers because most of the cities within the metropolitan region are not contributing to the Metropolitan Development Fund\textsuperscript{9} due to the economic crisis, diminishing its investment capacity.

**Figure 1.** Map of RMBH

![Map of RMBH](image)
Box 1. About Belo Horizonte

The Metropolitan Area of Belo Horizonte (Figure 1) has 6 million inhabitants with 34 cities within its administrative boundaries and territory covering 9,500,000 km². It is the political, financial, commercial, educational, and cultural center of the state of Minas Gerais, representing around 40 percent of the economy and 25 percent of the population of Minas Gerais. Its GDP in 2018 is estimated at USD 4.5 billion, of which more than 40 percent belongs to the city of Belo Horizonte, which covers 3.5 percent of the territory of the metropolitan area. Its economy is significant and active, and it is based on industry, finance, services, commerce, mining, tourism, and construction.

The benefits of the region’s significant economic activity are not equally distributed in the 34 cities across the metropolitan area, indicating a spatial inequality that has become a primary challenge to achieving equitable development across the region. For instance, the City of Belo Horizonte and two other cities account for 60 percent of the population in 9 percent of the territory, and 77 percent of the GDP of the entire metropolitan area. Meanwhile, 22 cities with a population smaller than 50,000 inhabitants occupy 60 percent of the territory and contribute to only 7.5 percent of the GDP.

Box 2. About the SDG in Action partners

University Newton Paiva has teachers and researchers from different areas of expertise who share their knowledge and collaborate to address the multidimensional realities of sustainable development in metropolitan areas. For SDG in Action, students tutored by teachers worked as a field team,
helping local governments with data collection and participating in data analysis activities that were conducted by their professors.

Movimento Nossa BH coordinates the Mobility Observatory, a partnership between the municipality of Belo Horizonte and civil society. Their data production and analysis expertise were utilized when reviewing data that were collected in the cities from the RMBH during the SDG in Action project.

METRODS network developed a framework of 80 indicators, most of them based on SDG 11, to establish a long-term, practical tool to help political decision-making and investment in the development of metropolitan areas based on SDG 11’s aims. As a network of institutions and organizations, METRODS mobilized its affiliates—more than 40 national and international institutions—in order to disseminate the results and stimulate debate around the facts and figures that came up from work developed by the SDG in Action project.

The RMBH Development Agency acted as the link between local governments and the university/nongovernmental organization (NGO) team. It was initially slated to be the host for capacity-building activities and workshops and the place where all SDG 11 indicator data would be collated and shared. Due to concurrent elections in Brazil, SDG in Action coordinators reevaluated the situation and decided to conduct all activities inside the University Newton Paiva facilities.
The SDG in Action project was launched in 2017 by METRODS in partnership with Movimento Nossa BH, University Newton Paiva, and civil society organizations working on housing and urban development issues in the region. One of the initial partners was the RMBH Development Agency, which initiated the approach of engaging with local institutions and supporting METRODS in piloting its participatory monitoring and evaluation methodology and SDG 11 indicators framework for metropolitan areas. They aimed to create a “temporary Metropolitan Observatory” that would coordinate, monitor, and evaluate these activities at the metropolitan level for a six-month pilot period.

METRODS and University Newton Paiva designed and managed the project. Movimento Nossa BH provided data analysis and administrative activities, and the Metropolitan Agency helped to connect the project team with the 34 local governments. The RMBH Development Agency also provided institutional support to the project. The combination of a well-organized metropolitan governance system and a dedicated group of local and regional stakeholders that were committed to Agenda 2030 made the Metropolitan Area of Belo Horizonte an ideal location for this initiative. This work was conducted during the LDA-SI grant period in 2018.

The project utilized METRODS’ guidelines, which promoted a robust participatory approach both in the process of institutional design as well as in indicator development and data decision-making activities. The guidelines also highlighted the need for interaction among different areas of expertise in order to capture the multidimensional realities of sustainable
development in metropolitan areas in Brazil. With the expertise of each of the partners, the project aimed to establish the foundation for a long-term Metropolitan Observatory. By incorporating local government, university counterparts, and civil society, the coalition provided capacity, legitimacy, and community perspective to this end.

**BUILDING PROCESS**

The SDG in Action project initially pursued three activities: (i) awareness and mobilization; (ii) data collection; and (iii) data analysis. The beginning of the data collection activities revealed a disconnect between the original METRODS SDG 11 indicators framework and the reality of the Metropolitan Area of Belo Horizonte. Consequently, the coordination team added an activity into the work plan: (iv) METRODS SDG 11 indicators review.

Due to time constraints, the team worked concurrently on these activities. The project was also implemented during an election period, which created challenges and prolonged its implementation.

The project leaders based the SDG in Action project on sourcing local data to underpin the SDG 11 indicators. They invited mayors and technicians from the RMBH cities to join the project and nominate focal points who could provide the field team with the necessary data from their governments, allowing the SDG in Action team to calculate the indicators and build the proposed SDG 11 metropolitan profile. Without the appointment of focal points and subsequent access to local data, none of the planned activities of the project would have been possible.
Awareness and Mobilization

In May 2018, the project team initiated activity (i) at a Metropolitan Council meeting, having determined this large convening presented a good opportunity to share the SDG in Action project. However, this attempt to sensitize and mobilize the city representatives failed; as the meeting took place during an intense national and local electoral campaign, the attendees wrongly believed that the project was a partisan effort.

The project team then launched a second attempt to engage with the cities. University Newton Paiva students emailed an official letter—signed by the project’s coordinators and presenting the project proposal, its near-term objectives, its long-term goals, and the roles of each of the partner—to the 34 mayors. After that, the 34 mayors and their teams were invited to attend an informational and training meeting at the University Newton Paiva in Belo Horizonte in June 2018. Though 16 of the 34 cities confirmed attendance, only three attended the meeting.

Not to be deterred, the team personally recruited the remaining mayors by visiting each of their offices to provide further information on the project, address concerns, and request the nomination of a focal point. This technique was a marked success. In fact, in some cases, when the team arrived they found the mayor of a given city was aware of the project and had identified a focal point.

In the end, the team secured the participation of the 34 cities representatives to collaborate on the project.
While mobilizing the city representatives, the team also initiated a review of the list of SDG 11 indicators compiled by METRODS, as it became evident that some of the original indicators were not compatible with the realities of the RMBH.

The original METRODS SDG 11 Indicator Framework (see Annex A) was developed with input and guidance from technical experts in the monitoring and evaluation procedures of different partners of the initiative. This original framework is composed of 80 indicators that use official national census data, as well as local data from local and state governments. This framework was developed as a tool to create “SDG 11 profiles” for metropolitan areas without depending exclusively on official statistics. It is important to mention that most of the METRODS partners live in capital cities of metropolitan areas, such as São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, and Belo Horizonte—the urban centers that generally offer the best quality of life and public services in Brazil. The standards proposed for the indicators were closer to these capital cities’ realities and did not consider the diverse conditions that exist across cities in a single metropolitan area. The standards included features considered “normal standards” for Belo Horizonte (as a large capital city), but not necessarily typical for the region’s smaller peripheral cities (such as Ribeirão das Neves, Raposos, and Baldim).

For example, the framework listed indicators measuring the presence of public transportation but did not count regional public transportation
linkages. For the peripheral cities, a linkage indicator would have been a better way to understand the quality of the service offered in the RMBH. In another example, it called out the presence of exclusive bus lanes, such as the ones used for Bus Rapid Transportation (BRT) systems, when some of the peripheral cities are too small to have this service.

To refine the original list of 80 indicators, the project coordinators conducted weekly meetings with the field team during July and August 2018. The review focused on the indicators’ relevance to the RMBH, the presence in the peripheral cities of the public service to be measured, and the ability to obtain timely data. In the end, the project team and local authorities approved a revised list of 55 localized indicators customized for the Metropolitan Area of Belo Horizonte. Titled “RMBH SDG 11 Indicators,” the list included housing, transportation, public spaces, climate change, and urban development (Annex B). The team did not use national census or other official data because it was outdated. Instead, they drew on data provided by the local governments.

3 Data Collection

Parallel with the indicator review, the project team developed two online questionnaires: a Knowledge Survey (Annex C) with questions about the Millennium Development Goals or MDGs (the precursors to the SDGs) and the SDGs, and an SDG 11 Survey (Annex D) that called for data on the RMBH SDG11 Framework. The purpose of the first survey was to measure how much city officials knew about each of the MDG and SDG initiatives and if they had designated any structure or person to work on the 2030 Agenda. The purpose of the second survey was to produce baseline
metropolitan profiles for each city to be used to track progress. Out of 34 cities in the metropolitan area, 22 cities completed the Knowledge Questionnaire. Nine cities completed the SDG 11 Indicators Questionnaire.

In September 2018, an evaluation workshop was conducted to evaluate the project to assess and document its outcomes. It involved professors, local government representatives, social movements, nongovernmental organizations and students. They determined that the low response rate on the SDG 11 Indicators Questionnaire was due to the lack of knowledge of Agenda 2030. They also concluded that the presence of seven targets for SDG 11 may have been confusing, causing the cities to fail to answer if the respondent’s knowledge focused on a particular public service sector.

Consequently, the group decided to personally contact representatives in unresponsive cities to collect the missing data. They wrote to each local government and followed up with phone calls. During this new round of field visits, the project team delivered a hard-copy form of the SDG 11 Indicator Questionnaire and succeeded in getting responses from ten cities.

4 SDG 11 Data Analysis

The last phase of the SDG in Action project consisted of an analysis of the data collected in both questionnaires. Representatives from Movimento Nossa BH and University Newton Paiva, under supervision of the project coordinators, undertook this task. The results of the Knowledge Questionnaire confirmed that governments across the Metropolitan Area of Belo Horizonte lacked understanding of both the MDGs and the SDGs. They also did a more detailed analysis that cross-tabulated the data with population and proximity to the capital, among other variables. They used
this information for the introduction to the metropolitan profiles for the 34 cities. Unfortunately, the low response rate on the SDG 11 Questionnaire prevented completion of the metropolitan profiles. However, the project team used data from city websites that have assembled partial profiles, covering the councils and legislation (e.g. housing and environment councils, historical patrimony, and environment legislation).

The results of the analysis were presented during a public workshop at the end of November 2018 (Annex E). The audience of students, professors, representatives from social movements, and local and state government representatives had the opportunity to see the project’s primary results and hear about the challenges and lessons learned.

The 22 municipalities that answered the Knowledge Questionnaire represent 65 percent of the total 4,571,165 inhabitants (87 percent of the total population), 6,744 km² (71 percent of the total of the RMBH), and 87 percent of the GDP of the RMBH. The 17 municipalities that responded to the SDG 11 Questionnaire represent 50 percent of the total 3,690,596 inhabitants (70 percent of the total population), 4,961 km² (52 percent of the total area), and 70 percent of the GDP of the RMBH.

Regarding the results of the Knowledge Questionnaire, 59 percent of the cities know what the MDGs mean, but only 27 percent of the 22 municipalities have done any follow-up on the MDGs. With regards to the SDGs, 73 percent know what they mean, 45 percent have developed a Plan of Goals (2017-2020) incorporating the Agenda 2030 concepts, and 41 percent have any kind of monitoring of Agenda 2030 through the SDGs. Considering
that 87 percent of the population lives in those cities, the numbers are better than expected; almost half are developing actions regarding financial planning and monitoring using SDGs.

**Table 1. Results of the SDG 11 Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDG 11 Goals</th>
<th>Goal (Average)</th>
<th>Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1 By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2 By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3 By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4 Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6 By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7 By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.a Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.b By 2020, substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“VERY LOW” effort was considered when the percent of respondents responding positively was below 30 percent, “LOW” when between 30 and 50 percent, “MEDIUM” when between 50 and 70 percent, and “HIGH” when above 70 percent.
The results of the SDG 11 Questionnaire (Table 1) provided a basic profile of RMBH’s status in regard to SDG 11 and its goals, informing the creation of related, local-level indicators. The vast majority represent the existence of structures and instruments identified as adhering to the goals, but their effectiveness and quality cannot be evaluated through these indicators. However, other questions may give clues about these qualities, which was considered in the analysis.

**STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES**

**Theory versus practice: general methodologies need to be customized for local reality.** When the METRODS team developed its indicator framework, it intended to use the framework in all of Brazil’s metropolitan areas. After testing it in the SDG in Action project, however, they discovered the need to customize the indicators to the local situation. They demonstrated how to localize an indicator framework in the Belo Horizonte Metropolitan Area, producing the RMBH SDG Indicator Framework. *Lesson: Local coalitions must adapt indicators to the local context.*

**Politics are always “on.”** Support from metropolitan or regional government agencies is essential to connect the data collection team with local government representatives, particularly in the peripheral cities. The SDG in Action project revealed that without careful planning, local authorities can misperceive the work as a political initiative. For example, the initiation of the SDG in Action project at the same time as the presidential and gubernatorial electoral campaigns led to its association as a partisan effort. Consequently, additional time and resources were required for the project
team to explain the work and recruit focal points. Lesson: An evaluation of the political situation in the metropolitan area, even in the absence of an election, can help project implementers establish metropolitan and regional government agency support for and participation in the project in a prudent way, keeping in mind the need to reduce risk to project goals.

The use of secondary local data saves time and resources. The leaders of the SDG in Action project discovered that local governments provide important data online that can be used to construct a “minimum profile” for cities that fail to respond to questionnaires seeking information or that supplements the data submitted by compliant cities. Lesson: The use of opensource, localized data from public websites helps save time and resources and fills data gaps across the metropolitan area.

Capacity-building activities are essential when collecting data in small and peripheral cities. Results from the Knowledge Questionnaire revealed that local government employees in the Belo Horizonte Metropolitan Area had little knowledge of the Millennium and Sustainable Development Goals. During the SDG in Action project, only one capacity-building workshop was conducted, aiming to educate local government officials on the project implementation activities. Lesson: The concept of sustainable development and Agenda 2030 is still unknown by public servants from small and peripheral cities of metropolitan areas. When resources and time allow, more extensive education and training on the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs should be added to the work plan.
Universities are helpful to the implementation of Agenda 2030.

As demonstrated by the SDG in Action project, the partnership with University Newton Paiva made the project feasible. Professors and students contributed time and expertise to the SDG 11 indicator review, the data collection process, and project evaluation discussions. Achieving the SDGs will require partnerships from different levels of the government, civil society, and academia. 

Lesson: *Universities and other partners are essential players in training local governments about sustainable development concepts and monitoring SDG projects.*

**ADDITIONAL RESOURCES**

The resources below provide further information about the mentioned experiences in this document and other Brazilian experiences regarding SDG implementation in metropolitan areas:

- Spotlight Synthesis Report: the 2030 sustainable development agenda in Brazil 2017
- Spotlight Synthesis Report: the 2030 sustainable development agenda in Brazil 2018 (em português)
- Book of Experiences of Localization, Monitoring and Advocacy for Sustainable Development Goals
- METRODS methodologies and SDG 11 indicators framework creation process
- Belo Horizonte Millennium Observatory (em português)
- Mobility Observatory of Belo Horizonte (em português)
## Annex A. Original METRODS SDG 11 Framework

**TARGET 11.1.** By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Synergies</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Housing Deficits</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>National Household Sampling Survey (PNAD), Demographic Census</td>
<td>FUNDAÇÃO JOÃO PINHEIRO. CENTRO DE ESTATÍSTICA E INFORMAÇÕES. Déficit habitacional no Brasil 2011-2012. Belo Horizonte, 2015</td>
<td>Total number of people without adequate housing in a given region</td>
<td>Situation of domicile (urban or rural area); Geographical regions; Cities; Metropolitan regions; Family income ranges in minimum wages.</td>
<td>SDG 1, 10</td>
<td>UNDP, PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Proportion of the population living in subnormal settlements and in other urban areas</td>
<td>Decennial</td>
<td>Demographic Census</td>
<td>Demographic Census 2010 Aglomerados subnormais: Informações territoriais</td>
<td>“Subnormal settlements set consisting of 51 or more housing units characterized by absence of ownership and at least one of the characteristics below: - irregularity of lanes and the size and shape of lots and / or - lack of essential public services (such as garbage collection, sewerage, water network, electricity and public lighting).”</td>
<td>Great regions; States; Metropolitan regions; Municipalities; Districts and census tracts; Specific territorial aspects (urban / rural, topography, urban patterns, density and site characteristics)</td>
<td>SDG 1, 10</td>
<td>UNDP, PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dwellings with connection to the official water supply network</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>PNAD</td>
<td>PNAD Contínua: Rendimentos e características gerais dos moradores e dos domicílios 2012-2016 Previsão de divulgação: Outubro 2017</td>
<td>Percentage of dwellings with official connection to the water supply network over the total number of dwellings in the city.</td>
<td>Situation of dwelling (urban or rural area); Geographical regions; Cities; Metropolitan regions; Family income ranges in minimum wages.</td>
<td>SDG 3, 6, 10</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dwellings with connection to the official sewage collection network</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>PNAD</td>
<td>PNAD Contínua: Rendimentos e características gerais dos moradores e dos domicílios 2012-2016 Previsão de divulgação: Outubro 2017</td>
<td>Percentage of dwellings with official connection to the sewage collection network over the total number of dwellings in the city.</td>
<td>Situation of dwelling (urban or rural area); Geographical regions; Cities; Metropolitan regions; Family income ranges in minimum wages.</td>
<td>SDG 3, 6, 10</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Existence or effectiveness of programs or actions for urban and land regularization</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>State and Municipal Secretariats of Urban Development and Housing</td>
<td>Percentage of dwellings benefiting from urbanization and land tenure regularization actions</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 1, 10</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Empty dwellings in urban and rural areas</td>
<td>Decennial</td>
<td>Demographic Census</td>
<td>Demographic Census 2010</td>
<td>Percentage of dwellings under construction, to rent or sell, and abandoned</td>
<td>Situation of dwelling (urban or rural area); Geographical regions; Cities; Metropolitan regions; Family income ranges in minimum wages.</td>
<td>SDG 1, 10</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TARGET 11.2.** By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Synergies</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Average time spent from home to work</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>PNAD</td>
<td>IPEA. Tempo de deslocamento casa-trabalho no Brasil (1992-2009): diferenças entre regiões metropolitanas, níveis de renda e sexo. Texto para discussão. Brasília; Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>Average time spent on commuting between the home and the workplace, in minutes.</td>
<td>Cities; Metropolitan regions; Income level; Sex; Other economic variables</td>
<td>SDG 1, 10</td>
<td>UNDP, PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annual Cost of Traffic Accidents</td>
<td>Annual, since 2003</td>
<td>IPEA, DENATRAN</td>
<td>“IPEA. DENATRAN. Impactos sociais e econômicos dos acidentes de trânsito nas rodovias brasileiras - relatório”</td>
<td>“Subnormal settlements set consisting of 51 or more housing units characterized by absence of ownership and at least one of the characteristics below: - irregularity of lanes and the size and shape of lots and / or - lack of essential public services (such as garbage collection, sewerage, water network, electricity and public lighting).”</td>
<td>Great regions; States; Metropolitan regions; Municipalities; Districts and census tracts; Specific territorial aspects (urban / rural, topography, urban patterns, density and site characteristics)</td>
<td>SDG 1, 10</td>
<td>UNDP, PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Deaths in transport accidents</td>
<td>Annual, since 1980</td>
<td>DATASUS</td>
<td>Mapa da violência 2014: os jovens do Brasil. Brasilia, 2014</td>
<td>Number of deaths in traffic accidents</td>
<td>Regions; UFs and municipality; Age; Sex; Color / Race</td>
<td>SDG 3</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Existence of cycle lanes and exclusive cycle paths</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Transportation Secretariats</td>
<td>Total percentage of the extension of cycle paths and permanent cycle lengths (km) on the total length of roads in the city (km).</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 3, 13</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Existence of a system or action to monitor congestion</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Transportation Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence of congestion monitoring system, monitored kilometers and annual congestion index in the city.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 13</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Existence of exclusive bus corridors</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Transportation Secretariats</td>
<td>Percentage of kilometers (km) of the network of exclusive bus corridors over the total length of the city's streets.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 13</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Periodicity</td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Disaggregation</td>
<td>Synergies</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Existence of a bus fleet with accessibility for people with disabilities</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Transportation Secretariats</td>
<td>Percentage of the bus fleet with accessibility, lowered floor and elevator for people with disabilities, over the total bus fleet.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 3</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Total transport budget for public transport</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Finanças/Planejamento</td>
<td>Percentage of the city budget destined to public transport on the total budget of the transport area.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 1, 10</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Weight of the public transport fare in the monthly budget</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>PNAD</td>
<td>PNAD Contínua: Rendimentos e características gerais dos moradores e dos domicílios 2012-2016 Previsão de divulgação: Outubro 2017)</td>
<td>Percentage of monthly average income spent on public transportation over average monthly income.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 1, 10</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Departments of Urban Development / Planning</td>
<td>Percentage of population living within a radius of up to 300 meters from a public transport station over the total population of the city.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 10, 13</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Access to school transportation</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>School Censuses</td>
<td>Secretariats of Education / Transportation</td>
<td>Percentage of children enrolled in schools with access to school transportation free of charge</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 4, 10</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Number of intercity public transport lines</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State Governments</td>
<td>Transportation Secretariats</td>
<td>Total intercity bus lines</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 10</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Existence of sound signals for crossing pedestrians</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Transportation Secretariats</td>
<td>Total sound crossing signals over the total number of crossing signals</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 10</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Existence of effective preventive programs or actions against harassment in public transport</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Transportation Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence of a program or preventive action against harassment in public transportation and of recording occurrences</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 5, 10</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TARGET 11.3. By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Synergies</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local Governments with Agenda 21 according to the stage of implementation</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Planning / Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Adoption of Agenda 21 by local governments and implementation stage</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of a Participatory Master Plan</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Planning / Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence of a Master Plan, in which year it was elaborated, if the revision was made, in which year the revision was made and what participatory mechanisms were used.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of a Participatory Integrated Urban Development Plan</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State Governments</td>
<td>Planning / Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence of PDUI, in which year it was elaborated and which participatory mechanisms were used.</td>
<td>Metropolitan regions</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of a specific instance or group of integrated planning for SDG monitoring</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Planning / Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of a specific instance or specific group of integrated planning for SDG monitoring and which participatory mechanisms exist</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Existence of public transport by bus with sustainable energy</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Transportation Secretariats</td>
<td>Percentage of collective buses that use sustainable energy systems (electric, hybrid and clean and renewable fuels), over the total collective buses of the municipality.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 3 13</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of legal instruments of urban policy</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Secretariats of Urban Development and Housing</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of the following legal instruments: Code of Works, Urban Perimeter, Zoning, Land Installment, and Code of Municipal Postures</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of legal instruments of the Statute of Cities</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Secretariats of Urban Development and Housing</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of the following legal instruments provided by the City Statute: Improvement Contribution, Progressive Tax (IPTU), Onerous Concession of the Right to Build, Consortium Urban Transactions, Transfer of the Right to Build, Concession of the Real Right of Use, Special Zoning of Social Interest, Special Zoning of Cultural Interest, Special Zoning of Environmental Interest, Installment, Edif. or Compulsory Use, Disappropriation with Payment in Securities, Right of Preemption, and Neighborhood Impact Assessment</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of forums for debate (public councils and public hearings) linked to urban policy</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Secretariats of Urban Development and Housing</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of forums for debate (councils, public hearings) linked to urban policy, periodicity of meetings and participatory mechanisms</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TARGET 11.4. Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Synergies</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percentage of state and local governments with approved legislation and heritage policy in relation to the total of states and cities</td>
<td>Annual (available data for 2012 and to be released for 2013)</td>
<td>&quot;IBGE. Perfil dos estadose dos municípios brasileiros. Rio de Janeiro, 2015&quot;</td>
<td>Planning / Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Adoption of Agenda 21 by local governments and implementation stage</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Existence of a Master Plan, in which year it was elaborated, if the revision was made, in which year the revision was made and what participatory mechanisms were used.</td>
<td>2001-2014</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>&quot;IBGE. Perfil dos estadose dos municípios brasileiros. Rio de Janeiro, 2015&quot;</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of a specific instance or specific group of integrated planning for SDG monitoring and which participatory mechanisms exist</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Percentage of total budget allocated to culture in the three spheres of government</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Courts of Accounts</td>
<td>National, State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Percentage of total budget allocated to culture in the three spheres of government</td>
<td>States and cities</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of affirmative public actions or programs of cultural diversity (language, dance, clothing, religion, among others)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Education / Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of affirmative public actions or programs of cultural diversity (language, dance, clothing, religion, among others)</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of municipal council of culture and historical patrimony, activities and mechanisms of participation</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Culture Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness in local government of actions of preservation, valorization and diffusion of the material and immaterial heritage</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Existence of active public cultural equipment</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Education / Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence of public cultural equipment in operation (theaters, cultural centers, cinemas, museums, arenas, libraries) and number of visits</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Existence of active public cultural equipment</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Education / Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence of public cultural equipment in operation (theaters, cultural centers, cinemas, museums, arenas, libraries) and number of visits</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Existence of active public cultural equipment</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Education / Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of affirmative public actions or programs of cultural diversity (language, dance, clothing, religion, among others)</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Periodicity</td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Disaggregation</td>
<td>Synergies</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of municipal environmental council</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Environment/Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence of specific municipal council of environment, activities and mechanisms of participation</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 6, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>New municipal conservation units in the National Register of Conservation Units (CNUC)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>MMA/CNUC, IBGE. Perfil dos estados e dos municípios brasileiros. Rio de Janeiro, 2015</td>
<td>Percentage of creation of new conservation units in the CNUN</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 6, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TARGET 11.5.** By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Synergies</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Deaths due to environmental accidents recorded by Ibama</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Administrative Record</td>
<td>Relatório de Acidentes Ambientais Registrados pelo Ibama em 2014</td>
<td>Number of deaths caused by social and environmental disasters in the city</td>
<td>Risk class; Day period; States</td>
<td>SDG 3, 6, 13, 15</td>
<td>UNDP, PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Human and material impacts of extreme weather events</td>
<td>Periodically since 1940*</td>
<td>Civil Defense</td>
<td>State Governments</td>
<td>Describe what were the financial and material impacts on the city how many injured and how many dead were recorded.</td>
<td>Kind of event; Day period; State; Type of impact (human or material)</td>
<td>SDG 13, 15</td>
<td>UNDP, PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Percentage of cities with actions and / or risk management instruments</td>
<td>Periodo de 2001-2014</td>
<td>Munic</td>
<td>IBGE. Perfil dos estados e dos municipios brasileiros. Rio de Janeiro, 2015</td>
<td>Existence in the city of actions and / or instruments of risk management.</td>
<td>States and cities</td>
<td>SDG 13</td>
<td>UNDP, PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Existence of dwellings in risk areas</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Housing Secretariats</td>
<td>Percentage of dwellings in risk areas over total dwellings.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 13</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Municipal Risk Reduction Plan</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Housing Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness in the municipality of risk reduction plan and which participatory mechanisms were used.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 13, 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Civil Defense</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Housing/ Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence of municipal, regional or state staff in the cities of the Metropolitan Region</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 13</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Depending on the variable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Synergies</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of risk prevention actions or programs</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Housing/ Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of risk prevention actions or programs and participation mechanisms</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 13, 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of early warning system</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Housing/ Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of early warning system in risk areas in the city</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 13, 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Number of occurrences and disasters due to disasters (without deaths)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Housing/ Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Percentage of occurrences and disasters due to catastrophes (without deaths) over the total number of occurrences and disasters</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 13, 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TARGET 11.6. By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Synergies</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Per capita collection of household solid waste (RDO)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td>PNIA - Painel Nacional de Indicadores Ambientais</td>
<td>PNIA 2012 – Referencial teórico, composição e síntese dos indicadores da versão piloto. Brasília, 2014</td>
<td>Per capita collection of household solid waste (RDO)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>SDG 6, 12, 15</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Consumption of ozone-depleting substances (MDGs)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td>PNIA - Painel Nacional de Indicadores Ambientais</td>
<td>PNIA 2012 – Referencial teórico, composição e síntese dos indicadores da versão piloto. Brasília, 2015</td>
<td>Consumption of ozone-depleting substances (MDGs)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>SDG 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of selective collection service</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Meio Ambiente/ Governo</td>
<td>Existence, effectiveness, points of collection and scope of the municipal service of selective collection of solid waste</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 12, 15</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of adequate disposal of solid waste</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Meio Ambiente/ Governo</td>
<td>Existence of adequate disposal site for solid waste and% of collected waste</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 12, 15</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of air quality measurement points</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Meio Ambiente/ Governo</td>
<td>Existence, coverage and effectiveness of air quality measurement points</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 12, 15</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Percentage of deaths from respiratory diseases</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>DATASUS</td>
<td>Indicadores e Dados Básicos - Brasil - 2012</td>
<td>Percentage of deaths from respiratory diseases</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 12, 15</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of recycling plants</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Meio Ambiente/ Governo</td>
<td>Existence of recycling plants and percentage of recycled garbage over total garbage collected</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 12, 15</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of an Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan, under the terms established in the National Policy on Solid Waste</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Meio Ambiente/ Governo</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of an integrated solid waste management plan under the terms established in the National Solid Waste Policy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 6, 12, 15</td>
<td>UNDP, PCS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TARGET 11.7.** By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Synergies</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percentage of people who were the victims of robbery or theft in the reference period</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>PNAD</td>
<td>PNA 2012 – Referencial teórico, composição e síntese dos indicadores da versão piloto. Brasília, 2014</td>
<td>Per capita collection of household solid waste (RDO)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>SDG 6, 12, 15</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Homicide rate</td>
<td>Annual (since 1980)</td>
<td>Datasus</td>
<td>WAISELFISZ, JJ. Mapa da Violência 2014: Homicídios e juventude no Brasil - Atualização 15 a 29 anos. Rio de Janeiro: FLACSO, 2013</td>
<td>Number of people killed and per capita mortality rate (per 100,000 population)</td>
<td>Regions; States and cities; Age; Sex, color / race</td>
<td>SDG 1, 3, 5, 16</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Green area in the urban area</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Desenvolvimento Urbano/Meio Ambiente</td>
<td>Total square meters of public green area per inhabitant and percentage of the population living in a radius of up to 300m of green areas.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 10, 15</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Existence of reference center or similar for elderly population</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Assistência Social</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of reference center or similar for elderly population and number of visits</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 10</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Existence and Effectiveness of Council of Elderly</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Assistência Social</td>
<td>Existence of specific municipal council of elderly, activities and mechanisms of participation</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 10</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Accessible sidewalks</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Desenvolvimento Urbano/Obras</td>
<td>Percentage of kilometers of sidewalks accessible over the full stretch in kilometers of city sidewalks.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 10</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Accessibility in public buildings</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Assistência Social</td>
<td>Percentage of public buildings with accessibility</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 10</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Percentage of squares and parks in urban area</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Desenvolvimento Urbano/Meio Ambiente</td>
<td>Area of squares and parks in m² in relation to the total area of public green spaces</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 10, 15</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Existence of free internet access in public spaces</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Administração/ Governo</td>
<td>Percentage of public spaces with free internet over the total of public spaces</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 9, 10</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Periodicity</td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Disaggregation</td>
<td>Synergies</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Underreporting of robbery and theft rate</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Segurança Pública</td>
<td>Percentage of underreporting of robberies and thefts</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 1, 3, 5, 16</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Percentage of victims of rape in public spaces</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State Governments</td>
<td>Secretarias de Segurança Pública</td>
<td>Percentage of victims of rape in public spaces</td>
<td>States and metropolitan regions; Sex / race-color; Social groups; Type of site; Age</td>
<td>SDG 1, 3, 5, 16</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Percentage of children who are victims of violence in schools</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State Governments</td>
<td>*Pesquisa Nacional de Saúde Escolar</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of reference center or similar for elderly population and number of visits</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 10</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TARGET 11.a.** Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, per-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Synergies</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Existence of public consortium, partnership agreement, support of the private sector or active communities in the areas of urban development, employment / work, education, health, culture, tourism and environment.</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Government Secretariats</td>
<td>&quot;Percentage of cities with public consortium, partnership agreement, private sector or community support in urban areas, employment / work, education, health, culture, tourism and environment. &quot;</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>SDG 6, 12, 15</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Existence of Metropolitan Governance as established by the Metropolis Statute</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State Governments</td>
<td>Government Secretariats</td>
<td>partnership agreement, support from the private sector or active communities in the areas of urban development, employment / labor, education, health, culture, tourism and the environment. &quot;</td>
<td>Metropolitan regions</td>
<td>SDG 10, 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of State and Municipal Controllership</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and local Governments</td>
<td>Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of state and municipal controllership, means of interaction and mechanisms of transparency</td>
<td>State and cities</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TARGET 11.b.** By 2020, substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Synergies</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local Governments with Municipal Environmental Departments</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Environemnt Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence of Municipal Environmental Departments or similar</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 15, 16</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local Governments with Environmental Councils</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Environemnt Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of municipal Environmental Council, activities and mechanisms of participation</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 15, 16</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of cities involved in the initial process of implementing Local Agenda 21</td>
<td>*2002, 2009</td>
<td>State and local Governments</td>
<td>Government Secretariats</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of state and municipal controllership, means of interaction and mechanisms of transparency</td>
<td>State and cities</td>
<td>SDG 17</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Number of cities with effective plan, program or policy to combat climate change</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Governos Municipais</td>
<td>Environemnt Secretariats</td>
<td>Percentage of cities with an effective plan, program or policy to combat climate change over the total number of cities of the metropolitan region</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 13</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Number of cities with effective resilience plan, program or policy</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Governos Municipais</td>
<td>Environemnt Secretariats</td>
<td>Percentage of cities with effective resilience plan, program or policy over the total number of cities of the metropolitan region</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SDG 13</td>
<td>METRODS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex B. RMBH SDG 11 Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>RMBH (% of cities)</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>RMBH (average)</th>
<th>Goal (average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Existence of programs or actions for urban and land regularization</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>58.30%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Number of repossession in public or private properties unaccompanied of</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Percentage of repossession in public or private properties unaccompanied of housing solution over total repossession</td>
<td>11.80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Existence of participatory Social Interest Housing Local Plan</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>41.20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Existence of participatory Local Housing Council</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>47.10%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Existence of participatory Local Housing Fund</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>35.30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Existence of cycle lanes and exclusive cycle paths</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Existence of a system or action to monitor congestion</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Existence of a bus fleet with accessibility for people with disabilities</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>52.90%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Total local transport budget for public transportation</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Percentage of the budget of the municipality destined to public transport over the total budget of the transport area</td>
<td>52.90%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Number of intercity public transport lines</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>94.10%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Existence of effective preventive programs or actions against harassment</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Existence of participatory Mobility Local Plan</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Existence of tariff integration in intermunicipal public transport</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>52.90%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Periodicity</td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>RMBH (% of cities)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>RMBH (average)</td>
<td>Goal (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local Governments with Agenda 21 according to the stage of implantation</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Existence and effectiveness of a Participatory Master Plan</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.10%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Existence of a Participatory Integrated Urban Development Plan</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Existence of a specific instance or group of integrated planning for</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Existence of public transportation by bus with sustainable energy</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Existence of legal instruments of urban policy</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Existence of legal instruments of the Statute of Cities</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.40%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use and Occupancy Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.60%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Code/Posture Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.80%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Existence of legal instruments of the Statute of Cities</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onerous Grant of the Right to Build</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progressive Property Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consortium Urban Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer of Building Right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concession of the Real Right of Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Zone of Social Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Preemption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood Impact Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Existence of local forums for debate (public councils and public</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hearings) linked to urban policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Periodicity</td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>RMBH (% of cities)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>RMBH (average)</td>
<td>Goal (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Existence in the city of specific legislation to deal with the environmental issue.</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Existence in state and local governments of specific legislation to deal with the heritage issue</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>82.40%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Existence of municipal council of culture and historical patrimony</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>88.20%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Existence of public cultural equipment in operation (theaters, cultural centers, cinemas, museums, arenas, libraries)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>88.20%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Existence of actions or affirmative programs of cultural diversity</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>94.10%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Existence of municipal environmental council</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>94.10%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>New municipal conservation units in the National Register of Conservation Units (CNUC)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Percentage of creation of new conservation units in the CNUC</td>
<td>35.30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Existence of Municipal Plans for the Conservation and Recovery of the Atlantic Forest (PMMA, Federal Law No. 11.428 / 2006) or another Biome</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>11.80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Goal Description</td>
<td>Periodicity</td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>RMBH (% of cities)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>RMBH (average)</td>
<td>Goal (average)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Existence of dwellings in risk areas</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>76.50%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Existence of Local Risk Reduction Plan</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>41.20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Existence of Civil Defense</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>76.50%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Existence of risk prevention actions or programs</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>58.80%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Existence of early warning system</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>35.30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Number of occurrences and disasters (without deaths)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Percentual de ocorrências e desastres decorrentes de catástrofes (sem óbitos) sob o total de ocorrências e desastres ocorridos</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>294.91666667</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Existence of selective collection service</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Existence of adequate disposal of solid waste</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>State and Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>4710%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Existence of air quality measurement points</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>11.80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Existence of recycling plants</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>41.20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Existence of an Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan, under the terms established in the National Policy on Solid Waste</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>4710%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Existence of programs or actions aimed at waste pickers</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>41.20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Periodicity</td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>RMBH (% of cities)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>RMBH (average)</td>
<td>Goal (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Existence of green area in the urban area</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>94.10%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Existence of reference center or similar for elderly population</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>82.40%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Existence of Council of Elderly</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>64.70%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Existence of accessible sidewalks</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>52.90%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Existence of accessibility in public buildings</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>70.60%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Percentage of squares and parks in urban area</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,152,287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Existence of free internet access in public spaces</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>35.30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Existence of squares in urban areas</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Existence of public parks in urban areas</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>52.90%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Periodicity</td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>RMBH (% of cities)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>RMBH (average)</td>
<td>Goal (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.a</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>88.20%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.a</td>
<td>Existence of public consortium, partnership agreement, support of the private sector or active communities in the areas of urban development, employment / work, education, health, culture, tourism and environment.</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>64.70%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.a</td>
<td>Existence of State and Municipal Control-ershrips</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Governos Estaduais e Municipais</td>
<td>Number of cities with yes response on total number of cities surveyed</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Periodicity</td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>RMBH (% of cities)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>RMBH (average)</td>
<td>Goal (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.b</td>
<td>Percentage of cities with effective plan, program or policy to combat climate change</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Percentage of cities with effective plan, program or policy to combat climate change</td>
<td>11.80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.b</td>
<td>Percentage of cities with effective resilience plan, program or policy</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Percentage of cities with effective resilience plan, program or policy</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex C. Knowledge Questionnaire

Translated from the original Portuguese

SURVEY in the MUNICIPALITIES: SDG Sustainable Development Goals

(Agenda 2030)
This research is an action of the Scientific Initiation Project of the Newton Paiva Academic Center, a project called: sources of measurement for the uses of the Sustainable Development Goals in the metropolitan areas of Minas Gerais.

This survey aims at understanding the level of knowledge of the municipality and the community about the 2015 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Although some personal data is required (only to ensure the reliability and security of the responses), this survey will not display or provide any information of users who respond to the questions.

It is intended:

- To verify the level of knowledge on the topic.
- To verify the level of engagement with the Agenda 2030.

Thank you for the attention and if you have difficulties filling out, do not hesitate to send us an e-mail: propicnewtonods11@gmail.com, addressed to Vinícius Turquete. Contact phone number: +55 31 99917-6542.

*Required

1. Name of municipality:

Profile of the respondent in the municipality: (We want to know a little about you)

2. What is your position in your municipality?

3. Gender *

Mark only one oval.

- Male
- Female
4. Age *
Mark only one oval.
- Up to 17 years old
- 18-24 years old
- 25-31 years old
- 32-40 years old
- 41-50 years old
- 51-60 years old
- Over 61 years old

5. Adding your income to the income of the people who live with you, how much is, approximately, your monthly household income? *
Mark only one oval.
- Up to 1 minimum wage (up to R$ 954,00)
- From 1 to 3 times the minimum wage (from R$ 954,01 to R$ 2.862,00)
- From 3 to 6 times the minimum wage (from R$ 2.862,01 to R$ 5.724,00)
- From 6 to 9 times the minimum wage (from R$ 5.724,01 to R$ 8.586,00)
- From 9 to 12 times the minimum wage (from R$ 8586,01 to R$ 11.448,00)
- From 12 to 15 times the minimum wage (from R$ 11.448,01 to R$ 14.310,00)
- More than 15 times the minimum wage (more than R$ 14.310,01)

6. In which (CITY) do you currently live? *

7. Neighborhood? *

8. And in which street? (with house and apartment/unit numbers) *

Municipal Structure (We want to know the governmental structure of
9. Environment? *
Mark only one oval.
- Yes
- No

10. If it does not exist, which governmental agency/department substitutes it?

11. Transportation? *
Mark only one oval.
- Yes
- No

12. If it does not exist, which governmental agency/department substitutes it?

13. Cultural heritage? *
Mark only one oval.
- Yes
- No

14. If it does not exist, which governmental agency/department substitutes it?

15. Housing and urban development? *
Mark only one oval.
- Yes
- No

16. If it does not exist, which governmental agency/department
17. Civil defense? *
Mark only one oval.
O  Yes
O  No

18. If it does not exist, which governmental agency/department substitutes it?

Level of knowledge about the MDGs and the SDGs (We want to know a little more of your knowledge about sustainable development)

19. Do you consider yourselves part of the metropolitan area?
Mark only one oval.
O  Yes
O  No
O  Little
O  I do not know how to respond

20. What public function of common interest is part of your relationship with the metropolitan area?

21. Does your municipality participate in the Metropolitan Council?
Mark only one oval.
O  Yes
O  No
O  Yes, and holds a chair in the Council

22. Does your municipality participate in the GRANBEL (Association of the Municipalities of the Metropolitan Area of Belo Horizonte)?
Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No
- Yes, and holds a chair
- I do not know
- Other:

23. Does your municipality participate in any Drainage Basin Committee?
Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No
- I do not know

24. Which one?

25. Do you know what MDG (Millennium Development Goals) means? *
Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No

26. Do you know what SDG (Sustainable Development Goals) means? *
Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No

Follow-up on the MDGs: (We want to know about the process of implementation of the MDGs)

27. Has your municipality done any kind of follow-up to the Millennium Development Goals? *
Mark only one oval.
O Yes – Go to question 28.
O No – Go to question 30.

**Actions taken to implement the SDGs** (We want to know if your municipality has followed the SDGs since its inception)

28. What is/are this/these action(s)? *
29. Which sector is responsible for the action(s)? *

**Interaction of the municipality in the SDGs** (We want to know about the application of the SDGs in the management investments for this government)

30. Has your municipality elaborated a plan of goals and targets for the 2017-2020 term, incorporating the Agenda 2030 and the SDGs? *
Mark only one oval.
O Yes
O No

31. Does your municipality do any kind of monitoring of the Agenda 2030 through the Sustainable Development Goals? *
Mark only one oval.
O Yes – Go to question 32.
O No – Go to question 34.

**Details of the actions for the implementation of the SDGs** (Describe at least one action developed by the municipality)

32. What are these actions? *
33. Which sector and who are responsible for the coordination of the action(s)? *
Stop filling out this form.

**Implementation of the SDGs/Agenda 2030** *(We want to know the level of engagement of your municipality with the Agenda 2030 and the SDGs)*

34. Please list the reason why you do not monitor the Agenda 2030: *
Mark only one oval.
- Unfamiliarity with the Agenda 2030 and the SDGs;
- Lack of qualified staff to monitor the Agenda 2030;
- Lack of interest;
- Lack of resources;
- None of the above;
- Other:

**Based on the explanation of the importance of the SDGs...** *(We want to know about the mobilization of your municipality regarding the monitoring of the Agenda 2030 and the SDGs)*

35. Is your municipality interested in following and using the SDGs in the planning and monitoring of its actions, goals and indicators? *
Mark only one oval.
- Yes
- No

36. Is your municipality interested in starting to implement the Agenda 2030?
Mark only one oval.
- Yes
- No
Annex D. Municipalities Survey

Translated from the original Portuguese

Municipalities Survey: Indicators of the SDGs for the municipalities of metropolitan areas

This is a research to quantify and qualify the current stage of the SDG’s 11th goal in the scope of the research and scientific initiation project “Sources for measuring the goals of sustainable development in the metropolitan areas of Belo Horizonte and Vale do Aço,” carried out by the Newton Paiva University Center, in partnership with the Metropolitan Observatory ODS-METRODS, and the ‘Nossa BH’ Movement (Our BHMovement), with financial support from SDSN.

Additional information on the research: Professor Cláudia Pires +55 31 99917-6542/ propicnewtonods@gmail.com

*Required
1. Email address *
2. Name *
3. Phone number *
4. Municipality*

TARGET 11.1
TARGET 11.1. by 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services, and upgrade slums
1. Number of households in the municipality: *

2. Is there a slum in your municipality? *

Mark only one oval

O Yes
O No
O I do not know

2.1. If yes, how many?

3. What is its housing shortage rate? *

4. Is there a PLHIS (Local Plan of Social Interest Housing) in your municipality? *

Mark only one oval

O Yes
O No
O Under review

4.1. If yes, what is the date of approval of the PLHIS?

5. Is there a Municipal Housing Council in your municipality? *

Mark only one oval

O Yes
O No
O In progress

5.1. If yes, is it active?

Mark only one oval

O Yes
O No

5.1.1 How often does it meet?

5.1.2. What is the date of its last meeting?
6. Is there a Municipal Housing Fund? *
Mark only one oval
- Yes
- No

6.1. Is there a board of directors of the Municipal Housing Fund? *
Mark only one oval
- Yes
- No
- In progress

6.1.2. If yes, the board is:
Mark only one oval
- Advisory
- Deliberative
- Regulatory

6.1.3. Does the housing fund receive municipal funds?
Mark only one oval
- Yes
- No

7. Are there programs, actions or plans for regularization of urban planning and land tenure in your municipality? *
Mark only one oval
- Yes
- No
- In progress or under review
8. Has there been repossession of private property (forcible removal) since the beginning of this government management? *

Mark only one oval

O Yes  
O No

8.1. If yes, how many?

8.2. Of this amount, how many were not accompanied by housing solutions?

9. Has there been repossession of public property with no housing solution (forcible removal)? *

Mark only one oval

O Yes  
O No

9.1. If yes, how many?

9.2. Of this amount, how many were not accompanied by housing solutions?

TARGET 11.2

TARGET 11.2. by 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons

1. Is there a Municipal Mobility Plan? *

Mark only one oval

O Yes  
O No
1.1. If yes, when was the plan elaborated?

2. Are there cycle tracks and/or exclusive cycle paths in your municipality? *
Total percentage of the extension of cycle paths and permanent cycle tracks
(km) on the total length of roads in the municipality (km)
Mark only one oval
○ Yes
○ No

2.1. If yes, how many kilometers?

3. Is there traffic congestion in your municipality?
Mark only one oval
○ Yes
○ No

4. Is there any kind of action to monitor traffic congestion in
your municipality? *
Existence of a traffic congestion monitoring system, monitored kilometers
and annual traffic congestion index in the municipality

5. Is there a metropolitan transportation line in your municipality? *
Mark only one oval
○ Yes
○ No

5.1. Does the metropolitan transportation have fare integration?
Mark only one oval
○ Yes
○ No
○ There is partial integration
6. Is there a bus-only lane in your municipality? *
Mark only one oval
○ Yes
○ No
○ Under construction

7. Is there an accessible bus fleet (low floor and lift) in your municipality? *
Mark only one oval
○ Yes
○ No

7.1. If yes, how many fleet vehicles are accessible?
Percentage of fleet buses with accessibility, low floor and lift for people with disabilities on the bus fleet

8. What is the total municipal transport budget (%) for public transport? *
Percentage of the budget of the municipality destined to public transport on the total budget of the transport area

9. Are there audible signals for pedestrians crossing? *
Total audible pedestrian crossing signals on the total number of pedestrian crossing signals
Mark only one oval
○ Yes
○ No

10. Are there sustainable energy buses in the municipal public transport network? *
Mark only one oval
○ Yes
○ No
11. Are there effective preventive programs or actions against harassment in public transport in your municipality? *

Existence of a program or preventive action against harassment in public transportation and of occurrence recording

Mark only one oval

O  Yes

O  No

TARGET 11.3

TARGET 11.3. by 2030 enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacities for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries

1. Has the municipality adhered to Agenda 21? *

Adoption of a sustainable development agenda in the municipality?

Mark only one oval

O  Yes

O  No

O  In progress

1.1. If yes:

Mark only one oval

O  There are actions still in progress.

O  There are not actions in progress.

2. Is there a participatory Master Plan in your municipality? *

Existence of a Master Plan, in which year it was elaborated, if a revision was made, in which year the revision was made, and which participatory mechanisms have been used
3. If yes, what is its date of approval?

4. Is there a specific body or group of integrated planning for monitoring the SDGs in your municipality? *

Existence and effectiveness of a specific body or group of integrated planning for SDG monitoring and what participatory mechanisms exist

Mark only one oval

O Yes
O No
O Under review

5. Does the municipality have the following legal instruments of urban policy in line with its Master Plan? *

Mark only one oval

O Building Law
O Land Use and Occupancy Law
O Municipal Code

6. The Master Plan includes: *

Mark only one oval

O Onerous grant of the right to build
O Progressive IPTU (municipal property tax)
O Urban Operation Consortium
O Transfer of Development Rights
O Grant for Real Right of Use
O Special Zones of Social Interest (ZEISs)
O Right of Pre-emption
O Neighborhood Impact Study (EIV)

7. Does it have an Urban Policy Council? *

Existence and effectiveness of forums for debate (councils, public hearings) connected to urban policy
Mark only one oval
O Yes
O No

7.1. If yes, how often does the council meet?

7.2. What is the date of its last meeting?

7.3. The council is:

Existence and effectiveness of forums for debate (councils, public hearings) connected to urban policy
Mark only one oval
O Advisory
O Deliberative
O Regulatory

TARGET 11.4

TARGET 11.4 strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage

1. Does the municipality have specific legislation on cultural heritage approved? *

Mark only one oval
O Yes
O No
2. Does it have a Cultural Heritage Council or similar body? *

Mark only one oval

○ Yes

○ No

2.1. If yes, how often does the council meet?

2.2. What is the date of its last meeting?

3. Is there an inventory of cultural heritage? *

Mark only one oval

○ Yes

○ No

4. Is there a Culture Council?*

Mark only one oval

○ Yes

○ No

4.1. If yes, how often does the council meet?

4.2. What is the date of its last meeting?

5. Is there a Municipal Fund for Culture? *

Mark only one oval

○ Yes

○ No

5.1. Is there a board of directors of the Municipal Fund for Culture? *

Mark only one oval

○ Yes

○ No

5.1.2. If yes, the council is:

Existence and effectiveness of forums for debate (councils, public hearings)

connected to urban policy
Mark only one oval

- Advisory
- Deliberative
- Regulatory

5.1.3. Does the fund for culture receive municipal funding?

Mark only one oval

- Yes
- No

6. Are there actions for preservation of places listed as cultural heritage? *

Mark only one oval

- Yes
- No

7. Does it have active municipal public cultural places? *

Existence of public cultural equipment in operation (theaters, cultural centers, cinemas, museums, arenas, libraries) and number of visits

Mark only one oval

- Yes
- No

7.1. If yes, how many municipal public cultural places are in operation? *

Existence of public cultural equipment in operation (theaters, cultural centers, cinemas, museums, arenas, libraries) and number of visits

Mark only one oval

- Yes
- No
8. Do you have actions or affirmative action programs for cultural diversity? What are they?*
Check all that apply
- Language
- Dance
- Clothing
- Religion
- Other:

9. Does the municipality have specific environmental legislation approved? *
Mark only one oval
- Yes
- No

10. Does it have an Environment Council? *
Existence of specific municipal council of environment, activities and mechanisms of participation
Mark only one oval
- Yes
- No

10.1. How often does the council meet?

10.2. What is the date of its last meeting?

11. Does it have Municipal Conservation Units (protected territories) listed in the National Register of Conservation Units (CNUC)? *
Mark only one oval
- Yes
- No
- In progress
11.1. If yes, how many have been created since 2015? *

12. Does it have green spaces in the urban area? *

Total square meters of public green area per inhabitant and percentage of the population living in a radius of up to 300m of green spaces

Mark only one oval

O Yes

O No

12.1. What is the total in square meters? *

13. Does it have squares in the urban area? *

Mark only one oval

O Yes

O No

13.1. If yes, what is their area in square kilometers? *

14. Does it have parks in the urban area? *

Area of squares and parks in square meters in relation to the total area of public green spaces.

Mark only one oval

O Yes

O No

14.1. If yes, what is their area in square kilometers? *

TARGET 11.5

TARGET 11.5. By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations.


Mark only one oval

- Yes
- No

1.1. If yes, what is its date of approval?

2. Are there risk management actions and / or instruments? *

Mark only one oval

- Yes
- No

3. Are there households in high-risk areas? *

Mark only one oval

- Yes
- No

4. Is there a municipal Risk Reduction Plan? *

Existence and effectiveness of a risk reduction plan in the municipality and the mechanisms of participation employed

Mark only one oval

- Yes
- No

4.1. If yes, what is its date of approval?
5. Is there a Civil Defense team in the municipality? *

Existence of municipal, regional or state staff in the municipalities of the metropolitan area

Mark only one oval

○ Yes

○ No

6. Does the municipality have risk prevention actions and programs? *

Mark only one oval

○ Yes

○ No

7. Does the municipality have an early warning system? *

Mark only one oval

○ Yes

○ No

8. What is the number of occurrences and disasters due to catastrophes (without deaths) since 2015? *

Percentage of occurrences and disasters due to catastrophes (without deaths) under the total number of occurrences and disasters - If not stated, “not applicable” will be the answer

9. What was the number of deaths in disasters due to catastrophes since 2015? *

Percentage of occurrences and disasters due to catastrophes under the total number of occurrences and disasters - If not stated, “not applicable” will be the answer
TARGET 11.6.
by 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality, municipal and other waste management

1. Is there a solid waste collection service in the municipality? *
Existence, effectiveness, points of collection and scope of the municipal service of selective collection of solid waste
Mark only one oval

O Yes
O No
O Other:

1.1. If yes, what is the frequency of this collection?
1.2. What is the average (monthly) volume collected?

2. Is there a selective waste collection service in the municipality? *
Existence, effectiveness, points of collection and scope of the municipal service of selective collection of solid waste
Mark only one oval

O Yes
O No
O Other:

2.1. If yes, what is the frequency of this collection? *
2.2. What is the average (monthly) volume collected? *

3. Are there recycling plants or similar in the municipality? *
Existence of recycling plants and percentage of recycled garbage over total garbage collected
4. Are there programs or actions aimed at informal garbage collectors in the municipality? *
Existence and effectiveness of programs or actions aimed at collectors, including number of visits
Mark only one oval
○ Yes
○ No

5. Does the municipality have any arrangements to dispose of solid waste? *
Mark only one oval
○ Yes
○ No

5.1. What type of solid waste disposal does the municipality have? *
Mark only one oval
○ Open dump
○ Sanitary landfill
○ Controlled landfill
○ Other:

6. Does the municipality have an Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan, in accordance with what is established in the National Solid Waste Policy? *
Existence and effectiveness of an integrated solid waste management plan under what is established in the National Solid Waste Policy
6.1. If yes, what is its date of approval?

7. Are there air quality measurement points in the municipality? *
   Existence, coverage and effectiveness of air quality measurement points
   Mark only one oval
   O Yes
   O No

TARGET 11.7.

TARGET 11.7. by 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, particularly for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities

1. Is there a reference center or similar for the elderly population in the municipality? *
   Existence and effectiveness of a reference center or similar for the elderly population and number of visits
   Mark only one oval
   O Yes
   O No

2. Is there a Council of Elders in the municipality? *
   Existence and effectiveness of the Council of Elders, periodicity of meetings and participation mechanisms
2.1. How often does the council meet?

2.2. What is the date of its last meeting?

3. Does the municipality have accessible sidewalks? *
   Percentage of kilometers of accessible sidewalks over the full extension in kilometers of city sidewalks
   Mark only one oval
   O Yes
   O No

3.1. If yes, what is the total extension of accessible sidewalks? *
   Percentage of kilometers of accessible sidewalks over the full extension in kilometers of city sidewalks

4. Are municipal public buildings accessible? *
   Percentage of accessible public buildings
   Mark only one oval
   O Yes
   O No

4.1. What types of accessibility do they have? *
   (This question allows more than one answer)
   Mark only one oval
   O Ramp
   O Lift
   O Tactile paving
   O Braille signs
O  Adapted toilets
O  Other:

5. Is there free internet access in public spaces? *

Mark only one oval
O  Yes
O  No

5.1. If yes, identify the location: *

Percentage of public spaces with free internet on the total of public spaces

Mark all that apply
O  Square
O  Park
O  Other:

TARGET 11.a

TARGET 11.a. support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning

1. Does the municipality have public consortium, partnership agreement, support of the private sector or active communities in the areas of urban development, employment / work, education, health, culture, tourism and the environment? *

Public consortium, partnership agreement, private sector or community support in the areas of urban development, employment / labor, education, health, culture, tourism and the environment

Mark only one oval
O  Yes
O  No
2. Are you aware of the Metropolitan Governance body as established by the Metropolis Statute? *
Existence of effective metropolitan governance composed of State and Municipal Governments, as well as representatives of civil society and participation mechanisms
Mark only one oval
○ Aware
○ Not aware

3. Is there a State Controllership Department in the municipality? *
Existence and effectiveness of state and municipal controllership, means of interaction and mechanisms of transparency
Mark only one oval
○ Yes
○ No

4. Is there a Municipal Controllership Department? *
Existence and effectiveness of state and municipal controllership, means of interaction and mechanisms of transparency
Mark only one oval
○ Yes
○ No

TARGET 11.b.
TARGET 11.b. By 2020, substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and develop and implement, in line
with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels

1. Does the municipality have an effective plan, program or policy against climate change? *

Effective plan, program or policy against climate change

Mark only one oval

○ Yes
○ No

1.1. If it is a plan, when was it established? *

Effective plan, program or policy against climate change
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PROJECT OBJECTIVE

The main objective of the proposed research project is to measure the level of commitment of municipalities from the Metropolitan Area of Belo Horizonte (RMBH) to the Sustainable Development Goal #11 - Sustainable Cities and Communities, through the use of METRODS methodologies and set of indicators.

RMBH

5 873 841 inhab. (IBGE 2016)
34 cities
HDI: 0,774 (UNDP 2010)
Density: 640, 20 inhab/km²
9 467,797 km²
METRODS
METROPOLITAN SDG OBSERVATORY

To influence public policies and actions by civil society which accelerate multi-sector implementation of SDG 11 in metropolitan regions in Brazil, by developing a robust network that develops, monitors and evaluates localized indicators, and provides a platform for the exchange of knowledge among its members.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES

1. Sensitization and mobilization
2. METRODS SDG #11 indicators review
3. Questionnaires and SDG #11 data collection
4. SDG #11 data analysis.
FIELD VISITS

QUESTIONNAIRES: DIFFICULTIES

APPLICATION OF 2 QUESTIONNAIRES
Support of the RMBH Development Agency

Questionnaire #1: Knowledge Survey - 22 of 38 answers
Visits by researchers: 3

Questionnaire #2: SDG #11 focused - 17 of 34 responses
Visits by researchers: 3

DIFFICULTIES

- Difficulty of contact with the Municipal Director;
- Absence of readability of the local administrative structure contacted and visited;
- Lack of knowledge of the subject;
- No continuity of follow-up MDG/SDG; 53.8% know what MDG is and 65% SDG/65.4% do not follow Agenda 2030 and 30% do not know about it;
- Political moment (June to September - electoral scenario).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>QR</th>
<th>QT</th>
<th>Population 2016</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>AADB 2013 poverty %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>221,581</td>
<td>10,521</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>177,706</td>
<td>10,837</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>157,373</td>
<td>9,898</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONNAIRES

The 22 municipalities that answered the Knowledge Questionnaire represent 65% of the total, 4,571,165 inhabitants (87% of the total population), 6,744 km² (71% of the total area), 3,966 inhabitants (70% of the total population), 4,961 km² (52% of the total area), 70% of the GDP of the RMBH.
### KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONNAIRE: MAIN RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you know what the MDGs mean?</th>
<th>Do you know what the SDGs mean?</th>
<th>Has your municipality done any follow-up on the MDGs?</th>
<th>Has your municipality developed a Plan of Goals (2017-2020) incorporating Agenda 2030/SDGs?</th>
<th>Does your municipality do any kind of monitoring of the Agenda 2030 through SDGs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SDG #11 QUESTIONNAIRE: MAIN RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDG #11 Goals</th>
<th>Goal (average)</th>
<th>Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1 By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and</td>
<td>38.70%</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic services and public infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2 By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older</td>
<td>38.70%</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3 By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries</td>
<td>48.70%</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4 Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage</td>
<td>74.10%</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations</td>
<td>57.60%</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6 By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7 By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities</td>
<td>69.10%</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.a Support positive economic, social, and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning</td>
<td>51.00%</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.b By 2030, substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adapting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and development and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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