



**UCLG Committee
on Social Inclusion,
Participatory Democracy
and Human Rights**

New Urban Agenda zero draft's analysis and comments

The New Urban Agenda (NUA) zero draft's main *strengths* are:

- a. Reference (although relativized) to the **Right to the City** at the beginning of the Declaration, and inclusion of its core principals in the Agenda's draft: right to housing, to water, polycentric and inclusive cities, etc.
- b. Acknowledgment of **Human Rights** in the city, and NUA framework within the international mechanisms for the protection of human rights.
- c. The issue of the **right to housing** is especially present in the draft:
 - Commitment to implement **sound public policies**, articulated among national and local governments, to guarantee the right to adequate housing (including access to basic services and infrastructures) and to prevent evictions and to guarantee the **security of tenure**.
 - Acknowledgement of the **social function of land**, of tenure forms other than ownership, and of community-based solutions.
- d. Acknowledgement of **local governments' role in guaranteeing inhabitants' rights**, and of the need for a real and effective **decentralization**.
 - This need is especially emphasized regarding the issue of local finances: the draft calls for the **decentralization to local governments of the 20% of national resources**, and for the development of **fair and equitable fiscal systems**.
- e. **Strong and transversal gender approach** –especially on the field of access to services, right to housing, fighting against gender-based violence, urban planning and labour equality.
- f. Call to strengthen **metropolitan governance** and to deeply democratize it.
- g. Acknowledgement of the existence of **urban social segregation** and of the need to work for **polycentric and inclusive cities**. Commitment to fight against such segregation and against **urban gentrification processes**.
 - Commitment to guarantee **free access to public spaces**, without any physical, legal, economic or architectural barrier that may prevent citizens (especially most vulnerable collectives, like homeless people) from accessing to it.

- h. Commitment to acknowledge and to support **informal sector** –both at the employment and habitat levels.
- i. Commitment to guarantee **access to water, energy, food security, health, air quality and liveable and attractive urban landscapes**.

On the other side, the main **weaknesses** of the draft are:

- No reference to democracy as essential political system –neither to **local democracy**.
 - **Civil society and citizens’ role** is limited to the monitoring and the evaluation of public policy and to urban planning. No mention to their participation to the real decision-making and to the **co-production of public policies**.
 - Few mentions to citizen empowerment and the need for supporting it.
- Call to keep building **competitive cities**, oriented to financial investments and aiming at the economic growth –although it is called “inclusive and sustainable economic growth”.
 - The draft includes precise policies and actions to create **business-friendly cities**, but it is far less concrete regarding policies to ensure the inclusiveness of economic growth.
 - No reference to **social and solidary economy** –which also enters in contradiction with calling for an inclusive economy.
 - No reference to the need for framing **public-private partnerships** as part of a system to guarantee human rights and the general interest.
- No acknowledgement of **urban common goods** as such, either of their **democratic governance**. Even if there are mentions to urban goods (public spaces, air, landscapes, gardens, green spaces, water, energy...), they are not recognized as “common goods” and, thus, they are not framed within a democratic governance system aiming at ensuring that there is decided according to general interest.
- No recognition of some discriminated collectives –especially **LGBTI and racialized people**.
- No mention to the growth of racism –especially from institutions, in the form **urban and police violence**, either to the stigmatization of neighbourhoods with a high concentration of minorities. We strongly recommend framing police interventions within a legal framework according to human rights, to guarantee the transparency of their actions (through identity control, the implementation of a control committee...) and to reinforce victim’s chances to access to justice.
- No reference to the fight against **corruption and tax evasion** –which diminishes the amount of available resources to set up public policies.
- Regarding the **gender mainstreaming**, it is focused on a legal and normative approach, rather than **effective public policies** –especially on the issue of **employment**, in which it is

needed support for women that take care of their children and this prevents them to access to labour market.

- Absence of recognition of citizens and collectives' **cultural rights** in the city.