Choosing and defining urban areas for humanitarian response
(117 minutes)

Leah Campbell: Hello everyone and welcome to this latest edition of ALNAP's urban webinar series. I am really pleased to welcome you today, my name is Leah Campbell, and I'm a senior research officer here at ALNAP. On the line today we have four different speakers who are going to share a presentation with us later on, and I'll get to introducing them in a moment, but collectively the five of us are calling in today from the UK, Lebanon, Niger, the Netherlands, and the Dominican Republic, so we're really coming to you from across the globe, and we're glad that so many of you are also joining us from wherever you are today. I wanted to start off by also figuring out a bit more about who we have in the room, I'll get to introducing our speakers in a moment, but we're also going to launch a quick poll while you listen to my introductory ramblings. This is just to get a quick sense of your experience with urban issues. So it goes from being a complete urban newbie, never having previously done or thought much about urban contexts, all the way up to urban expert, to basically should be speakers on this webinar also. So it's just a quick, fun poll, have a think and submit your responses, and then we'll get to the results in just a moment.

So about the topic we have today, we have a two-pronged topic, choosing and defining urban areas for humanitarian response. Really this topic is about within the broader city, at some point or another, it's probable that quite a few of us as humanitarians will need to either do analysis or assessment or programme at a smaller scale than the entire city, to work in an area, a neighbourhood, a settlement, some sort of geographically smaller area than a city. When we're doing that, there are two, somewhat technical, but also somewhat philosophical questions that might come out for us. One is, amongst the entire city, which area should we focus on? Where are the vulnerabilities? Which area should we prioritise, and how do we do that in a way that is evidence-based, and that doesn't get based on convenience, and that we really are confident in the decision that we make there? The second part of this is about once we're there, how do we understand what the boundaries of that area might be? Are those administrative boundaries? Do we ask people's sense of neighbourhood? What if there are differences in those things, and how does that get reconciled? So that's really the topic we're going to be diving into today, and really this isn't about the merits of an area-based approach. There are other resources for that. There's some great research done by Parker and Maynard, and then more recently Sitko and Sanderson. We've had a previous ALNAP urban webinar about this. InterAction held a great workshop earlier this summer, and this is now also part of the agenda, both of the Global Alliance for Urban Crises and also a new working group on settlement approaches under the Global Shelter Cluster, as well as new guidance material coming out from PCI. So there's lots of other work going on about area-based or settlement-based approaches, and that's not what we're tackling here. We're tackling these technical challenges about choosing and defining the area.

So I'm going to take a quick look at our poll results now. It looks like quite a few of you, 40% have had some urban experience, but not a huge amount. So we also have about 16% of you who are quite new to urban. We also have 12% who've done some research on urban, but perhaps not operational, and a good number of you also have had a lot of operational experience, 33%. 0% of you said you're urban experts, and demand to be added as a speaker on this webinar, so I'm glad we got it right, because we do have four very experienced experts in their own right, to introduce to you in just a moment. I just wanted to quickly explain the outline of this webinar before we get to them. As I mentioned, this webinar is quite a long one, with four different speakers, and we're running for the next two hours. The webinar is going to be effectively split up into two halves. Within each half we have two presentations and time for Q&A. We also have a couple more polls to throw in for you throughout, so in the first hour we have presentations from CRS, and UN Habitat, and in the second hour we have presentations from IMPACT Initiatives, and Humanitarian OpenStreetMap.

So without further ado, we're going to start our first section, and we're going to introduce our first two speakers to you. Again, while I'm doing this I'm going to launch another poll, just so we also hear a bit more again about your thoughts. The poll is about when you're thinking about what area to choose, there's two parts to this poll. You can answer all of the following, which might be applicable, about when you might choose an area, just to give us a sense of when this might be an issue for you. Is it when you're doing an assessment or analysis? Is it in a humanitarian response? Would you be looking for one area? Would you be looking at multiple areas, or can you not see any use at all for geographic areas? I apologies, there's only so many options we can put, and there's no option for a fill in the blank, but you can always add in your own thoughts in the questions bar. While you're filling this out I will introduce our first two speakers. Our first speaker from CRS is Tulio Mateo, who is an architect, with a Master's in urban development and post-conflict reconstruction. Before becoming part of the global technical advisors, Tulio served for CRS's Typhoon Haiyan response in Tacloban in the Philippines, where he was responsible for the urban planning and disaster risk reduction activities. He's previously worked in diverse reconstruction projects for Entrepreneurs du Monde, Habitat for Humanity, Oxfam and UNICEF in Haiti, Dominican Republic, the Sahrawi refugee camps, and Rwanda.

Our second speaker after Tulio is Riham from UN Habitat. Riham holds a Bachelor's degree in landscape architecture, and a Master's in sociology from the American University of Beirut. She has worked as a landscape architect for engineering consultancy firms, an urban planner for UNDP, and is now the socio-urban coordinator for UN Habitat in Lebanon. Riham is particularly interested in Social development and spatial analysis. In a moment I'll turn over to Tulio, we'll just take a quick look at our poll here. So, 78% of you would potentially look at choosing a geographic area when you're doing an assessment or analysis, and 67% of you would also, or instead use choosing an area for implementing a humanitarian response. 41% of you would use choosing an area to find one specific area, where 57% would look at finding multiple areas that might be compared, and none of you see no use for geographic areas, which is probably a good thing, since you're going to spend two hours of your life with us here today. Thanks for those responses, and without further ado, I'm going to turn over to Tulio for our first presentation. Take it away Tulio.

Tulio Mateo: Hi everyone, I'm going to be presenting about our experience in the Philippines. The presentation has the reflection we've had from our emergency and transitional response, as well as the permanent, long-term housing solutions that we are providing right now. I would like to start with this picture, because it tells us the story about many of the challenges that we face there in the Philippines. The No Build Zone, was an area that was identified by the government, that was trying to be enforced after the typhoon, and it was also very crowded, especially in Tacloban. So we had of course, a lot of population, with a diversity of needs and vulnerabilities. We also had limited space for building new housing solutions. We had, of course, people losing livelihoods, losing family members and documents, but we also had a lot of opportunities, other citizens, residents willing to host their fellows, willing to repair their house in a much better way, and I would say that very important, we had land available nearby in the city area, and then we also had a government that was trying to become the driving force, because they had experienced themselves the damages of the typhoon.

In CRS we had two different strategies. We had the emergency and transitional response, which focused on 3,000 families, providing a set of options, seven different options according to needs, and there was, one thing the government could provide, a permanent solution. Then on the other hand, after that emergency and recovery response, we had the long-term one, which focused on another very vulnerable area. The target, 900 families to be relocated to a new resettlement, with a community driven approach. So what did we learn about this experience? How can we say that we chose areas, and not by convenience? We can say that we had six different steps, and again those steps apply for our emergency and long-term initiative. One of them is the mapping of the hazards, the mapping of the impact of the hazards. So first of all, either by doing it ourselves, or through information available by other stakeholders, we need to understand the challenges that the area faced. In this case, the height of the storm surge, we need to map the different vulnerabilities, or the risks, like the height of the storm surge, floodable areas, but we also need to understand the non-physical vulnerabilities that can be the tenure situation, which is very critical in an urban area. We need to understand as well the aspect of livelihoods, and then we can start our process of identifying areas based on actual needs.

Then we also had a deep analysis, or deep surveys to understand the population sections. We needed to know what was the level of damage of the shelters, of course, but we also needed to understand what's their priority, would they prefer to have assistance, let's say, for food or for education, or some other income generating support? We needed to understand that, and also we needed to have directions from the government. So we needed to see what was their vision, do they have a master plan, a vision for their own city that we can (? 14.57) within our projects, we can build upon. And that's very important, as we will see for our long-term, or for either our exit strategy, but also for the long-term sustainability of our intervention. Then as we start getting out of that analysis, we need to start analysing what options are feasible and acceptable based on those needs, and directed from the government. I have to say that this is very important, to get out of that convenience box. We need to identify not one or two solutions, but you know, as many as we can, to fit those diverse needs. As we do that, we need to recognise in the context of an urban area, that there are going to be-, these solutions may not be geographically linked to maybe the area that we are starting to consider. People might choose solutions that are farther away, or that we did not consider. So we need to welcome those, and start assessing the formal and informal networks that will arise. In the specific case of resettlement that we are doing at the moment, that could help us to have a more cohesive neighbourhood approach, or definition of a new neighbourhood, and make it more efficient in the long-term, as we start creating committees, and the one thing that we discuss as well, the links that remain. Even people are moving out, they still come back, they might still come back to their old area, residence area. So those things, we need to embrace them, those new connections, and use them to build our project.

To wrap it up, I have to say that when we embrace that complexity, and we follow these different steps, we were basically driven to address many different topics that maybe we were not considering at the beginning. Dealing with the politics and governance issues, dealing with urban planning, and also we had to deal with infrastructure at a scale that we didn't consider before. Very, very critical as well, to explore with the government and the affected populations, how can we ensure the tenure, a safe tenure for them, so they can recover the quality of life, and be able to start generating income? As well we have to facilitate a lot of protection and social activities to foster cohesion, and that is of course, things that take us out of the convenience box, that we might have in a single oriented project. We think that it's very, very useful, because in the end it ensures a lot of buy in by the different stakeholders, the population itself, but also by the government. We ensure the people are stable, and they can remain safe and develop their life, and it drives all of us to coordinate better, to provide a holistic approach, to cover not only ourselves, but also later on with the community to cover as many needs as we can together. Then of course it connects with the long-term vision for the city, and facilitates our strategy as international organisations, leading towards a proper, safe, durable and sustainable intervention. I think that was the synthesis of the six different steps, and based on the urban complexity that we have, across the two different initiatives, the emergency and the permanent intervention. Thank you very much.

Leah Campbell: Great, thanks Tulio. Before moving on to our next presenter, I wanted to remind everyone that you can send in your questions. You should have the functionality within your GoToWebinar dashboard to send in any questions or thoughts, your own experiences, your own answers to these questions, and any follow ups, big or small, you're welcome to send in any of those questions throughout the presentations, and that way we'll have them on hand and ready to go, once we start the Q&A in about 20, 25 mins. Before moving on to our speaker Riham from UN Habitat, I wanted to share a couple of other examples that came up during a piece of research that I'm currently doing here at ALNAP. One of these is vulnerability criteria for neighbourhoods, used by ACF. These are based on the sustainable livelihoods framework, and they're outlined in their document, identification of vulnerable people in urban environments, assessment of sustainable livelihoods and urban vulnerabilities, which is one of the different tools that I've been looking at in a paper about tools for understanding urban contexts, which is what got me very interested in this topic. I just wanted to add in a couple of the indicators and criteria that they developed for looking at different neighbourhoods. In this tool they've got housing with indicators, including the distance from house to employment area, house inequality and consolidation, neighbourhood development model. They've got access to urban services, including access to health, to passable road systems, electricity, and market access. They've got environment, including the situation, the typography, the access to ground water, domestic waste landfill and so on, and they've also got social and human capital, including location of neighbourhoods where there are sustainable infrastructure or community services that are complex, the types of leadership in certain areas, literacy, urban violence, gated communities, and then any neighbourhoods with certain minorities or certain populations in them.

PCI interestingly also have a similar approach that they've used in a project that they've been doing in Guatemala, which I was in Guatemala over the last two weeks, I just got back a few days ago, doing a case study for a further piece of research, and they used 18 different criteria to identify vulnerable neighbourhoods in that project as well, including things like, have there been previous disasters there? Are there community groups or organisations present? What are the existing lines of communication between neighbourhoods and municipal authorities, and proximity to physical hazards like rivers for flooding, or slopes for risk of landslide. So there really are a range of different criteria that can be used, and those are just a couple more examples that I wanted to pull out in addition. So we're going to turn now to Riham to give her presentation from UN Habitat's perspective. Riham, take it away.

Riham Kowatly: Hello everyone, I'm glad to join you today to share my experience in UN Habitat Lebanon. We've been (? 24.37) urban (? 24.39), as you might know, and part of our area-based approach was aimed to identify the most disadvantaged areas. Our aim was to ensure that the most disadvantaged population groups, and geographic areas are identified, so frequently we aim to profile selected vulnerable urban neighbourhoods, which have poor socio-economic status, refugee presence, or where there are stresses in basic urban services. By identifying these areas, we aim to gather more urban knowledge, and create (? 25.18) into the urban response (? 25.21). So how did we do that? The methodology of the selection process was designed to be participatory, using local knowledge, consensus building and triangulation. This is an ongoing process or exercise that we are on, and we developed this methodology in partnership with UNICEF. So the aim was to identify the most disadvantaged areas across the country, verify them, rank them, before we could get to identify the specific boundaries, or specific neighbourhoods that we aimed to profile, or that we aimed to disseminate, or let other agencies and stakeholders know about.

The first step, we wanted to identify these most disadvantaged areas across all the districts in Lebanon. So the involved and identified local stakeholders per district, to report on this exercise. These local stakeholders comprised public officials, mayors from municipalities, (? 26.22) organisations, (? 26.24) for example, and so forth. We gathered these local stakeholders in workshops, where they individually identified the most disadvantaged areas to them, based on their local knowledge. Then we gave them some guiding questions and specific criteria to be able to rank their identified choices, and this selection criteria was comprised of (? 26.46) such as their perception of the poverty in this area, presence of refugee populations, slums, out of school children, and frequency of violence or insecurity, the overburdened public services, and in general to consider the (? 27.02) have more than 20,000 persons in their area. After each of them individually, they identified and ranked their areas, they deconstructed their choices, in terms of area choices and in terms of (? 27.16). So that was the local stakeholder's knowledge of the areas which they come from. In the next step we wanted to (? 27.32), verifying this list by showing this to a national stakeholder, which has managed these areas (? 27.40). These national stakeholders comprised of (? 27.45) Ministry of Social Affairs, water establishments, education, regional (? 27.51). This verification of (? 27.58) came up with new areas being identified, or (? 28.04) areas, we (? 28.07).

And the third step became a ranking of (? 28.18). And how you will do that is that you will combine the local knowledge scores that local stakeholders have provided, with a multi-deprivation index score, which is at the cadaster level. And this multi-deprivation index will more or less be the objective score, and this is comprised of (? 28.42) vulnerability indicators, referring to education, such as out of school children and school attendance, child protection, child labour, child marriage and (? 28.54). Certain WASH indicators pertaining to sanitation, facility usage and individuals who live within (? 29.03). Other indicators related to health and nutrition and social policy, or living under the poverty line. So in our ranking we'd be combining the local knowledge score, with the multi-deprivation index score, to get an average score to be able rank the most disadvantaged areas. The last step, identifying these areas, we'll go ahead to identify these boundaries of the neighbourhoods that we will work in, given these informal-, vulnerable neighbourhoods have informal boundaries, so we would have to delimit and verify the boundary of that area through discussing it with the municipality, through perception-based exercises with the community, or field observations.

All in all, as I mentioned before, these are identified areas, we aim to further profile them through neighbourhood profiling, which is a spatial analysis tool that we use to learn more about, and collect data about a certain neighbourhood, within the different sectors, such as the population, governance, (? 30.22) other social services and basic urban services, and later on develop a response plan, (? 30.31). Thank you.

Leah Campbell: Thanks very much Riham, and thanks to everyone who's been busy sending in your questions. I'm going to take a quick look at those, and start to feed some of these in. Before doing that, I just also wanted to share one more example of some different criteria that could be used. IRC have developed a context analysis tool that they piloted in about five different locations, and this is another one of the tools that I've reviewed for the research I'm currently working on, and I put together this quick slide to highlight some of the things that came up, both in their final guidance material, and also some of the different pilots of different criteria that could be used to choose particular areas, in this case, to be looked at in more depth for the context analysis. This includes the presence of a high number of IDPs living outside camps in the area. The IRC tool was developed for displacement contexts. Whether there was previous existing or future planned IRC programming in the area, any security risks or access issues for the area, and then particularly thinking about selecting multiple areas, getting variations, so you could have different representative examples of the city. Vulnerability of that area in comparison to other areas of the city, the organisations existing, or future programme, or strategic preferences. Existing gaps in contextual understanding, have assessments been conducted of some areas already? Also any request from government or other actors present, to focus on a particular area might be something to consider.

So those are quite a lot of examples, we had the two more in depth cases from Riham and Tulio as well as the few other examples I've brought in, so we're going to start going to your questions. The first question that's come in is about getting into a bit more of the specifics of this. It's in part about how do we ensure that, I guess, an assessment, when we look at a certain area is comprehensive, and then there are some specific sub-parts to this in terms of the technical details. Is there a scoring system used? In Riham's presentation, you mentioned that a final score was calculated, but perhaps you could go into a bit more depth of how this is then used to choose one area, and Tulio, if you have any thoughts about how this was done. The question I think is really about, a bit more technical detail on, we've got these different indicators, they're used in these different ways, how do you compare one area against the next? How do you score them? Do you weight through indicators, or criteria, and overall how is that done in a bit more depth? So we'll turn first to Tulio, because this wasn't covered in as much detail in your presentation, and then we'll go onto Riham as well.

Tulio Mateo: In the case of Tacloban I want to say that, there were many different actors, many different stakeholders, and it was important for us to first of all sit together and try to coordinate together with the government. That was very important. Then we also did some, the mapping itself, of the city, or part of the city, where we had unmanned aerial vehicles, drones to be going around and help us out to start the assessment. Then we had things in the field surveying, validating some of the visual data that we collected, and then as I said before, doing the presentation, we had a process of individual household assessments that could help us segregate that data over the map. And that, I think, when we had that we could see, okay, let's say these areas need more assistance on this detail, issue, and others on other things. Of course, once we had the survey's done by our field staff, we had a process of community validation. So we had community meetings where we, not only with the leaders of the community, but we called for all of the community to approach us, to these meetings, or read the posting notes that we had posted in the neighbourhoods, so they could provide feedback. Again, we needed to set up feedback mechanisms that will help us analyse, take those inputs, and integrate them in our project. Did I answer the question?

Leah Campbell: Thanks Tulio, thanks for that response. I'll turn as well to Riham to see if you have any additional thoughts about the specifics of how the scoring goes, whether you weight certain criteria, and perhaps what do you do when you have several areas that all meet the criteria, how do you choose then?

Riham Kowatly: So the local stakeholder's knowledge of their areas vary, depending on their experience, and give that we are all covering the selection at a district level, we would have different mayors from different municipalities, and the knowledge would vary. Usually we provided them with specific criteria, and help guide their choices, or guide their ranking. So that's, I think that's on our local people (? 37.16), whereas in terms of the multi-deprivation index, as you could see, we have different sectors, and each sector had its own indicators. The percentage, score of each indicator would eventually factor into the index of this urban cadaster, and that's how we compare, that how we aimed at comparing the local knowledge with the vulnerability index in general.

Leah Campbell: Great, thanks Riham. Another question that I'm going to put to you both is, obviously in these two examples, you're both sharing what's happened in one particular context, and the question that's come in is about, is it possible to develop consistent criteria, that we could use across to measure the vulnerability level of an urban neighbourhood, no matter the context, like we have for example, for certain risk factors, or certain sectors, or is this something that's always going to be context based, that each country, and even perhaps each area of a country might need its own context specific criteria to use to measure? I'll turn first to Tulio to get your thoughts.

Tulio Mateo: There is potential to have a basic criteria, but the analysis is really going to be context-based. It's impossible to have the same interpretation of an urban context in Latin America, than in Asia, or African cities. The people behave different, the expectations and needs are going to be different. So I think when we have a set of questions, related to shelter, water and sanitation, those things can be standardised more or less, but then the analysis definitely has to be contextualised.

Leah Campbell: Great, thanks Tulio. Riham, do you have any thoughts?

Riham Kowatly: I actually second Tulio, because the living conditions might be comparable between different areas or countries, and the factors that fit into living conditions in a certain place. Every neighbourhood, every area from rural or urban area, I guess will have its own context, and will have its own history and culture, factors, for the services, etc., that can feed into the situation at hand. So definitely there's a (? 40.09) and how you will be able to address a certain context versus another.

Leah Campbell: Great, thank you. We've had a few questions come in, I'm going to try to do my best to mould them together, and to put the specific topic of this webinar's spin on them. The questions that are coming in are about, I guess, the consequences or the implications of choosing one particular area for something, when certain issues affect the wider city. As I mentioned, in this webinar we're not focusing on the merits or the relevance of an area-based approach, but I think there are some specific parts to this that we could look at, in the context of choosing one area, particularly where we're talking about looking at different criteria for understanding which of those areas we should select. For example, there might be some topics that-, or challenges or issues that affect a wider area than just that neighbourhood, so how do we account for that, when we're looking at a risk factor, or the situation of sewage, or violence, those might be things that are experienced across the city, or across several areas of the city. So how do you take that into account, where there are things that affect a wider area than one neighbourhood, or one part of a neighbourhood you're trying to look at, and how do you take that account within the approaches that you've tried, or how do you think others should account for that in future?

Then, what do you do about communicating that you've selected a certain area, particularly where other areas might have been involved in some sort of assessment, and are there any implications then of how you communicate the reasons behind choosing a specific area over another, given the fact that it's unlikely that just one neighbourhood might be affected by any crisis, and you will be in effect making a selection? So I'll turn again first to Tulio, to get your thoughts on those.

Tulio Mateo: So in terms of the infrastructure constraints, I think that's extremely challenging, especially when we are not able to support the process ourselves, but that's part of the complexity of working in a city. I think we need to take a leading role in facilitating conversations with service institutions, or infrastructure agencies in the government, being able to join those conversations, maybe they have government working groups where we can drive, or at least put our ideas there, and get their buy in as well. It takes a lot of time. That might be challenges that we face with our donor commitments, but it's something that we cannot avoid. To build infrastructure also takes time. Then on how do we communicate the selection, so of course that starts since the very beginning. When we are explaining, we need to have a clear communication strategy, since the very beginning we need to think about it with our own team, with maybe a focus group from the community, to be able to have that communication strategy clear. Because when we communicate, we might have some setbacks, and then we need to be very open, what we can provide or not. Maybe set up complementary support for those areas that might not be selected, we can include them in activities such as preparedness, hygiene that may be are not so intensive as others, but still improve the quality of life of those other neighbourhoods.

Leah Campbell: Great, thanks Tulio, and I'll turn again to Riham as well to see if you have any thoughts on this one.

Riham Kowatly: In our methodology, I can spend (? 44.57), a neighbourhood which you have already profiled previously. We used to select our neighbourhoods based on our city profiles, so these (? 45.10) would be within the cities we've profiled, and we would be able to usually identify the most vulnerable areas within a certain city. So this would give us the bigger picture, or the context which our neighbourhoods are within. In general, we are asking, how can we relate our problems that are within a certain area to problems that are more national basis. Definitely whenever we are in a certain area, we usually need to try to see the bigger picture. So for example, if you're discussing basic urban services, we can't be analysing or studying the network, this huge network within the neighbourhood without (? 45.51). So just think to update, learning more about the other networks that it's connected to, in surrounding neighbourhoods. Or for example, in terms of safety and security, too many times it's a crippling effect, if there are any incidents or insecurity within a certain city, it will also be replicated within the neighbourhood. Some are dealing with livelihood opportunities, or local economy, (? 46.16) between one area and another. So even when we have an area-based approach, we need to keep in mind the wider context, and the national factors that influence certain dynamics within a neighbourhood.

Leah Campbell: Great, thank you. Tulio, I'm going to come to you with this one, because I know you've done some work on disaster risk reduction. We have a question here about whether you think the approach to choosing an area would change or not, in a preparedness programme. If you were looking at preparedness work rather than a response, like the Tacloban response that you described, do you think this strategy of how you choose the area would change in a preparedness approach?

Tulio Mateo: Yes, so I think it also depends on what you might want to achieve. But I would say yes, it can change. For instance, I was in Sierra Leone, and we wanted to-, we were starting a project there that is to influence the government in this preparedness and mitigation works, and I think we-, if we are trying to influence, we might want to be more conservative and ensure that we can show some success, to then take the next step, and go to more critical areas. So I would say that depending on what you want to achieve, and the scope of your funding and your long-term mission, I think yes, we can adapt.

Leah Campbell: Great thanks. Riham, I'm going to pose another question to you, by all means if you have any thoughts on the preparedness one, go ahead, but a question's also come in that I think speaks to something that you were mentioning in terms of how UN Habitat's brought in the perspectives of local stakeholders in an area, to help with choosing the area. The question is about how you deal with and negotiate between the priorities that local stakeholders might have, and the experience and knowledge they might have, with the experience and knowledge that the team might have, with a specific topic. For example, there might be an aspect that locally people feel is important, but based on someone's specific knowledge about risk factors, or about the response, they might think that another aspect should be prioritised. How do you negotiate between those aspects?

Riham Kowatly: This is what we wanted with the guiding criteria for the local stakeholders, which would have considered the different opinions, or any biases in their selection, during the workshops, if that might answer your question. Similarly, that's why we wanted to triangulate the data with a multi-deprivation index, which is a more objective ranking, versus the subjective ranking that you get from the local stakeholders.

Leah Campbell: Thanks. We've had a few queries about whether we can share certain documents, and methodologies. Some things are published and others are not. We do have, UN Habitat have published several of their neighbourhood and city profiles in Lebanon, so we can certainly make sure that we sent out an email that has the links to all of those ones that have been published to everyone. A few of the other approaches that I've mentioned, the ACF one is published, the PCI criteria haven't been published anywhere, but whatever we do have that's published we will put together in an email afterwards, and send out, either right after the webinar in the next few days, or when we send out the recording in a couple of weeks, depending on how long it takes to get everything together, and pending the speaker confirmation, yes, we'll make all the slides available. As well, there will also be a recording of the webinar that you can watch back that has all the slides embedded in it, as well as a transcript. And those will be available in about two weeks after the webinar. I'll probably go to our final question on this topic before we turn over to the next area of focus, which for me is an interesting one, because as some of you might know, here at ALNAP I focus on urban and also coordination issues, and so I'm always interested when those two things collide, like they do in this question. The question is, how do you coordinate with other organisations so that all the actors operating in a humanitarian response don't choose the same area for the same thing? I think this question is particularly a challenge when you are trying to use the criteria you've developed, and you're trying to have a methodology, but those methodologies might be different than one another, or the same, and then you come up with the list of the areas that are deemed the ones to focus on, and then at that point, after having gone through that process, might realise that others have the same idea. What do you do in that situation? I'll turn first again to Tulio.

Tulio Mateo: That is a tough question, considering the (? 52.21) of actors and the rush that sometimes we have after a catastrophe to attend the needs, but I think what I've seen much more useful is that more often we see professionals willing to coordinate, willing to sit with the others and talk, and that can come from headquarters and global shelter, or WASH, or in my case, discussions that are happening, and be able to either in the field, and top down, both have the interest to coordinate. Being able to join as soon as possible, coordination boards that are in the area, either led by the government or by the UN system, that, I think that's key. Then you know, being able to negotiate, face the other organisations and try to agree, how to work in compliment rather than against each other. I think that's the best way, and the negotiation skills is not only with the communities as we try to provide them assistance, it's also within ourselves as humanitarian stakeholders.

Leah Campbell: Great, and Riham, I'll turn to you as well, although I suspect part of your answer, because of the work I know that you guys have done at UN Habitat, working so closely with municipalities, my suspicion is that part of the answer for you is working closely with the municipalities, so that they know all the things going on in their area, but I'll see if you have any further thoughts as well.

Riham Kowatly: Yes, unfortunately here in Lebanon we have a lack a data, so what we care to do with our urban profiling is to provide urban knowledge to local authorities or other agencies, or other INGOs, or NGOs working in vulnerable neighbourhoods. So we care to disseminate and present our profiles within existing working groups, or inter-sector agencies, meetings, we disseminate, make it available to the municipalities, and create a regional technical officer which can help disseminate this knowledge to any future stakeholders who care to develop any projects within the municipality. Similarly, after we did profile our neighbourhoods, we had a participatory approach, we aimed to involve all local stakeholders within certain neighbourhoods to come together and strategize the projects based on the collected data together, in terms of the response plan, in terms of priority or in terms of data. So in general we care to disseminate this data, we think it will inform, and hopefully it will help inform other agencies' work, and similarly we care to join forces on project planning.

Leah Campbell: Great, thanks Riham, and thanks again to both of you, both Tulio and Riham, hopefully you'll stay with us for the rest of the webinar, and maybe come back in, in the final Q&A section to add in further thoughts. We're going to start the second half of this webinar now, and shift a bit to thinking about, once we've found an area to work in, however we decided it, how do we understand and make a choice about how to define, or define for this moment the boundaries or the borders that we're talking about when we're talking about working in a specific area, or doing an assessment or analysis of a specific area? I think some of the challenges about this is that these boundaries might be changing, based on lived reality, since they perhaps were originally drawn. They might not exist at all. There might be resistance to change in the boundaries, because this might have certain political implications, or could be contentious between different groups. The boundary might be at a higher level, broader level than the area needed. It might be smaller than a city, but not as small as a neighbourhood, so what do you do there? Some of the common things that people seem to talk about are concepts around fuzzy boundaries, which is a way of demarcating an area without drawing strict lines, and having more of a boundary area than a strict line, and also zones have been used going back to the ACF example. They used some zones, and these have also been used as an approach in the city profiles that UN Habitat is doing in Syria, which are similar, but quite different also, than the profiles that Riham talked about in Lebanon, where they've grouped together certain neighbourhoods into a broader zone if they're facing common vulnerabilities, and defined the boundary of that in that way.

So that's a bit about this challenge, about identifying the boundaries, and so I'm pleased to say we have two more speakers joining us, who I'm going to introduce now to share some examples of how they've approached this part of the challenge. The first speaker is from IMPACT Initiatives. Christian is currently leading IMPACT's field mission in Niger, where he supervises an applied research project focusing on community area identification, and data gathering in out of camp settings. Prior to this he was the technical lead on implementing this project's first pilot in Mafraq in Jordan. Christian has been with IMPACT since August 2016, and he studied physics and philosophy in Munich, and holds a Master's degree in development studies from the Graduate Institute in Geneva. After Christian we're going to hear from Paul from Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team. Paul has worked in open data, participatory mapping, location based services and GIS for over ten years. Paul has a Master's in telematics from the University of Twente, and has worked extensively with local communities, businesses, IGOs, NGOs, and government agencies in both Europe and Africa, and he's currently the Director of Community Programmes for Humanitarian OpenStreetMap team. So I'm going to turn first to Christian, to hear his presentation from IMPACT Initiatives.

Christian Keller: Thank you Leah, I hope you can all hear me. On behalf of IMPACT Initiatives, we are very pleased to present to everybody today, thank you very much Leah and her team for inviting us. So in the next few minutes I will present to you an approach to identifying areas, community areas for response planning and aid delivery, and that we are actually currently piloting in various different crises affected urban areas around the globe. I will first outline the approach itself, talk about the lessons learned so far from our first two pilot rounds, and then present some key findings to illustrate the usefulness of this approach. So I will not lose much time on explaining the rationale of identifying community areas, or areas of intervention for response planning, as I think these reflections have been sufficiently discussed in the first hour, but in order to understand our approach to identifying areas, it is important to underpin the rationale of our particular approach. So we, at IMPACT Initiatives, we're seeking to find a way to most reliably identify humanitarian needs, but also pre-existing local capacities in out of camp settings, meaning our approach to identifying areas is crucially based on the objective to find reliable information on the ground in such settings. So it kind of, nurtures an evidence base that can then inform where and how to respond. So that ties back into the first part of this webinar.

So in effect, our area-based approach is twofold. First we identify a community area, or area of knowledge if you want, as conceived by its very own inhabitants. Once we have this geographic entity, once we have that identified, we then seek to identify people that have the best knowledge about this area. And it's visualised here on the slide on the right, we look for key informant networks, in an across identified community areas, and through social network analysis, we're then trying to find the best connected, and thereby possibly the most reliable key informants for each identified community area. But today's webinar focuses more on defining areas, so I will not go much farther into social network analysis, but will concentrate really on how we identify these community areas. So based on this rationale, let me now show you how we identify community areas, or areas of knowledge. So we use a very well known, qualitative research approach, focus group discussions. And adding to this, we add a mapping component, a participatory mapping component. So we are talking about mapping focus group discussions. Armed with maps at different zoom levels, colour pens, a note taker, a facilitator, we go to communities and conduct MFGDs, mapping focus group discussions, with five to ten community members, usually of the same sex and same population type. That means either host population, or displaced population. The first thing we would do is explain very well the rationale of our approach, so that MFGD participants know from the outset that we are trying to identify community areas, in order to find the most informed community members for this area, on topics related to service access, population characteristics, humanitarian needs.

This from the outset avoids that participants stick too much to official boundaries, or scale up their understanding of community area too much. A small anecdote, during our first pilots in Jordan, our first MFGD rounds, we naively introduced the question 'what is your community area?' or 'where does your community live?' Knowing that the word community can have many different scales in Arabic, and can very well for example refer to the community of fellow Muslims, one MFGD participant replied, his community area reaches from Istanbul to Mecca. So we learned from that. What we then tried to do was introducing a map of the larger surroundings, and at first familiarising participants with the map, by pointing out main landmarks, such as mosques, hospitals, schools, etc. The key here is that you will describe very well on the map, using the local names of streets and landmarks, so that participants can really visualise the map and what we found is that most participants can usually very fast orient themselves on a map. Then what we would do, we would ask some first probing questions. So for example, where do you access daily services? Where do you go to the barber? Where do you send your children to school? Where is your hospital? Then that leads already to asking for local names of areas, around which their daily lives are centred. So by then we are usually already at the point where several neighbourhood or area names have been dropped by the participants, and then we would ask for similarities and differences between these areas.

So for example, are people who live in this part, the same as people who live in that part? And answers could then range from 'yes, absolutely, a silly question', to 'no, on this side people are much richer, they send their children to private schools, and on that side people from a different ethnicity live there, and households are generally much poorer, and there's no interaction whatsoever between the two different populations'. In that sense we try to establish similarities and differences between those different areas that have been named. Then we want to know, where do these differences start? So in order to delineate areas with certain characteristics, and sometimes there's obviously some sort of continuum between two areas, and very often what we found is that landmarks, hospitals, schools, police stations and so on, or certain infrastructures, mostly main streets, or geographic boundaries, such as hills, ditches, riverbeds, that they mark a clear boundary between such areas. And these boundaries are usually also conceived as boundaries by local inhabitants. In so proceeding, we usually do several MFGDs per locality, and then we usually see some sort of data saturation. That means we always come out with the same boundaries that have been drawn, the same area names that are used by different focus group discussion participants. Based on this data we're able to draw a city map with different community areas, community boundaries, just posing of a certain profile, certain characteristics for each of these boundaries, and such common characteristics that we find usually are more or less same livelihood and income, more or less similar population density, tribal origin or ethnicities, same employment patterns or economic activities in one area, and all these commonly shared characteristics then usually define one area.

In the next slide you see our results from our very first pilot that has been conducted in Mafraq city in the north of Jordan, and on the left you see official neighbourhood boundaries, and on the right you see our results, the indigenously identified community areas, and you see there is quite a difference between the two. The differences in Mafraq city are mostly that official boundaries, they span over uninhabited areas that weren't mentioned as a particular community area to us. Official boundaries, mostly on the periphery, as you can see in the southwest of Mafraq, they don't include newer settlements that have been installed outside the initial city boundaries. And in the case of Mafraq city, it's also a very interesting one, names have been changed entirely. Official neighbourhood names have nothing to do with the community names, the names used by community members for a specific area. In one case, it was even the case that an official neighbourhood name, referred to an entirely different area than the community area that was known under the same name.

If we switch to the next slide you can see an overlay of these two areas. Here we have in white the official boundaries, official neighbourhood boundaries, and with the grey lines we have the community boundaries as we identified them, together with MFGD participants, and you see that in some cases there is some overlap, especially if you look in the northeast, especially at the periphery, official neighbourhood boundaries correspond to our boundaries, the boundaries that we identified as community area boundaries, but globally there is not too much overlap. What you see often however, is that main roads, they do coincide, they usually have official boundaries overlapping with perceived community area boundaries, but other than that, what we found from Mafraq city is that community areas are quite different from the official neighbourhood boundaries. To end this presentation I will show you our last findings, our latest findings from a similar pilot that we have been conducting in Diffa, in the east of Niger. It's quite a different context than Mafraq, because in Diffa you don't really have official neighbourhoods as such. There are official neighbourhood names, but no one can really pin them down. There's no official boundaries for the official neighbourhoods. We're talking about six official neighbourhood names, and we identified ten community areas, as you can see on this map. Again, main roads, geographic patterns, infrastructure, very much served as delineating factors for community areas. I'll leave it at that, and I'm very happy to answer any questions about this approach.

Leah Campbell: Great, thanks so much Christian, and I'm happy to say we are perfectly on time, so there will definitely be room for lots of questions. That's another plug and reminder for everyone to send in those questions. I'm sure you were enthralled by Christian's presentation, but do take a moment to type in those questions so we've got them at the ready. I'm going to use and abuse my power as chair again to insert some more reflections from some of the research I've been doing as well, before we turn to your final presentation from Paul. Again, for this piece of work that I'm doing that will be out around February about tools that humanitarians can use to understand urban contexts, I've come across different approaches to understanding these boundaries, and it's interesting in Christian's presentation, the approach of the focus group discussions hits across a couple of these. One is administrative boundaries, so this is the already existing boundaries which I think can be quite useful, particularly where you're looking to compare the current situation to any baseline data that is available. Also, if you want to focus on a smaller area within a city, without necessarily looking at doing analysis or programming in a holistic way, and you're just quite happy to have a smaller defined boundary, and it's not as important to understand how that area is currently used. I think it's also useful to use an administrative boundary approach, because these are boundaries already being used perhaps by local governance, and in planning, and so if you use these boundaries or can incorporate them, your work can build upon the work being done by local authorities and planning departments, as well as the bonus of the fact that these boundaries are hopefully, in many cases, already defined, and therefore no work further is needed.

The challenges, as we've heard even from Riham's presentation earlier, is that in some areas these boundaries might not exist, and as clearly shown in Christian's example, and in another example I'm going to bring in at the end of our session today, the administrative boundaries might not align very well with current use and understanding of the area, which brings us into the second potential way, or approach to understand boundaries, which is more a perception, how do we understand this area, this potential neighbourhood? The advantages I think, of this approach, is that you can get a real understanding of the current use by residents, and this can also often include a participatory approach, as Christian's example has shown. It might also shed light on other dynamics, for example how different groups understand the same area, and it might be the foundation for further participatory activity, and is particularly useful and needed in the case where there aren't any official boundaries to go on. The challenge here is that no two people have the same understanding, so some triangulation or data saturation as Christian described it, will be required, and not everyone will agree. It might be hard to compare with baseline data, because of not overlapping with boundaries that have been previous defined, and there will be some need to carry out a process, to gather and compare perceptions, because this social perception of a community or neighbourhood area won't already exist. Also it's possible that those living on the margins, who aren't part of a cohesive neighbourhood, might end up being left out.

Another approach is to use a service catchment area, focusing on a specific service, for example a school or hospital, and the area served around it. So this is using a core geographic feature, and then looking at the periphery around it, which makes up a catchment area, which can be useful when looking at specific sectors, or if you're seeking an understanding of how people are connected to different spaces, or neighbourhoods or communities. It can be particularly good to understand the connections between different boundaries. The challenge might be again that these might not align with administrative boundaries, or social perceptions, and that catchment areas might serve multiple neighbourhoods, but it's another interesting layer that might be looked at. Another approach, which Christian also mentioned was part of the mapping focus group discussion approach, is to use physical characteristics, satellite imagery, maps, to demarcate an area based on a map or physical characteristics that don't necessarily align with existing boundaries, but seem to make sense when you look at the physical structure, the infrastructure of the area, which again, can be useful when there are no existing boundaries. It also could be useful because this might be done quickly, particularly where there is a map or satellite image available. The negative side of this might be, or the challenge might be that again, this will not likely align to any current or past understanding or use of the area, without further combination of this with other factors, and others might disagree with the approach. You might unwittingly exacerbate tensions.

These are just some of the potential ways, and as Christian's example showed, often the approach might be to combine a number of these different approaches. Whichever the approach, there are some questions that you might consider. These include, what's the purpose of defining this boundary? What information already exists about boundaries and baselines in this area? How much time do you have? How precise do the boundaries need to be? Could you do fuzzy boundaries? What extent are boundaries shaped by political issues, political affiliation, and how might this shape how you make decisions about boundaries? So those are a few thoughts from me and the research, and now I'm going to turn to Paul for our final presentation before we start the Q&A.

Paul Uithol: Thanks to Leah for the introduction, the ideas just now. I do feel somewhat like I'm doubling up some information here and there. From our perspective, we're an organisation, Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team, that mostly focusses on mapping of geographical infrastructure and features. In a sense, we're often sticking to more the first category you indicated, the geographical administrative boundaries let's say, and seeing how those match up to reality, community perception, and official administrative boundaries. Of course there are several scenarios you can find out on the next slide. We look at more official administrative boundaries, which is the category we most often work with. As I said, the work we do is mostly in support of the programming of other organisations, the support of urban planning, disaster risk management, so in that sense we often collaborate quite a bit with local, national governments, to help them improve urban planning, delivery of the areas they are supposed to-, they're governing. Of course what you can find, the first case is the easy one, probably not very often counted, but all of us in the areas were working in, everything aligns perfectly, always neat and orderly. Basically you can just use official data and be done with it. Of course there are alternatives to this. Official data may be available, but differ from community perceptions, due to various factors as social perception differs, service catchment areas are significantly different, or there may be physical, characteristics which interfere, there may be major roads or rivers crossing in the middle of official boundaries of locations.

The third option is that there is a (? 01.15.00) understanding at the community level of boundaries, also of say, maybe local government, (? 01.15.06), but a lack of survey data, and lastly of course there's also the option that is little to no data on boundaries available, and you'll need to be working with local communities, governments, to define those. So this is the first case, roughly where I live. I don't think many of us will be working in this type of urban context, and it's a scenario that I've not really encountered in the work we've been doing, smack in the middle of the Netherlands, everything is nice, neat, order. You can get open data on boundaries, buildings and whatever infrastructure you need. (Laughs) If you ever want to have an operation here, we are all set. That's probably not what you will be encountering. A major city where we have been doing mapping at the community level in support of urban planning is Dar es Salaam, which is a city which is, according to the African Development Bank reports, is the fastest growing city in Africa, growing at around 6% a year, which means about half a million people get added to the city on a yearly basis, which means that the situation is also quite dynamic, and community perceptions of boundaries also are a moving target. So you'll often be working with, maybe official data, but that doesn't conform to reality anymore, due to the growth of the city, in combination with urban planning, which is quite far behind reality. It's a city suffering from numerous issues due to that rapid growth. The project we're running there is focused on drainage and flooding, flooding issues and waterways, and trying to improve infrastructure to cope with that. A lot of associated problems there, flood plains being built up, waterways, (? 01.17.02) improper solid waste disposal, and what we found there is that there are official boundaries of the city, of the wards, but these don't really align anymore with reality on the ground, as it is now.

So it's the same type of approach that Christian was discussing for reach, where you work with local communities and focus group discussions, and see where their perceptions of boundaries align with official government data, and where they don't. This is important, obviously, because we found for example cases where the local person in charge of a ward, which is the (? 01.17.45) at which we're working in Dar es Salaam, has a very different perception of this boundary than the municipality. There was basically an area where no one was paying any attention to, because everyone thought it was being taken care of by someone else, which means these people don't have a voice basically, have nowhere to address their issues and living conditions to work on that. Here we see an exercise focusing more on flooding and vulnerability, but in the same type of sessions we're also addressing administrative boundaries. There are official data sources available here. This is the HDX, Humanitarian Data Exchange, where you'll find official boundaries at the ward level of Tanzania, but as you'll see, this particular one has quite a weird shape, it's crossing major roads, and there's disjointed pieces. It's incredibly large, if you imagine at the part just to the top right of it is all of downtown Dar es Salaam, up until the inner ring road, but due to expansion of the city, as I mentioned, these other things mean that by now a lot of people living in this area, and there's a very low level of awareness there of boundaries, whose responsibility these people are, and therefore, whose responsibility it is to be making sure that services are properly being expanded to the people living there.

This is a bit of a different situation, this is northern Uganda, refugee situation there. Of course, one of the smaller questions here is indeed, how you define urban. This seems to be the USAID definition, anything above 5,000 persons, or something like that I believe. In a sense the refugee camps in northern Uganda definitely count as urban, but it's a situation you encounter in other countries, we've encountered in other countries and locations as well, where basically villages that have existed for some time, again are swallowed up by urban expansion, or in this case expansion of refugee settlements. Which means there's a very low level of organisation and planning, and basically communities are being swallowed up by larger ones, which really wreaks havoc on existing perceptions of boundaries. Going back to the categories Leah identified, in this case you end up with a very dynamic situation where both service catchment areas and social perceptions, but also official boundaries are basically being pulled in a lot of different directions, will not correspond to previous realities, which means there's a need to again be collecting more data and surveys, and see how administrative boundaries will need to be handled to address current changing situations.

Then lastly, you will also encounter situations where basically there's little to no information on the current administrative boundaries, which means that effectively a lot of people are not being accounted for in urban planning, and planning for education, healthcare, water points, these types of things. So what you see here is in Liberia, in Zwedru to be exact, a city in more the hinterland of Liberia, where on the wall you'll see the latest and greatest urban planning documents that are being used there from before the civil war in Liberia, which basically captures a tiny area of the city, where people actually live, work, etc. In this case we've been working quite heavily with different layers of governments, with municipality, with national mapping agency, everything in between, to work to redefine standardised boundaries, working with communities to get a sense of where indeed their perceptions of boundaries are, how that aligns to official data, which up until now just existed on paper. On the left you'll see basically the city's idea of what area they need to govern. There's two central plots, and then in Liberia, the official city limit is an eight-mile radius from the centre of the city, so there's that, but within that, there was fairly little data on where communities actually exist, and this being a quite dense jungle, to a very large extent, tropical rainforest, with people living in places where they've basically not been counted, and certainly not considered part of their administrative zone previously.

You also see that the names given here are very helpful, zone one through eight, and we think that there's named communities. The (? 01.23.06) align to the lines that the people live and they actually use for these parts, and (? 01.23.15) do not, so, but that's also something you need to account for. So figuring out the name for these zones for the communities, you need to ask what is the official name for this part, if you know it? How do you call it? How do your neighbours call it? Do these things intersect, or do we need to make sure that we capture all these names? Wherever we can, as I said, we do try to collaborate with local authorities as much as we can. This also ensures that say, in future, operations and interventions, other organisations can also make use of this same data. We're an organisation that publishes all the data we collect onto OpenStreetMap, which is an open data platform, meaning everyone will have access to, and can use that data going forward. This goes for both, say, local governments, but also other aid organisations, so hopefully this makes sure that in the future they will be better able to deliver services to everyone living in this area. Lastly of course, we are collecting the data in primarily digital format, but it is important also to definitely not neglect paper maps, and make sure to, just due to the low possibility sometimes of having access to digital formats, and the capability of people to be using proper GIS systems. You should also be distributing paper maps and those other things. That's in for our part, so I'm looking forward to your questions. Thank you.

Leah Campbell: Thanks Paul, thanks very much. As the questions keep pouring in, I'm going to just add in one tiny, final example that I came across, that I think there's some method to my madness in why I'm going to tell you about an example from Boston in the US, and a similar example in New York. When I was doing the research for the paper I've mentioned, I came across two blogs, one focused on Boston, the link is up there, and one looking at New York. Both of these examples have used open source software to crowd source, basically, the type of thing that Christian's mapping focus group discussions were doing, but on a crowd source kind of basis. So the idea was, people living in New York or Boston could go in, and draw the boundaries of how they understood their different neighbourhoods. I think the results are quite interesting, in the context of thinking about this in a humanitarian context, partly because these are open source tools that any humanitarian organisation could potentially adapt and use, and also because the issues around boundaries aren't just found in the context we've been talking about, in the humanitarian world, but also in the cities. In the New York example, the blog describes how there aren't official boundaries and understood neighbourhoods in New York. Boston does have official ones, and we'll get to that in a minute, but I just wanted to show a couple of the images from the Boston blog, because I think they're quite interesting in the context of this discussion.

The picture that's on your screen right now is of one of the neighbourhoods in Boston, and the different shaded colours show the percent agreement of what Christian was calling data saturation. So if more than 75% of people agreed on the area, it's the darker blue, and that's the kind of, central area. Then you have more than 50% agreeing with a slightly larger area, and less than 20% agreeing to the wider area there. I think this is quite interesting, one of the quotes that this blog uses, I'm just going to read it verbatim, because it really spoke to me. It says 'although we talk a lot about boundaries, this blog included, the maps here should also remind us that neighbourhoods are not defined by their edges, essentially what is outside the neighbourhood, but rather by their contents. And it's not just a collection of roads and things you see on a map, it's also about shared history, activities, architecture and culture'. So while the neighbourhood summaries above that they've used in this blog describe the edges on the maps, it's also interesting to think about the area represented by the shapes. Why are they the shapes they are, what's the significance between different of opinion between different residents in a neighbourhood, people outside the neighbourhood? The New York blog that you might take a look at has some interesting data on, for example, people who lived in an area for more than 20 years, and people who've just arrived, which I think is an interesting reflection, thinking about displacement contexts where people who have recently arrived to an area might have a very different understanding of what they consider neighbourhood, to people who've been living there.

Just to show you a similar example to Christian's, this is a map on the left there of the neighbourhoods identified through this Boston project, the darker blues being the cores with most agreement, and the lighter blues getting less agreement as it goes, and on the right, that's compared with the official boundaries of Boston, which you know, has a very similar finding as the focus group maps that impacted in that there's lots of difference there. There are some similarities, but there's lots of difference, and that's quite interesting to think about. And this kind of, difference in shading is one example of the fuzzy boundaries I was talking about, as one way of presenting this sort of disagreement. So we're going to jump into the Q&A now, and I'm going to ask the first question going back to Christian. Somebody's asked if you could give us a bit more information about who comes to the mapping focus group discussions, how those people are invited, how long it takes, and how you ensure that minority, or invisible members of a community might get represented in these discussions? Unfortunately Christian's internet has cut off, so we'll come back to that question in a second, and hope that his internet connection in Niger kicks back in, and we're going to go to Paul. Paul has some thoughts about the original question for Christian, so we'll turn to Paul now.

Paul Uithol: So in our case, how we organised these focus group discussion, basically we try to approach it from different angles, and we do account for diversity there. On the one hand we will approach community leaders, and groups through local authorities, so ask them what that different social groups, both socioeconomic, ethnic, other types of identifiers are, and who to invite, who they think can be properly representing the group. On the other hand we also ask them to keep gender balance and those types of things in mind when inviting people to those focus group discussions. Then of course you also need to do your own research and see what other organisations, for example, are based in a certain ward, so in one of the wards in Dar es Salaam, there is a (? 01.31.21) association, which is quite a vulnerable group, a minority in Tanzania, so that's how we approach it at least.

Leah Campbell: Thank you, Christian is just getting reconnected, so we'll ask another question of Paul, and then get back to Christian when he's reconnected. Paul, there's been a couple of questions come in around data. How useful is it to rely on characteristics where there might be poor data? What do you do if data can't be readily verified, and how do you ensure the quality and representativeness of the data that's used in the maps?

Paul Uithol: Representative, with respect to that, that does mean you need to have access to some data on inhabitants of an area. What is the distribution in age, economic type of activity, poor versus rich, this type of data. So for that you want to look, and male versus female, etc. You want to see if there are any statistics available to ensure you're not excluding any socioeconomic, ethnic groups that should be present and living in those communities. On the other hand, indeed those interviews with ward leaders, with others, so we tried to take a look at different types of sources to make sure that we have a good feel, overview of the inhabitants and communities that are present in a location.

Leah Campbell: Thanks very much, and I'm hoping that Christian's back online, so I'm going to come back to him with the question of earlier, and also another one. The first question Christian, was about how you ensure that minority or invisible members in a community are represented in the focus group discussions, and if you could talk a bit about the process, how you select people for the focus group discussions overall, that would be interesting, and also another question's come in about how, when you're using these community defined maps, how you then coordinate actions with local government, who might be using the administrative boundaries, and how you go back and forth between those. Unfortunately I don't think that Christian's internet connection has come back fully, so we'll cross our fingers and hope he returns, and keep on going forward with another question for Paul. Paul, what would you say are the advantages and disadvantages of using open source tools for mapping?

Paul Uithol: The advantages of course are that the data you're generating can be useful to everyone, everywhere, as opposed to just generating data that's used for a specific use case that's, just scoped within your programme. You immediately ensure that there's open, easy access to other people, also to use the same type of data known to the future. On the tools that we're using, HOT has quite an extensive range of tools to support both the complete mapping workflow, but also access to information. So some of the tools we use most are also standardised tools among humanitarian organisations, so there's an open data kit, which is used quite widely for surveys in a wide range of use cases. We've acquired some expertise in using ODK, and there's a plug in on top of that, open map kit, which is specifically geared towards gathering data for OpenStreetMap. So in that sense, it integrates quite easily with the tools other humanitarian organisations are already used to utilising. I couldn't really think of any downsides to using open source tools, my fear is only (? 01.35.43) the only thing with regards to the data would be that you do need to be careful of the type of data you're exposing on certain vulnerable groups. There may be scenarios where there is definitely things that you need to be, not concerned about, but keeping in mind on what type of data you can and cannot be opening up. But that comes before pushing it out to OpenStreetMap.

Leah Campbell: Thanks Paul, we're going to try, third time is the charm, going back to Christian on the two questions, the first one about how people are selected for the mapping focus group discussions, and then how to coordinate with government actors using perhaps, official boundaries, administrative boundaries, rather than the ones identified in the focus group discussions. Christian, go ahead.

Christian Keller: Thank you Leah, I hardly understand you, but I have your question in writing, I hope you can understand me better than I do you. So coming back to the question that you asked about how to choose people to participate in MFGDs, how we chose them, first of all it's important again to keep in mind what our aim was. Our aim was really to define a geographic entity, an area of knowledge, that we could then later use as a basis, as a unit to gather information on, with the help of key informants, informed key informants within this community area, within this area of knowledge. That being said, we were still trying to be, having as large of a spectrum represented in the focus group discussions as possible. In Jordan for example, we always tried for each area that we targeted to have at least a female refugee, a female host, male host, male refugee focus group, and indeed perceptions, they did differ between these four different groups. One finding was that the refugee community, the displaced community in Mafraq, they always had a much smaller conception of the community area, which was probably a very contextual finding. It was probably a matter of interaction with other community members, being less integrated than the hosts that have been living there for generations. So hosts usually had a much bigger understanding of their community area than the displaced in the very same area.

In the end, what counted for us, was to come up with a geographic entity, with a community area that was later understood by the key informants that we identified, so that was our main target, our main objective. So in that sense our focus group discussions may have been in a way, biased towards defining an area that can later serve as an entity, a unit of knowledge, an area of knowledge.

Leah Campbell: Great, thanks very much Christian. The next question would be for both of you, both Paul and Christian, so we'll come to Paul first and then hopefully go back to Christian afterwards. The question is about expectations. When you're doing the mapping focus group discussions, the mapping with communities, but you're not the organisations responsible for aid delivery, how do you manage expectations around that? We'll turn to Paul first.

Paul Uithol: It can be a difficult one at times, but in general we find that people are really happy to be part of the process, and that of course does mean that you need to make sure that there's not-, they're not overestimating what they're going to get out of the mapping we do. But in general we always include local communities, and try to make sure we share back on the knowledge we gain, and the data we generate. So what we find is that, basically everywhere we go, people are quite happy to have a proper paper map of their area at the end of the process, which they can start using as a communication tool around the issues they face in their communities to local government, to higher levels of government, to other organisations. Basically we're also supplying them, giving back to them a bit of knowledge, so we try to include them in both discussions, but if we need to do mapping we also include them in the mapping. We give them some training on how to be using tools, how to use a map, how to use data. That already makes them feel appreciated and accounted for as human beings living in those communities. So in general, they already feel grateful to be taking part in this exercise, to be part of the process, and also gain something from it in terms of knowledge. We also supply certificates, so they also have something to show for it in terms of skills they can utilise later on, and also prove that they've been taking part in this, and make sure they at least get some products out of the mapping and the process we're going through with them as well. We do make sure, or make clear that we're not actually the ones that will be working on service delivery or aid operations in that area as well, but we do ensure that we supply them with something at the end of the process.

Leah Campbell: Thanks Paul, and we'll turn also to Christian for his thoughts.

Christian Keller: I'm risking to repeat what Paul just said, as I can't really understand you. So manage expectations when doing mapping sessions, when you're not responsible for aid delivery. That's a very good question, and I think it relates to that mapping exercise, it's a question we always ask ourselves when doing assessments, not delivering aid first hand, but doing assessments, and especially in Jordan, during our first pilot, that was actually an issue, especially in Jordan, north Jordan, you have a lot of assessment fatigue. There has been a lot of assessments that have been done, that are still being done, so people risk having been interviewed for the fourth, the fifth time, so that definitely is a very big issue. And I think in the end it is hard to address that issue, but one thing that you can do that we should do, is being transparent, as transparent as you can be with the participants, explaining what the purpose of this mapping focus group discussion is, and explaining very well what the objective of your project is. Nevertheless, that was definitely an issue we had in Jordan, and some of the participants that we initially identified, they didn't want to participate in the end, because of exactly that issue.

On the other hand, in Diffa, our second pilot, we experienced the exact opposite. People, they are very willing to participate in our mapping focus group discussions, there's some feeling of empowerment. People really appreciate being asked about their local experience, about their local communities. It hasn't been done before, and the feedback that we got from the participants in Diffa was a very positive one, particularly because of that feeling of empowerment. To answer that question, I think it's highly context dependant as well.

Leah Campbell: Thanks Christian. So I'm going to turn to all of our four speakers to get any final thoughts and advice they would give to our audience today on either choosing or defining the areas when you're working in an area smaller than a city, but before I do that, in case some people have to head out right at 4:00, and we run a couple of minutes over, I just want to say a huge thank you to all of our speakers for taking the time out of their busy days to share their experiences with us all today. I found it really interesting, and I'm really looking forward to listening to the recording and looking at the transcript as well, because there's been so much information, it's been hard to take it all in, in this two hours, so thank you so much. Also a huge thank you to the 50 of you listening out there, still with us, who stuck with us over the two hours. This is the first two-hour webinar ALANP's done, and my colleagues weren't quite sure how it would go, so I'm glad so many of you have stuck with us and I hope it's been interesting. A final reminder that a survey about your thoughts on the webinar will pop up, and also the email to you tomorrow, if you could share your thoughts about what you thought about the webinar, we really value that feedback, and do use it to inform future urban webinars. Before we end, I'll turn back to Tulio, one of our first hour speakers to hear any final thoughts, advice that you might have for our audience as a closing thought.

Tulio Mateo: Hi again. I think we've discussed a variety of cases, and I think all of them show the complexity and the need to have a multi-layered vision, to be able to take things forward and address the needs. And then I think it was mentioned by Christian, that we need to be transparent when we intervene, to be able to build this integrated approach, otherwise we will create ourselves some (? 01.46.10), and that's not what we really want. Then we need to mediate and negotiate with the variety of stakeholders that are in a city, so I think that will be my conclusion, embracing complexity, being transparent, and being able to mediate and negotiate in order to succeed.

Leah Campbell: Thanks Tulio, and thanks also to Riham, who isn't able to join us for a final reflection, but thank you very much to you both for your presentations and for those thoughts. I'll turn to Christian for any final thoughts and advice for everyone today.

Christian Keller: Thank you Leah. Yeah, I think this whole session has shown across the four different presentations that we've heard, and the discussions that we've had, I think it has shown that area-based approaches, there's still an immense potential behind that. There's still a lot of things that are not yet fully understood, the concept of community areas, where does the community area start, where does it end, what is the overlap between service areas, community areas, how do we get the best information within a community area, within a service area, how do I target these areas? So I think there's still a lot of work to be done. It was very interesting to see as well all these other approaches, and I think there's a lot of interlinkages there, we can think, every one of us learn a lot from each other, and I think this is going to be a very hot topic for the next couple of years still. For our part, we're very happy to share next year the final results of our four pilots, so we've been doing in the first two pilots, as we said already, next year we're trying to come up with the final results report on our particular approach I've been presenting.

Leah Campbell: Great, thanks Christian, and finally I'll turn to Paul for any final thoughts and advice for our participants today.

Paul Uithol: Thanks Leah for organising this webinar, I think it's a really important topic for everyone to be thinking about a bit more, and take into account in our programmes. There's a quite a lot that we need to think about a bit more, how we can integrate it into our projects, with the open data platform that we're working on quite a bit, you're more or less contained to mapping or providing access to geographical features, and things that have a geospatial (? 01.48.56) that mostly pertains to administrative boundaries, but it's also quite important for us to think about how we can provide better access to these other types of boundaries we've been discussing, like social perception, service catchment areas, service delivery, those types of features. So it's very helpful for me in that regard, and if anyone would like to speak to us, learn more about how to be integrating the types of boundary mapping we've been doing, then I'd be happy to help out. So thank you.

Leah Campbell: Great, thanks Paul. So thanks again to all of our speakers and to all of you. We have recorded this webinar, we will be getting a transcript of it, and also an edited version into smaller clips so it's easier to share and watch again, and so all of that will be sent out to you in a couple of weeks, along with all of the links that everyone's referred to, and the presentations pending speaker agreement. So thank you all again, please do fill out the survey, and please do join us another time for another urban webinar. If you have any ideas, there's a question in the survey to let us know your further ideas and thoughts for future webinars. Thanks again very much, and I hope you enjoy the rest of your day.