

APPENDIX

TABLE 2.1. MATRIX OF POLICIES FOR PHYSICAL REHABILITATION OF INNERBURBS: MACRO, MESO AND MICRO LEVELS

<i>SCALE</i>	<i>POLICY APPROACH</i>	<i>CORE INSTRUMENTS/ POLICY ELEMENTS</i>	<i>ACTORS/ SECTORS</i>	<i>KEY AREAS of SECTOR OVERAP</i>	<i>UPSIDE</i>	<i>DOWNSIDE</i>	<i>NOTES</i>
<i>MACRO</i>	Mitigate water runoff and drainage issues	Install bio-swales	Public		Natural way to control water flow	Specialized knowledge	
		[Re]build storm water drainage				Cost; disruption	
	Create or renovate public space	Build parks	Public	Business			
		Establish open-air markets	Mixed				
		Install street furniture	Public				
	Makeover streets	Landscape verges	Public	Zoning	Provide shade and beauty	Establishing care for the plants	
		Establish street parking		Zoning	Get cars off of sidewalks	Fear of auto thefts	
		Repave streets in poor condition			Reduce street noise; increase safety	Cost and disruption	
	Increase accessibility	Construct sidewalks	Public	Zoning / public disability institution	Increased pedestrian safety		

		Construct public staircases	Public	Zoning / public disability institution	Can use local labor (as in Lima)		Only when topography requires
		Improve public transit	Mixed	Transportation	Increased mobility; accessibility		
MATRIX OF POLICIES FOR PHYSICAL REHABILITATION OF INNERBURBS							
SCALE	POLICY APPROACH	CORE INSTRUMENTS/ POLICY ELEMENTS	ACTORS/ SECTORS	KEY AREAS of SECTOR OVERAP	UPSIDE	DOWNSIDE	
	Establish community center		Mixed	Social			
	Renovate schools	Make accessible for community activities	Public		Can be used for multiple purposes		
	Improve refuse collection	Composting	Public		Improve sanitation	Cost; bureaucracy	
MESO	Promote local businesses	Increase accessibilities	Mixed	Social	Money stays in community		
	Rehabilitate state-owned housing	Stairs, corridors	Public	Structural	Keep dwellings active in housing stock	Cost; disruption	
	Address issues unique to renters	Technical support and maintenance	Public	Law	Encourage mix of tenure		
	Implement shared sustainable resources	Bio-swales, solar panels, composting, recycling	Mixed	Environment	Reinforce connections between micro and macro scales through greening	Maintenance	

	Address shared spaces in between front of house, businesses and the street	Consider optional re-drawing public / private boundaries	Mixed	Zoning, social, financial (tax incentives)	Decrease "wall effect" of public space, put priority on sidewalks / streets / shared spaces	
	Address existing morphologies	"Rent" rooftops for solar arrays	Mixed	Environment, structural, financial	Using leftover spaces for environmental and financial gains	Cost
	Temporary uses of empty structures for public uses	Green space	Mixed		Using leftover spaces for social and financial gains	
	Community building centers	Iterative building / technical knowledge dissemination	Mixed	Construction / building industry, building and zoning	Can be used as a community resource and for local governments to establish community boards for progressive code compliance	

MATRIX OF POLICIES FOR PHYSICAL REHABILITATION OF INNERBURBS							
SCALE	POLICY APPROACH	CORE INSTRUMENTS/ POLICY ELEMENTS	ACTORS/ SECTORS	KEY AREAS of SECTOR OVERAP	UPSIDE	DOWNSIDE	NOTES
	Repairs to failing structures	Rebuild collapsing walls	Private	Building codes, public safety	Enhanced integrity for further rehab projects	Expensive	
		Repair/replace roofs repair cracks in structure					
	Improve accessibility	Reconstruct staircases	Private	Public safety, fire	Increased ease of access; safety in	May require major	

MICRO		Add extra doors		and emergency services	event of fire	redesign of interiors	
		Build alleyways to structures in back					
	Rebuild/upgrade utility connections	Rewire electrical interface	Mixed	Utility companies	Increased efficiency	Expensive; expertise required	Depends on climate
		Replace leaking pipes					
		Install solar panels	Private	Natural resource conservation	Reduction in utility costs		
	Install rainwater catchment system						
		Heat water in rooftop tanks					
	Increase climactic comfort	Window placement facing away from afternoon sun	Private		Blocks heat but allows daylight in	May require drastic re-construction	
		Install louvers/awnings					
	Reconfigure interior layout	Minimize load-bearing walls	Private		Allows for reconfiguring	May req. drastic re-construction	
		Make floor plan open					
		Consolidate utility interface				Easier to repair in future and to add additional hookups	
	Reduce household waste	Implement composting	Mixed	NGOs	Reduces litter	Requires specialized knowledge	
		Establish kitchen gardens	Mixed	NGOs	Improves nutrition		
	Reduce issues due to overcrowding	Additional bathroom facilities	Private			Expensive; requires specialized knowledge	

**APPENDIX TABLE 2.2. PARTS A – C.
FINANCING FOR REHAB AND REGENERATION**

APPENDIX 2.2A. MACRO LEVEL – TAXES AND PUBLIC SPENDING

Policy Approach	Core Instruments	Actors/Sector	Key Overlap w/ Other Sectors	Upsides	Downsides
Tax Credits: Abatements	Abatement scheme on assessed value of land/building for specified period	Municipality, private developers, homeowners, new buyers, commercial/ industrial investors	Regulatory sector	Adjustable (rate/time period); reduces administrative costs of appraisal/ assessment; leads to expanded tax basis	Cost in foregone revenue; uncertainty about real effects of abatement
Tax credits: Urban Enterprise Zone	Tax legislation (package of tax breaks/incentives on particular zone)	Municipality, private developers, homeowners, new buyers, commercial/ industrial investors	Regulatory sector	Allows for geographically targeted revitalization programs; rehab effects are accompanied by economic dynamism	Gentrification effects as property prices go up (includes tenants); negative externalities from industrial activities; uncertainty about effects
Conditional cash transfers	Targeted transfers; conditionality; monitoring and enforcement	Central/ municipal government; administering agency;	Community (builds human capital)	Create demand for local industry; reduce opportunity costs of building human capital; may be used to leverage microlending	Not viable option for renter-occupied housing; not easily sustainable; targeting difficulties due to imperfect information

APPENDIX 2:2B. – LEVERAGING AND FINANCING FOR HOUSEHOLDS

Policy Approach	Core Instruments	Actors/Sector	Key Overlap w/ Other Sectors	Upsides	Downsides
Reduction, Insurance, and Deposits	Insures loans, reduces the principal/ interest, or provides security/ encouragement for lender.	Municipality and local lenders as primary actors/decision makers and sources of funds; state/ national/ international gov'ts and charities/NGOs as sources of funds.	Regulatory /juridical sector must allow leveraging techniques and can spur leveraging by legal carrots/ sticks (e.g. Equal Credit Opportunity Act);	Efficient use of limited funds; encourage private sector involvement; promote positive image for lenders; expand access to credit	Marxist critique-- exploitation of working poor by finance capital; does not ensure lending to lowest income families
Microcredit	Short-term, rotating loans at market interest rates	NGOs, private lenders	Community sector provides financial literacy, skills training, social welfare assistance to ensure success. Physical Rehab, particularly for sustainable methods, must be encouraged/ trained.	Seeks to address needs of low-income segments. Successful repayment statistics. Allows for incremental housing improvement. Impact on local economy.	Not affordable for all incomes, ability to repay can depend upon state welfare subsidies; harder to repay if loan doesn't generate extra income. May involve incremental building, i.e. long wait periods.
PACE-style	Government issued tax assessments	Local/City Government	Private sector financing	In case the home is sold, the cost of repair is transferred to new homeowner; money ultimately repaid remains in community; can regulate type/size of repairs	Currently stalled as mortgage lenders want the PACE assessments to be the junior mortgage (i.e. get paid last)

Forgivable Liens	Forgivable Liens	USA/Austin	Private Funds (NGOs - Austin Habitat for Humanity), Gov't funds/bonds	Local/City Government, Nonprofits/private donors	Private sector financing
---------------------	---------------------	------------	--	---	-----------------------------

APPENDIX 2:2C. – COMPREHENSIVE AND MIXED-CAPITAL APPROACHES

Policy Approach	Core Instruments	Actors/Sector	Key Overlap w/ Other Sectors	Upsides	Downsides
Municipal Bond Financing	Municipal bonds issued by municipal governments; bonds insured by multilateral institutions; debt denominated in local currency; private pensions possible source of private investment; technical assistance	Municipal governments are bond issuers; IDB/IBRD bond insurers; private capital finances debt	Regulations to allow pensions to invest in bonds (regulatory); need to manage relations between levels of government (regulatory); municipal-level planning should encourage community involvement (community mobilization)	Decentralization of project design and finance; local credit enhancement; reduced costs; increased municipal government transparency; leverage international assistance; appropriate for urban renewal	Increased risk for municipal governments; may not be adequate incentives for insurers; municipalities with short credit history may be disadvantaged; if used for subsidies, may not be sustainable
Public Private Partnership	Creation of mixed-capital firm/corporation	Municipality, private capital	Regulatory (defining statutes, prerogatives, risk-sharing structure, special tax regime)	Private capital deemed to bring organizational flexibility. More efficient profit-oriented strategies Emphasis on positive balance sheet Public sector participation allows for legislative/fiscal leverage to facilitate intervention through adaptation of regulatory framework	Creates oligopolistic situations where private investors have market privileges; conflicts between public good/private profits; requires captive market (as in highway or waste collection)

APPENDIX TABLE 2.3. LEGAL, REGULATORY AND JURIDICAL POLICIES FOR REHAB AND REGENERATION

<i>Scale</i>	Policy Approach	Core Instruments /Policy Elements	Actors/ Sector	Areas of Overlap	Upside	Downside
<i>National / Subnational Level</i>	Reform succession laws	Mainstream probate process	Public notaries	Juridical	Allow families to initiate succession processes; one-stop shop	Informal arrangements may be more attractive, feasible
		Dispute resolution mechanisms	Local government & non-profits	Community	Establish & clarify interests to family home	Can cause or bring to surface intra-family conflict
		Facilitate small estate admin	Public notaries & local govt	Juridical	Allow smaller estates to be considered exceptional, & can bypass regular probate process	Some consolidated households may surpass minimum amount considered "small estate", deemed ineligible

<i>National/ Subnational (continued)</i>		Patrimonio familiar	Public notaries & local government	Juridical	Family controls patrimony; taken out of formal housing market,	Cannot be sold; cannot be bequeathed
		Recognize oral agreements	Public notaries & local government	Juridical	Many rely on informal arrangements, including oral agreements over future of home	Difficult to establish, particularly if not all parties agree
		Allow majority of interests to decide mgmt of inheritance property	Public notaries & local government	Juridical	One person cannot impede management of estate	Persons not in agreement can be the person living in the family home
		Compulsory administration of estates	Public notaries & local government	Juridical	Ensure transfer of clean titles	If compulsory, has to provide financial aid for low income populations

<i>National/ Subnational (continued)</i>	International Building Codes	Performance-based codes & peer review compliance	Local government and community experts	Physical and community	Provides flexibility for local conditions	Time consuming to evaluate local conditions
	Parallel legal systems	Customary land tenure, collective ownership	Community, regional government	Community	Flexibility, takes into account local conditions	May be at odds with formal systems
	ZEIS Special Zones of Social Interest	PREZEIS regulatory laws; code relaxation and progressive compliance	Local government & community	Community	Progressive form of social/property rights	Judicial/civil code takes precedence over administrative policy
	Development zones or enterprise zones	Self-help core units followed by progressive improvement	National government & private sector (for land)	Physical, community, financial	Land acquisition, basic services, finance mechanisms, self-help, legal framework to avoid speculation	Requires greater resources for accountability and enforcement of code compliance particularly for add-ons

	TIFs, enterprise zones	Tax incentives	Local government and private sector	Financial	Incentivizes private sector to participate in rehab and development	do programs target or benefit the lowest income families
<i>Household / Micro Level</i>	Estate planning	Will-making	Local government	Financial	Transfer secure title; reward care giving for elderly; proprietors preferences are established & followed	Can exclude spouses & children; estate planning can cause intra-family conflict; does not take into account long-term costs for families
		Legal aid clinics & workshops	Local universities & neighborhood associations	Juridical	Promote & facilitate estate planning; provide low income populations with legal education for securing family patrimony; private setting for estate planning	Impersonal due to high number of cases given to lawyers; still only provides legal advice & support but does not take into account downstream costs
		Legal fees reduction	Public notaries & local government	Financial	Reduces costs of 'legalization' procedures for low income populations	Does not target most impoverished (high risk populations) because costs may still be too high
		Tax reductions	Local government	Financial	Intergenerational transfers are subject to taxation, these can be lowered, or removed altogether	Does not target most impoverished (high risk populations) because costs may still be too high

APPENDIX 2.4. PARTS A – C. SOCIAL MOBILIZATION AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: REGIONAL; MUNICIPAL AND COMMUNITY; AND HOUSEHOLD LEVELS

APPENDIX 2.4A. – SOCIAL MOBILIZATION AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: REGIONAL LEVEL

Policy approach	Core instruments	Actors involved	Key overlapping sectors	Upsides	Downsides
Encouraging NGOs and grassroots movements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring participants are informed about current laws and regulations • Make information on funding readily available • For funds from government, create bureaucracy that is easily maneuvered by small groups 	Community, federal or municipal government, local institutions, churches, NGOs, non-profits	Financing, legal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Movements contribute to social mobility • Organizations provide communities with tools to assert their rights and fight for progress in housing policy that will benefit them • Organizations can provide a forum for change driven by women or other marginalized groups 	Information may not be available equally, and groups that control information can manipulate communities
Emphasizing women's roles in funding rehabilitation and renovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primarily disburse money to women • Tie funds to conditions, such as health and education conditions, that will produce benefits for 	Residents, especially female, project funders, including government, NGOs, and private funders	Financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conditional cash transfer programs focused on basic needs have had great success in disbursing funds to women for better targeting and effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women end up with even more tasks – chores, work, planning and managing finances, and absorbing any extra tasks from fulfilling conditions

	<p>the community at large</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include men in general meetings and planning for goals for funding 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women work in the home and benefit from community facilities more directly as primary caregiver, and may be more effective at setting priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Men may not want to allow their wives or girlfriends to be away from the home for program activities • Women are generally not the primary workers in project implementation
--	--	--	--	--	---

Including residents in city planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop structures through which residents can participate in planning • Incentivize or otherwise encourage participation 	Government, residents	Physical	Resident participation increases speed and efficacy of construction, likelihood of long-term maintenance of infrastructure and services, and ensures that projects are more likely to satisfy resident demands	In some cases, residents have been unwilling to mobilize and participate
Using government institutions to facilitate community organization and mobilization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish area renewal offices to link communities with policymakers • Provide information and communicate with residents, coordinate renewal of public 	Residents, municipal government	Legal	Residents have direct communication with government, and assistance for maneuvering bureaucracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political support is a prerequisite for organizing capacity • Political parties may use increased communication to garner support for their preferred

	space, and identify self-help activities				projects rather than let residents set the agenda
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Offer administrative and technical support				

APPENDIX 2.4B. – SOCIAL MOBILIZATION AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: REGIONAL: MUNICIPAL AND COMMUNITY LEVEL

Policy approach	Core instruments	Actors involved	Key overlapping sectors	Upsides	Downsides
State-led mobilization (Top-down)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require communities to organize according to a certain structure in order to receive housing and facilities projects • Implement projects through new org • Continue to use org for future projects in the area • Promote social mobilization and artificial social cohesion 	Community, federal or municipal government, local institutions, churches, NGOs, non-profits	Financing, legal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community is given an incentive to organize • Through new org, community is given control over planning and implementation of project • Continued incentives to remain organized keep association in place • State oversees community actions and application of programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community mobilizes from the top-down, according to government priorities • Partisan politics dictate what funds and projects will be available • Sometimes communities needs are not prioritized • May generate resistance from community organizations • Information must be made available to communities and residents equally to keep other organizations from co-opting the funds to control a community
Planning and implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create funding sources accessible for 	Neighborhood associations,	Financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resulting plans are better tailored to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGOs may not represent those in need

through existing community organizations (Negotiated)	<p>community orgs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open dialogue with community orgs about physical or social problems in their area • Spaces of interaction among communities and state agencies 	NGOs, non-profits, workers' groups, all levels of government		<p>actual needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community involvement and responsibility more likely • Mutual exchange of ideas and priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voluntary labor not always most productive choice • Possible dependency on NGOs
---	---	--	--	---	--

Bottom-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community organizations define priorities and projects, and initiate process to get funding • Well established bureaucratic procedures (Applications) • State agencies that establish close/direct contact with community organizations 	State and international agencies, NGOs, non-profits, local institutions, churches, neighborhood associations, residents	Financing, legal, physical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy defines priorities based on community needs • High involvement of neighbors of all classes • High level of autonomy for the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities depend on funding availability and bureaucratic decisions • Sometimes communities' needs don't match state policies.
Planning with women in key positions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the inclusion of women in project planning • Tailor meetings around women's schedules 	Community organizations, municipal government	Financing, physical	Women are more likely to know what problems need to be addressed and how	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women are already over-tasked with work and home duties • NGOs and government can begin to dominate women's lives

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure women have maximal information about available funds and projects				<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Difficult to encourage participation
--	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 2.4C. – SOCIAL MOBILIZATION AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: HOUSEHOLD LEVEL

Policy approach	Core instruments	Actors involved	Key overlapping sectors	Upsides	Downsides
Including residents in city planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop structures through which residents can participate in planning • Incentivize or otherwise encourage participation 	Government, residents	Physical	Resident participation increases speed and efficacy of construction, likelihood of long-term maintenance of infrastructure and services, and ensures that projects are more likely to satisfy resident demands	In some cases, residents have been unwilling to mobilize and participate
Using government institutions to facilitate community organization and mobilization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish area renewal offices to link communities with policymakers • Provide information and communicate with residents, coordinate renewal of public space, and identify self-help activities • Offer administrative and technical support 	Residents, municipal government	Legal	Residents have direct communication with government, and assistance for maneuvering bureaucracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political support is a prerequisite for organizing capacity • Political parties may use increased communication to garner support for their preferred projects rather than let residents set the agenda

Policy approach	Core instruments	Actors involved	Key overlapping sectors	Upsides	Downsides
Encouraging residents to live or stay in city centers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create state subsidies and mortgage credit banks to encourage individuals and families to move to city centers • Subsidize remodeling of homes to encourage retention of residents in city centers • Finance improvement of public spaces and creation of green zones 	Community, government, private financiers	Financing, legal	Residents in city centers stay in their current location, residents in city centers have more jobs available to them, subsidies make homeownership possible for more people	Residents who move may be separated from social networks
Encouraging social mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus rehabilitation on integrating neighborhoods and residents into the larger urban fabric • Integrate social services for residents and partner with neighborhood associations and churches • Provide private funding for individual households to rehab their own dwellings 	Neighborhood associations, NGOs, Non-profits, workers' groups, all levels of government	Financing	Residents become more integrated with service providers, communities, and cities at large	Some cases saw these mobility programs produce racial tension

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage community organizations to work cooperatively 				
--	---	--	--	--	--

Encouraging NGOs and grassroots movements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring participants are informed about current laws and regulations • Make information on funding readily available • For funds from government, create bureaucracy that is easily maneuvered by small groups 	Community, federal or municipal government, local institutions, churches, NGOs, non-profits	Financing, legal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Movements contribute to social mobility • Organizations provide communities with tools to assert their rights and fight for progress in housing policy that will benefit them • Organizations can provide a forum for change driven by women or other marginalized groups 	Information may not be available equally, and groups that control information can manipulate communities
Emphasizing women's roles in funding rehabilitation and renovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primarily disburse money to women • Tie funds to conditions, such as health and education conditions, that will produce benefits for the community at large • Include men in general meetings and planning for 	Residents, especially female, project funders, including government, NGOs, and private funders	Financing	Conditional cash transfer programs focused on basic needs have had great success in disbursing funds to women for better targeting and effectiveness. Women work in the home and benefit from community facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women end up with even more tasks – chores, work, planning and managing finances, and absorbing any extra tasks from fulfilling conditions

	goals for funding			more directly as primary caregiver, and may be more effective at setting priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Men may not want to allow their wives or girlfriends to be away from the home for program activities • Women are generally not the primary workers in project implementation
--	-------------------	--	--	---	---

Including residents in city planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop structures through which residents can participate in planning • Incentivize or otherwise encourage participation 	Government, residents	Physical	Resident participation increases speed and efficacy of construction, likelihood of long-term maintenance of infrastructure and services, and ensures that projects are more likely to satisfy resident demands	In some cases, residents have been unwilling to mobilize and participate
Using government institutions to facilitate community organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish area renewal offices to link communities with policymakers • Provide information and communicate with 	Residents, municipal government	Legal	Residents have direct communication with government, and assistance for maneuvering bureaucracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political support is a prerequisite for organizing capacity

and mobilization	residents, coordinate renewal of public space, and identify self-help activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer administrative and technical support 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political parties may use increased communication to garner support for their preferred projects rather than let residents set the agenda
------------------	--	--	--	--	---

Colonia/Barrio	Monterrey		Monterrey (weighted)
	<i>Valle Santa Lucia</i>	<i>Francisco Villa</i>	
Metadata			
Number of cases	74	55	129
Background and Mobility:			
Years family have been living on lot (mean)	29.03	27.7	28.4
Age of the original owner (mean)	54.03	49.16	59.7
Year lot was acquired (mean)	1978	1980	1979
Owners (%) by the number of years of residence on lot:			
More than 30 years, i.e. prior to 1979	75.4	55.6	66.7
20-29 years (1980-1989)	14.5	31.5	22
10-19 years (1990-1999)	-	9.3	4.1
During the previous 10 years (2000 - 2010)	10.1	3.7	7.3
Lot Characteristics:			
Average lot size (m ²)	141.9	123.4	133.7
Percent of lots with tenure regularization	73.2	81.1	76.6
Percent of lots acquired with registered titles	25.4	14.5	20.6
Population Characteristics:			
Independent (separate) dwellings/homes on the lot (average)	1.2	1.2	1.2
Average number of families on lot	1.2	1.3	1.3
Average number of people living on the lot	4.6	5.7	5
Percent of lots with 2 or more dwellings (i.e. shared lots)	21.9	20.8	21.4
Household Characteristics			
Dwelling unit 1.			
Family structure of household:			
Nuclear	68.1	58.5	64
Extended	27.8	39.6	32.8
Lives alone (singleton)	2.8	1.9	2.4
Number of workers	1.62	1.98	1.7
Number of household members	3.69	4.83	4.18
Total Number of rooms in dwelling (excluding kitchen and bathroom etc.)	4.87	4.62	4.8
Number of bathrooms	1.4	1.4	1.4
Number of bedrooms	2.66	2.77	2.7
Index of persons per bedroom (overcrowding index)	1.4	1.9	1.7
Dwelling unit 2.			
Family structure of household:			
Nuclear	88.2	72.7	82.1
Number of household members	3.82	3.64	3.7
Number of bedrooms	1.47	2	1.7
Index of persons per bedroom	2.7	2.3	2.5

(overcrowding index)			
House construction and home improvement issues as reported by House 1			
Percent of dwellings that use part of the home for an economic activity (workshop, store, renting, etc.)	19.7	19.2	19.5
Percent of dwellings that have at least one room without natural light to the outside	17.8	26.4	21.4
Serious problems, 2 or 3 reported	11.1	30.2	19.2
One problem reported	23.6	35.8	28.8
No serious problems reported	65.3	34	52
Percent lots with only a single storey dwelling	78.1	79.2	78.6
Percent of dwellings reporting problems related to:			
Physical and construction issues	22.2	56.6	36.8
Installations and utilities	8.3	22.6	14.4
Dwelling design	15.3	20.8	17.6
Perceptions about the colonia and the home: percent of respondents who are satisfied			
With the house Likes everything)	14.1	26.4	18.6
With the colonia (likes everything)	1.4	5.9	3.3
Who would you approach for help with dwelling improvements?			
Local or regional authorities	5.8	1.9	4
No-one -- just ourselves	84.3	81.1	82.9
Who would you approach for help with improvements to the colonia?			
Local or regional authorities	36.8	20.8	29.8
No-one -- just ourselves	32.4	49.1	39.7
Residents' Association	-	-	-
Other	7.4	7.5	7.4
(Self) Estimated value of the home (lot and dwelling[s]); thousands of \$US	28	27	55
Median (\$ '000s)	\$21.81	\$21.81	\$21.81
Trimmed mean (\$ '000s)	\$26.19	\$21.63	\$24.07
Appraised (cadastral) value of the home (lot and dwelling[s]); thousands of \$US	16	7	23
Median (\$ '000s)	\$17.90	\$11.32	\$10.91
Trimmed mean (\$ '000s)	\$17.03	\$14.89	\$14.34
Percent of households planning or making home improvements	47.1	52.8	49.6

Lead Author & Editors' Affiliations and Biographies.

Peter M. Ward is the C.B. Smith Sr. Centennial Chair in US-Mexico Relations and is professor in the Department of Sociology (College of Liberal Arts), and in the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs where he also serves as the Associate Dean for Research. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Liverpool in 1976, and subsequently held senior teaching and research positions at University College London (1976-85), and The University of Cambridge (1985-91), before moving to the University of Texas at Austin (1991-present). Between 1993-7 and 2001-05 he was Director of the Mexican Center at the Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies; and from 2002-7 he was Editor-in-Chief of the *Latin American Research Review*. He is author or co-author of 15 books and over 120 scholarly articles on low-income housing, land markets, social policy, democratization and governance, Mexican politics and megacities (most notably Mexico City). His most recent book was published in 2012 by the University of Notre Dame Press *Metropolitan Governance in the Federalist Americas* (with Spink and Wilson). In 2006 he led the initiative to create the Latin American Housing Network, which he continues to coordinate at the University of Texas at Austin www.lahn.utexas.org

Contact: peter.ward@austin.utexas.edu

Edith R. Jiménez Huerta received her Ph.D. from the University of Essex in 1988. She worked as a research assistant at the Department of Geography at the University of Cambridge (1998-1991), and from 1991 – present, she has been Professor at the University of Guadalajara, where she conducts research and also teaches undergraduates and postgraduate students. She has had the uninterrupted recognition of the Federal Secretary of Education as a National Researcher (SNI) (1992 - present). She has coordinated major research projects funded by the National Council of Science and Technology. From 1993 to 1998 she served as Consultant on Urban Issues to the Governor of the state of Aguascalientes. Her book *El Principio de la Irregularidad* was published by Juan Pablos Editor and she has written over 50 scholarly articles and chapters of books on low income housing, land markets and cultural landscape. She is a Founding Member of the Latin American Housing Network (LAHN) and coordinator of the LAHN Guadalajara Team. Contact: ejimenez@cucea.udg.mx

María Mercedes Di Virgilio is a Founding Member of the Latin American Housing Network (LAHN) and coordinator of the LAHN Buenos Aires team. She earned her Ph.D. in social sciences from the University of Buenos Aires in 2008. She held her research positions at the University of General Sarmiento before moving in 2005 to the Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas (CONICET). As a CONICET researcher, she is part of the Instituto de Investigaciones Gino Germani where she has coordinated the Area de Estudios Urbanos from 2002 to 2008. In 2000 she held a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship at the University of Texas at Austin. In 2009, she returned to UT-Austin as a postdoctoral visiting scholar through a CONICET fellowship. Her principal research interests are housing policy and planning, urbanization of the Metropolitan Area of Buenos Aires, residential mobility and housing career. In 2013 she was awarded a Teacher Mobility Scholarship (Ministry of Education, Secretariat for University Policies) to work in Paris on the project “Processes and practices of residential and daily mobility within the context of Latin American cities.” She was recently awarded a Teacher Mobility Scholarship (Ministry of Education, Secretariat for University Policies) to work in Paris on the project “Processes and practices of residential and daily mobility within the context of Latin American cities” (2013). Contact: mercedes.divigilio@gmail.com

Authors Affiliations

Mtra. Angélica Camargo Sierra. Professor, Universidad Piloto de Colombia.

apcamargo@unipiloto.edu.co

Lic. María José Doyenart. Magister candidate, Demografía y estudios poblacionales, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de la República, mjdoyenart@gmail.com

Dr. Carolina Flores, Assistant Professor. Instituto de Sociología, Pontificia Universidad de Chile cfloresc@puc.cl

Ms. Erika Grajeda, M.A. Doctoral candidate, Department of Sociology, University of Texas at Austin, egrajeda@utexas.edu

Magdalena Marsiglia Lic. Magdalena Marsiglia, Professor, Universidad Católica del Uruguay. maguimars@gmail.com

Ms. Olga Peek, KU Leuven Master of Human Settlements. olgapeek@gmail.com

Dr. Bryan R. Roberts, C.B Smith Sr. Centennial Chair in US-Mexico Relations (#1), Department of Sociology, University of Texas at Austin. b.roberts@austin.utexas.edu

Ms. Danielle Rojas. M.A., M.S. University of Texas at Austin. rojas.dmr@gmail.com

Dr. Francisco Sabatini, Professor, Instituto de Estudios Urbanos and Centro de Investigación del Desarrollo Urbano Sustentable, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.

Arq. Martha Lazarte Salinas. mmlazartes@yahoo.com

Bibliography

- Abramo, P. (2006). *Ciudad caleidoscópica: una visión heterodoxa de la economía urbana*, Netbiblo, 255.
- Abramo, P. (2008). El mercado del suelo informal en favelas y la movilidad residencial de los pobres en las grandes metrópolis: un objeto de estudio para América Latina. *Territorios*, 18-19, 55-73.
- Abramo, P. (2010). Mercado informal de alquiler: nueva puerta de acceso a los asentamientos populares", *Arrendamiento y vivienda popular en Colombia como alternativa habitacional*, Ediciones Uniandes, pp. 52-78.
- Alfonso, O. (2012) ¿Ciudad prioritaria, ciudad social? Análisis de la política nacional de vivienda para familias de bajos ingresos en Bogotá (1991-2009). In T. Bolívar y J. Erazo (Eds.), *Dimensiones del hábitat popular latinoamericano* (pp. 19-45). Quito: FLACSO.
- Álvarez, M. J. (2009) *Contentious urbanization from below: land squatting in Montevideo, Uruguay*. Doctoral Thesis. University of Pittsburgh.
- Álvarez, M. J. (2005). *Golden Ghettos: Gated Communities and Class Residential Segregation in Montevideo, Uruguay*. Programa IPES, Universidad Católica del Uruguay. Montevideo, Uruguay.
http://www.ucu.edu.uy/Portals/0/Publico/Facultades/Ciencias%20Humanas/IPES/Documentos/EC_Numero%205.pdf. Recuperado Octubre 2012
- Archundia, M. (2010). *DF lanza jornada notarial 2010*", *El Universal, Ciudad de México, 22 marzo*. Retrieved from: <http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/notas/667746.html>
- Archundia, M. (2008). *Abundan las propiedades intestadas*", *El Universal, Ciudad de México, 20 mayo*. Retrieved from: <http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/ciudad/90221.html>
- Arequeros Mejica, M. S. and Canestraro, M. L. (2010). Intervenciones del Estado en la regularización de villas y asentamientos: alcances, límites y contradicciones. In Di Virgilio, M., Herzer, H., Merlinsky, G., and Rodriguez, C. (Eds.) *La cuestión urbana interrogada. Transformaciones urbanas, ambientales y políticas públicas en Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Café de las Ciudades.
- Azuela, A. (2001). "El acceso de los pobres al suelo urbano de los ejidos. A diez años de la Reforma." Paper prepared as a contribution to the study, *Mexico Low Income Housing: Issues and Options*, Banco Mundial.
- Banco Mundial. (2001). *Informe de Desarrollo Mundial 2000/2001*. Washington, D.C.
- Banco Mundial and Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo. (2006). *Informe sobre la pobreza en la República Dominicana*, Santo Domingo.
- Baumann, D., Bosquez, M., Bossin, M., Daley, E., Donoso, R., Kelley, M., Muñoz, S.,

- Baross, P. (1990). Sequencing Land Development: The Price Implication of Legal and Illegal Settlement Growth. In Paul Baross and Jan van der Linden (Eds.), *The Transformation of Land Supply Systems in Third World Cities* (pp. 57-82). Aldershot: Avebury.
- Batres, A. (2013). Hogar, imposible hogar, *El Periódico de Guatemala*, April 22, Economía.
- Berube, A., Singer, A., Wilson, J. H. and Frey, W. H. (2006). *Finding Exurbia: America's Fast-Growing Communities at the Metropolitan Fringe*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution Press.
- Blaustein, E. (2001). *Prohibido vivir aquí*. Buenos Aires: Comisión Municipal de la Vivienda del Gobierno de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires.
- Borsdorf, A. (2003). Cómo modelar el crecimiento y la dinámica de la ciudad latinoamericana. *Revista Eure*, XXIX (86), 37-49.
- Bouillon, C. P. (Ed.) (2012). Comprar o no comprar: la expansión del mercado de alquiler. In *Un espacio para el desarrollo. Los mercados de vivienda en América Latina y el Caribe* (pp. 95-119). Inter-American Development Bank, New York and Washington, D.C.
- Bravo Soto, M. (2007). *Proceso de urbanización, segregación social, violencia urbana y "barrios cerrados" en Guatemala 1944-2002*. Guatemala: Centro de Estudios Urbanos y Regionales, Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala.
- Briceño-León, R. (2010). Diez tesis sobre los pobres y el alquiler de viviendas. In Escallón Gartner, C. (Ed.). *Arrendamiento y vivienda popular en Colombia como alternativa habitacional* (pp. 105-124). Uniandes Editions, Colombia.
- Brigman, N., Clifton, M., Dávila, T., Díaz, O., Die, R., Genova, J., Rizzo, R., Rojas, D.,
- Bouillon, C. P. (2012). *Room for Development: Housing Markets in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Inter-American Development Bank.
- Burga Bartra, J. (2006). *El Ocaso de la Barriada: Propuestas para la Vivienda Popular*. Ministerio de Vivienda, Construcción, y Saneamiento; Facultad de Arquitectura, Urbanismo, y Artes Universidad UNI.
- Burgess, R. 1982. Self-help housing advocacy: a curious form of radicalism. A critique of the work of John F. C. Turner. In Peter M. Ward (Ed.). *Self-help Housing: A Critique* (pp. 55-97). London: Mansell.
- Caicedo, J. (2010). *La política de vivienda y la emergencia del derecho a la vivienda digna en Colombia: Aspectos conceptuales en la política de vivienda*. Paper presented at IX Seminario de Investigación Urbano Regional. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Calderón Cockburn, J. (2005). *La Ciudad Ilegal: Lima en el siglo XX*. Fondo Editorial de la Facultad de Ciencias Sociales UNMSM.

- Calderón Cockburn, J. (2010). Titulación de la propiedad y mercado inmobiliario. *Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos* 25 (75), 625-661.
- Camargo, G. (2007). Estado y Perspectivas de los Ecosistemas Urbanos 2008-2011. *Foro Nacional Ambiental, Documento de Políticas Públicas*, 16.
- Camargo, A. and Hurtado, A. (2011). Vivienda y Pobreza en Bogotá: Una relación compleja. Marco conceptual y caracterización de Bogotá. *Cuadernos de Vivienda y Urbanismo*, 4 (8), 224-246.
- Camargo, A. and Hurtado, A. (2012). Informalidad del Siglo XXI. Características de la oferta informal de suelo y vivienda en Bogotá durante la primera década del Siglo XXI. *Territorios*, 27, 71-103.
- Camargo, A. and Hurtado, A. (forthcoming). Urbanización informal en Bogotá: agentes y lógicas de producción del espacio urbano. *Revista INVI*.
- Campbell, T. (2003). *The Quiet Revolution: Decentralization and the Rise of Political Participation in Latin American Cities*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Camus, M. (2005). *La colonia Primero de Julio y la 'clase media emergente.'* Guatemala City: Flacso.
- Carte, L., Casey, G., Díaz, O., Engelman, L., Hershaw, E., Martínez, V., McQueen, G., Chantada, A. (1998). *Del proceso de urbanización a la planificación urbana de Santo Domingo*. Santo Domingo: Editora San Juan.
- Castillo, M. (2010). Anotaciones sobre el problema de la vivienda en Colombia. *Bitácora urbano territorial*, 1 (008), 15-21.
- Ceballos, O and Saldarriaga, A. (2010, October). *La atención estatal al problema de la vivienda en Colombia 1918-1990*. Paper presented at IX Seminario de Investigación Urbano Regional. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Cecilio, M. and Couriel, J. (2005). *Activos y comportamiento de riesgo en la zona metropolitana de Montevideo*. En Informe de Desarrollo Humano en Uruguay 2005 .Uruguay hacia una estrategia de desarrollo basada en el conocimiento. Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo. Uruguay.
- Cemex. (2012). *Patrimonio Hoy*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cemexmexico.com/DesarrolloSustentables/PatrimonioHoy.aspx>
- Clichevksy, N. (2003). Pobreza y acceso al suelo urbano. Algunos interrogantes sobre las políticas de regularización en América Latina. *Documentos CEPAL. Serie Medio Ambiente y Desarrollo*, No. 75. Santiago de Chile.

- Colombia, Cities Alliance, Banco Mundial, Departamento Nacional de Planeación, Ministerio de Ambiente Vivienda y Desarrollo Territorial (2007). *Suelo y Vivienda para Hogares de Bajos ingresos*. Bogotá: Autor.
- Colombia, Departamento Nacional de Planeación (DNP). (2010) *Línea base de los componentes de titulación de predios fiscales y mejoramiento integral de barrios del programa de viviendas de interés social*. Bogotá: Autor.
- Comisión Económica para América Latina (CEPAL). (2000). Desarrollo económico y social en la República Dominicana: los últimos 20 años y perspectivas para el siglo XXI. Proyecto BT-DOM-1999, LC/MEX/R.760, 27 de julio.
- Contreras, Y. (2012). *Cambios socio-espaciales en el centro de Santiago de Chile: Formas de anclarse y prácticas urbanas de los nuevos habitantes*. Tesis de Doctorado en Arquitectura y Estudios Urbanos, PUC-Chile.
- CONAU. (2007). Informe GEO Santo Domingo: Perspectiva del medio ambiente urbano. Santo Domingo: Consejo Nacional de Asuntos Urbanos, Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente (PNUMA), Universidad Autónoma de Santo Domingo.
- Congreso del Estado. (2013). *Iniciativa de la Ley para la regularización de la propiedad urbana en el estado de Jalisco*. July, p. 30.
- Connolly, P. (2012). La urbanización irregular y el orden urbano en la zona metropolitana del Valle de México de 1990 a 2005. In Clara Eugenia Salazar (Ed.), *Irregular. Suelo y mercado en América Latina* (pp. 379-425). El Colegio de México.
- Consejo Estatal de Población (COEPO). (2008). *Análisis sociodemográfico para la Zona Metropolitana de Guadalajara, marzo*. Retrieved from: <http://coepo.app.jalisco.gob.mx/PDF/Analisisociodemograficos/Zmg.pdf>
- Conway, D. and Brown, J. (1980). Interurban relocation and structure: low-income migrants in Latin American and the Caribbean. *Latin American Research Review* 15: 95-125.
- Cortez, M. (2005). La anexión de los 6 municipios vecinos a Bogotá en 1954 "Un hecho con antecedentes." *Revista Bitácora Urbano Territorial*, 9, 122-127.
- Coulomb, R. (2006). La vivienda en arrendamiento. In Coulomb, R. and Schteingart, M. (Eds.). *Cámara de Diputados* (pp. 115-191). Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana and Miguel Ángel Porrúa, Mexico.
- Coulomb, R. (2010). Arrendamiento urbano, necesidades habitacionales y dinámicas territoriales en México. In Escallón Gartner, C. (Ed.). *Arrendamiento y vivienda popular en Colombia como alternativa habitacional* (pp. 79-104). Ediciones Uniandes, Colombia.

- Cravino, M. C. (2006). *Las villas de la ciudad. Mercado e informalidad urbana*. Los Polvorines, San Miguel: Ed. Instituto del Conurbano – Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento.
- Cravino, M. C., Del Río, J. P. and Duarte, J. I. (2008). Magnitud y crecimiento de las villas y asentamientos en el Área Metropolitana de Buenos Aires en los últimos 25 años. *www.fadu.uba.ar*.
- Cresswell, J. (2013). (3rd Edition) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cuervo, L. (2012). América Latina: Metrópolis en Mutación. *Questiones Urbano Regionales.. 1 (1)*, 53-76.
- Dávila, J. And Brand, P. (2012). *Movilidad Urbana y Pobreza*. Development Planning Unit, UCL / Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- Diaz, M. (2012). *El espacio público en las políticas de legalización de barrios en Bogotá: aspectos cualitativos y cuantitativos*. Degree work for the degree of Master of Urban Management, Facultad de Arquitectura y Artes, Universidad Piloto de Colombia. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Dietz, H. A. (1998). *Urban Poverty, Political Participation, and the State: Lima, 1970-1990*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- De Mattos, C. (2012). Santiago de Chile, de ciudad a región urbana. In Alicia Ziccardi, (Ed.). *Ciudades del 2010: entre la sociedad del conocimiento y la desigualdad social* (pp. 57-94). Mexico DF: UNAM.
- Del Pozo, F., Jeldes, M. I., Montenegro, V., and Riquelme, I. (2009). *Disposición a la movilidad residencial en dos barrios populares de Santiago*. Informe Final Taller de Titulación, Instituto de Sociología, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile (profesora Carolina Flores).
- DESCO Centro de Estudios y Promoción del Desarrollo. (2005). *Densificación Habitacional: Una Propuesta de Crecimiento para la Ciudad Popular*. Lima: DESCO. Programa Urbano.
- De Soto, H. (1987). *El Otro Sendero: La revolución informal. 3rd Edition*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana.
- De Soto, H. (2000). *The Mystery of Capital: Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else*. New York: Basic Books.
- Di Virgilio, M. M., Arqueros, S. and Guevara, T. (2011a). Veinte años no es nada. Procesos de regularización en villas y asentamientos informales en la Región Metropolitana de Buenos Aires. *Revista Ciudad y Territorio*, 167, 109-129.
- Di Virgilio, M. M., Arqueros, S. and Guevara, T. (2012a). Conflictos urbanos en los procesos de regularización de villas y asentamientos informales en la Región

- Metropolitana de Buenos Aires (1983-2011). Urban. *Revista de investigación y reflexión urbanística*. Madrid: Escuela de Urbanística y Ordenación del Territorio. Universidad Politécnica de Madrid.
- Di Virgilio, M. M., Arqueros, S. and Guevara, T. (2012b). Estrategias de acceso al suelo y a la vivienda en barrios populares del Área Metropolitana de Buenos Aires. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais*. São Carlos, São Paulo, Brasil: Instituto de Arquitetura e Urbanismo. Universidade de São Paulo.
- Di Virgilio, M. M., Arqueros, S. and Guevara, T. (2012c). Regularización de villas y asentamientos informales en la región metropolitana de Buenos Aires. Ejes analíticos. *Seminario Internacional: Superada la informalidad, nuevos desafíos: Políticas para colonias populares consolidadas. 9 al 12 de noviembre de 2011*. Zapopan, Jalisco, México: Centro Universitario de Ciencias Económico Administrativas, Universidad de Guadalajara – Latin American Housing Network.
- Di Virgilio, M. M., Arqueros, S. and Guevara, T. (2012d). Políticas de regularización dominial en América Latina: un análisis comparado de la experiencia en Argentina, Brasil y México. Segundo Fórum de Sociología de la International Sociological Association. Buenos Aires, August 2012.
- Driant, J. C. (1991). *Las Barriadas de Lima: Historia e Interpretación*. Lima: IFEA, Instituto Francés de Estudios Andinos: DESCO, Centro de Estudios y Promoción del Desarrollo.
- Dureau, F. (2000). Bogotá: Una doble dinámica de expansión espacial y de densificación de espacios ya urbanizados. En Dureau, F., Dupont, V., Lelievre, E., Levy, J. and Lulle, T. (Eds.) *Metrópolis en Movimiento: Una Comparación Internacional* (pp. 28-36). Bogotá: Alfaomega.
- Dureau, F. (2010). Vivir en Bogotá: estrategias y prácticas de movilidad residencial urbana. In Jaramillo, S. (Ed.) *Bogotá en el cambio de siglo: promesas y realidades*. Quito: OLACHI.
- Empty Homes* (2013). *Empty Homes Agency Limited, Charitable Housing Association*, Available in: <http://www.emptyhomes.com/>
- Escallón Gartner, C. (Ed.). (2010). *Arrendamiento y vivienda popular en Colombia como alternativa habitacional*. Uniandes Editions.
- Escallon Gartner, C. (2011). La vivienda de interés social en Colombia, principios y Retos. *Revista de Ingeniería*, 35, 55-60.
- Fainstein, S. (2010). *The Just City*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Fanelli, J. M. and R. Guzmán. (2008). Diagnóstico de crecimiento para la República Dominicana. *Inter-American Development Bank*, Documento de Trabajo CSI-118 DR-P 1034.

- Fausto Brito, A. (Ed.). (1999). *Inventario de Asentamientos irregulares en el área metropolitana de Guadalajara*. Cuaderno de Trabajo, Centro de Estudios Metropolitanos, Universidad de Guadalajara,.
- Fernández Agraz, C. (2003). La cláusula de designación del beneficiario en el contrato de compraventa. *Podium Notarial*, 28, 60-69. Retrieved from: <http://www.juridicas.unam.mx/publica/librev/rev/podium/cont/28/pr/pr12.pdf>
- Figueroa, A. (2012). *Estudio del comportamiento de las cargas urbanas y el reparto de cargas y beneficios del tratamiento de desarrollo frente al nivel de accesibilidad y su repercusión en el valor residual del suelo*. Degree work for the degree of Master of Urban Management, Facultad de Arquitectura y Artes, Universidad Piloto de Colombia. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Filgueira, F. (2004). *Tendencias, coyuntura y estructura: la crisis social en Uruguay*. <http://www.henciclopedia.org.uy/autores/Filgueira/CrisisUruguay.htm>
- Garza, G. (2002). Evolución de las ciudades mexicanas, *Notas. Revista de información y análisis*, 19, 7-16.
- Garzón, C. (2011). *Programa de vivienda de interés social en Colombia: Una evaluación*. Discussion paper. Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo.
- Gilbert, A. (Ed.). (1996). *The Megacity in Latin America*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Gilbert, A. (1999). A home is forever? Residential Mobility and Homeownership in Self Help Settlements. *Environment and Planning*. 31, 1073-91.
- Gilbert, A. (2001). ¿Una casa es para siempre? Movilidad residencial y propiedad de la vivienda en los asentamientos autoproducidos. *Territorios*, (No. 6, pp. 51-73). Universidad del Rosario, Universidad del Rosario.
- Gilbert, A. (2003a). *In Search of a Home: Rental and Shared Housing in Latin America*, London: UCL Press.
- Gilbert, A. (2003b). *Rental housing: An essential option for the urban poor in developing countries*. Nairobi, Kenya: UN-HABITAT.
- Gilbert, A. (2010). Propiedad de vivienda, alquiler y microfinanciamiento: implicaciones de la crisis subprime para las personas de escasos recursos en las ciudades pobres. In Escallón Gartner, C. (Ed.). *Arrendamiento y vivienda popular en Colombia como alternativa habitacional* (pp. 21-52). Uniandes Editions.
- Gilbert, A. (2012). Rental Market and Rental Policies in Less Developed Countries, in *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home* (pp. 35-45). Elsevier, Ltd.

- Gilbert, A. and Ward, P. (1985). *Housing, Poverty and the State: Policy and Practice in Three Latin American Cities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Digital reprint 2009.
- Gobierno de Chile. (2013). *Política Nacional de Desarrollo Urbano*. <http://politicaurbana.minvu.cl/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Pol%C3%ADtica-Nacional-de-Desarrollo-Urbano.pdf>.
- Gobierno del Estado, (2012). *Iniciativa de Ley para la Regularización de la propiedad urbana en el Estado de Jalisco*. Comisión de Desarrollo Urbano, Diputados del H. Congreso del Estado, documento en discusión.
- González de la Rocha, M. (1994). *The resources of poverty: Women and survival in a Mexican city*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- González de la Rocha, M. (2001). From the Resources of Poverty to the Poverty of Resources? The Erosion of a Survival Model, *Latin American Perspectives*, 28 (4), 72–100.
- González de la Rocha, M., Jelin, E., Perlman, J., Roberts, B., Safa, H., and Ward, P. 2004. From the marginality of the 1960s to the “new poverty” of today. *Latin American Research Review*, 39(1), 183–203.
- Gouëset, V. (1998). *Bogotá: Nacimiento de una metrópoli. La originalidad del proceso de concentración urbana en Colombia en el siglo XX*. Bogotá: Tercer Mundo Editores, Observatorio de Cultura Urbana, CENAC, IFEA.
- Grajeda, E. D. and Ward, P. M. (2012). Inheritance and Succession in Informal Settlements of Latin American Cities: A Mexican Case Study. *Latin American Research Review*, 47, Special Issue, 139-162.
- Guevara, T., Imori, M. and Ronis, M. (2011). Parque de los Patricios. In N. Cosacov et al., *Barrios al sur: Villa Lugano, Villa Riachuelo, Mataderos, Parque Patricios y Villa Soldati a través del tiempo*. Documento de Trabajo N° 56, abril 2011. Buenos Aires: Instituto de Investigación Gino Germani, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Haggerty, R. A. (1989). *Dominican Republic: A Country Study*. Washington: Library of Congress.
- Hall, P. (1980). *Great Planning Disasters*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hidalgo, R. (2005). *La vivienda social en Chile y la construcción del espacio urbano en el Santiago del siglo XX*. Santiago: Instituto de Geografía, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.

- Hoffnung-Garskof, J. (2008). *A Tale of Two Cities: Santo Domingo and New York after 1950*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- INE – Instituto Nacional de Estadística. (2012). *Estimación de la pobreza por el método de ingresos. Año 2012*. <http://www.ine.gub.uy/biblioteca/pobreza/Pobreza%202012/Estimaci%C3%B3n%20de%20la%20pobreza%20por%20el%20M%C3%A9todo%20del%20Ingreso%202012.pdf>. Recuperado Julio 2013
- INE – Instituto Nacional de Estadística Censo. (2011). *Análisis de Resultados* <http://www.ine.gub.uy/censos2011/index.html>.
- INEGI, Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. (2010a). Censos Generales de Población y Vivienda, 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000 y 2010, México.
- INEGI, Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. (2010b). Marco Geoestadístico Municipal, México.
- INE-PIAI. (2006). *Relevamiento de asentamientos 2005-2006*. Convenio INE-PIAI. Montevideo. <http://www.ine.gub.uy/piai3/inepiai.htm>.
- Info7. (2009). Sólo 10 por ciento de mexicanos tiene testamento: Cabeza de Vaca, Nacional, Mexico. September 3, 2009.
- IPES-UCU. (2010). *Trayectorias Residenciales y Ocupacionales en las primeras y segundas generaciones de los viejos Asentamientos Irregulares de Montevideo*. Fondos Concursables DINAVI-CREDIMAT (Categoría II), Montevideo, Uruguay.
- Instituto Nacional de la Vivienda INVI. (2009). *Plan Estrategia Para El Sector de Vivienda: Periodo 2008-2012*.
- International Alliance of Inhabitants (IAI), Guatemala. Living on the edge of the abyss. http://www.habitants.org/news/local_info/guatemala._living_on_the_edge_of_the_abyss Accessed 9/17/2012.
- Jaramillo, S. (2008). Reflexiones de la “informalidad” fundiaria como peculiaridad de los mercados de suelo en América Latina. *Territorios*, 18-19, 11-53.
- Jaramillo, S. (2010). Constataciones empíricas y criterios para la adopción de una política de vivienda popular en alquiler en Colombia. In Escallón Gartner, C. (Ed.). *Arrendamiento y vivienda popular en Colombia como alternativa habitacional*, Uniandes Editions (pp. 221-233).
- Jaramillo, S. and Cuervo, N. (2009). *Dos décadas de política de vivienda en Bogotá apostando por el mercado*. Documentos CEDE. Bogotá: Universidad de los Andes.

- Jiménez, L. C. (2009). Espacialidad urbana de propietarios e inquilinos en sectores populares. El caso de Bogotá, 1938-2000. In Castillo, M. (Ed.). *Procesos Urbanos Informales y Territorio: Ensayos en torno a la construcción de sociedad, territorio y ciudad* (pp. 61-92). Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- Jiménez Huerta, E. R., Cruz Solís, H. and Rábago Anaya, J. de Jesús. (2004). Atlas de la producción de suelo urbano en el área metropolitana de Guadalajara, 1970 – 2000. investigación financiada por los fondos SEP/Conacyt, Ciencia Básica, R31042-S y la Universidad de Guadalajara, December 1999 to June 2004.
- Jiménez Huerta, E and Cruz Solís, H. (Eds.). (2012). *Superado la informalidad, nuevos desafíos: políticas para las colonias populares consolidadas*. Editorial Universitaria: Universidad de Guadalajara, Mexico.
- Jiménez Huerta, E. R., Cruz Solís, H. and Ubaldo Velázquez, C. (2012). El regreso a la irregularidad de las colonias populares. Títulos de propiedad y sucesión. In Clara Eugenia Salazar (Ed.), *Irregular. Suelo y mercado en América Latina* (pp. 337-377). El Colegio de México.
- Jiménez Huerta, E. R., y Ayala, M. de la Luz. (2014, forthcoming). Los ejidos y las comunidades indígenas ante la expansión de Guadalajara, 1920- 2000. In G. Olivera (Ed.), *A veinte años de la privatización del ejido: El desarrollo urbano de las ciudades mexicanas y su gestión hacia el futuro*, Centro Regional de Investigaciones Multidisciplinarias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Cuernavaca, Morelos, México.
- Jones, G. A. and Ward, P. (Eds.). (1994). *Methodology for Land and Housing Market Analysis*. London: University College Press.
- Joseph, J. A. (2005). *La Ciudad, la Crisis, y las Salidas: Democracia y Desarrollo en Espacios Urbanos Meso*. Alternativa Centro de Investigación Social y Educación Popular.
- Katz, B., Lang, R., Berube, A., (2006). *Redefining Urban and Suburban America: Evidence From Census 2000*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution Press.
- Katzman, R. (1999). *Segregación Residencial y Desigualdades Sociales en Montevideo*. CEPAL. Montevideo, Uruguay.
- Katzman, R., Retamoso, A., Holfman, G., and Fuentes, A. (1999). *Segregación Residencial y Desigualdades Sociales en Montevideo*. CEPAL. Montevideo, Uruguay.
- Katzman, R., Avila, S., Baraibar, X., Corbo, G., Filgueira, F., Errandonea, F., Furtado, M., Gelber, D., Retamoso, A., Rodriguez, F. (2004). *La ciudad fragmentada: Respuesta de los sectores populares urbanos a las transformaciones del mercado y del territorio en Montevideo*. Universidad Católica del Uruguay, Programa IPES. Montevideo, Uruguay.

- http://www.ucu.edu.uy/Portals/0/Publico/Facultades/Ciencias%20Humanas/IPES/GESU/Kaztman_et_al_La_ciudad_fragmentada.pdf.
- Katzman, Ruben y Retamoso, A. (2005). Segregación espacial, empleo y pobreza en Montevideo. *Revista CEPAL* 85.
http://www.ucu.edu.uy/Portals/0/Publico/Facultades/Ciencias%20Humanas/IPES/Documentos/Seg_y_empleo_Revista_CEPAL_IPES%20MS6.pdf.
- Kowarick, L. (1977). *The Logic of Disorder: Capitalist Expansion in the Metropolitan Area of Greater Sao Paulo*. IDS Discussion Paper, no 102. Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex, UK.
- Lang, R., and LeFurgy, J. (2007). *Boomburbs: The Rise of America's Accidental Cities*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Lattes, A. E. (1995). Urbanización, crecimiento urbano y migraciones en América Latina. *Población y Desarrollo: Tendencias y desafíos*, número especial conjunto de Pensamiento Iberoamericano (28) y Notas de Población (62), 211-260.
- Law 820. (July 2003). *Por la cual se expide el régimen de arrendamiento de vivienda urbana*. Diario Oficial, Congreso de Colombia, Colombia.
- Leeds, A. (1969). The significant variables determining the character of squatter settlements. *America Latina*, 12, 44-86.
- Lefebvre, H. (1974). La producción del espacio. *Papers: revista de sociologia*, 3, 219-229.
- León, L. (2006). Qué se ha hecho en legalización de barrios. Radio Program: Territorio Capital. UN Radio. September 26, 2006. Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- López Moreno, E. (1996). *La vivienda social: Una historia*. Editorial de la Red Nacional de Investigación Urbana, Universidad de Guadalajara, ORSTOM y Universidad Católica de Lovaina, Puebla, México.
- López Borbón, W. (2003). *Origen de la Informalidad Urbana En Bogotá, Años Cincuenta*. Universidad Piloto.
- Lozano, W. (1996). La Vida Mala: Economía informal, estado, y pobladores urbanos en Santo Domingo. In Alejandro Portes and Carlos Dore-Cabral, (Eds.). *Ciudades del Caribe*.
- Lozano, W. (1997). Dominican Republic: Informal Economy, the State, and the Urban Poor. In Alejandro Portes (Ed.) *The Urban Caribbean*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lozano, W. and Duarte, I. (1992). Proceso de Urbanización, Modelos de Desarrollo y Clases Sociales en República Dominicana, 1960-1990. FLACSO Working Paper Series No. 5. Santo Domingo: FLACSO.

- Mangin, W. (1967). *Classification of Highland Communities in Latin America. 1st Edition*. México: Instituto Indigenista Interamericano.
- Marroquín, L. (2012). *Vivienda, un problema sin solución*. Siglo21, 18 de Junio. SIGLO21.com.gt
- Martínez, J. F. (2006). *El Proceso de Urbanización en Guatemala: Un Enfoque Demográfico 1950-2002*. Guatemala City: CEUR-USAC.
- Mathus Robles, M. A. (2009). La Lucha contra la Pobreza en México. *Observatorio de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 109. <http://www.eumed.net/cursecon/ecolat/mx/2009/mamr.htm>
- Menéndez, F. J. (2009). *INE Condiciones de vida en Montevideo-2do semestre 2008. Análisis comparativo entre las condiciones en los asentamientos irregulares y el tejido residencial formal, a la luz de la Encuesta Continua de Hogares*. Serie Documentos Temáticos N°1, Departamento de Estudios Sociodemográficos.
- Merklen, D. (2002). Un pobre es un pobre. La sociabilidad en el barrio: entre las condiciones y las prácticas. *Margen. Revista de Trabajo Social*. Buenos Aires.
- Millán, R. (2010). *Los efectos de la geografía de oportunidades sobre las preferencias de movilidad residencial al interior de barrios populares consolidados en Santiago de Chile, 1990-2010*. Tesis de Maestría, Instituto de Estudios Urbanos, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. (Profesor-guía: Francisco Sabatini).
- Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente – MVOTMA. (2008). *Políticas Urbano- habitacionales. Informe de divulgación*. Montevideo, Uruguay.
- Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente – MVOTMA / Programa de Mejoramiento Barrial – PMB. (2008). *Caracterización Física y Social de los Asentamientos Irregulares y sus entornos*. Coordinadora Arq. Martha Cecilio. Proyecto PNUD URU 05/005
- Molina, V. (2012, November 25) *Dime dónde vives y te diré... Revista Pesquisa*.
- Montaño, J. (1976). *Los pobres de la ciudad de México en los asentamientos espontáneos*. Mexico DF: Siglo XXI
- Morales Schechinger, C. (2004). *Propuesta de política federal articulada sobre suelo urbano para México*. Documento preparado para reunión sobre el conocimiento y exploración de las diversas acciones y alternativas en materia de suelo de la Subsecretaría de Desarrollo Urbano y Ordenación del Territorio del Gobierno Federal de México. www.territorioysuelo.org.
- Moran, A. (2000). *Condiciones de Vida y Tenencia de la Tierra en Asentamientos Precarios de la Ciudad de Guatemala*. Guatemala City: CEUR-USAC.

- Moser, C. (2008). *Assets, livelihoods and social policy*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Moser, C. (2009). *Ordinary families, extraordinary lives: Assets and poverty reduction in Guayaquil, 1978-2004*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.
- Municipalidad Metropolitana de Lima. (2012). *Diagnostico Técnico Participativo del Plan Regional de Desarrollo Concertado de Lima 2012-2025*.
http://www.planlima.gob.pe/html/documentos_plan_completo.html
- Municipio de Guatemala. (2012a). Barrio Querido: La Florida. <http://cultura.muniguate.com/index.php/component/content/article/38-cllaflorida/120-portadalaflorida>.
- Municipio de Guatemala. (2012b). Barrio Querido: El Gallito. <http://cultura.muniguate.com/index.php/component/content/article/35-elgallito/77-portadaelgallito>
- Muraida, L., and Pusch, C. (2009). *Hacia un Camino Limpio: Gestión comunitaria de desechos sólidos en asentamientos precarios*. Bjorn Sletto. (Ed.) Austin, Texas.
- Oficina Nacional de Estadística. (2002). *VII censo de población y vivienda*. Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.
- Oficina Nacional de Estadística. (2012). *IX Censo Nacional de Población y Vivienda*. Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.
- Oficina Nacional de Planificación. (2005). *Atlas de la Pobreza en la República Dominicana*. Secretariado Técnico de la Presidencia. Santo Domingo, República Dominicana.
- Ortiz, A. (2012). Gobierno presenta política de vivienda. *Prensa Libre, June 15, Economía*.
- Osorio Bautista, S. (2005). *La Formación del Espacio Urbano y la Construcción de una Clase Media Emergente: el caso del distrito de Los Olivos en el Cono Norte de Lima*. MA thesis, Department of Sociology, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Lima, Perú.
- Panfichi, A. (2009). Urbanización Temprana en Lima, 1535-1900. In P. V. Centeno (Ed.), *Lima: diversidad y fragmentación en una metrópoli emergente* (pp. 143-166). Quito, Ecuador: Organización Latinoamericana y del Caribe de Centros Históricos.
- Parias, A. (2008). El mercado de arrendamiento en los barrios informales en Bogotá. Un mercado estructural. *Revista Territorios*, 18-19, 90-125.
- Peek, O. (2013). *Living between desires and possibilities: [re]visiting and [re]envisioning the self-help house in the 'consolidated' self-help settlements of*

- Lima, Peru*. Thesis conducted for the Advanced Master Program of Human Settlements, KU Leuven, Department of Architecture, Urbanism and Planning.
- Pellegrino, A. (2010). *La población de Uruguay. Breve caracterización demográfica*. UNFPA. Edición Doble Clic. Montevideo, Uruguay. http://www.unfpa.org.uy/userfiles/publications/5_file1.pdf. Recuperado Julio 2013.
- Pelling, M. (2002). Assessing urban vulnerability and social adaptation to risk. IDPR: 59-76.
- Perlman, J. E. (1976). *The myth of marginality: urban poverty and politics in Rio de Janeiro*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Perlman, J. E. (2010). *Favela: Four decades of living on the edge of Rio de Janeiro*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pons, F. M. (1985). *Situación de la Vivienda en la República Dominicana*. Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic: FORUM, Amigos de Hogar.
- Population Reference Bureau. (2003). *World Population Sheet*. Washington, D.C.
- Portes, A. (1972). Rationality in the slums: an essay in interpretive sociology. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 14(3), 268 – 286.
- Portes, A., and Hoffman, K. (2003). Latin American class structures: Their composition and change during the neoliberal era. *Latin American Research Review*, 38(1), 41–82.
- Pradilla, E. and Márquez, L. (2008). Presente y futuro de las metrópolis en América Latina. *Territorios*, 18-19, 147-181.
- Programa de Integración de Asentamientos Irregulares – PIAI. (2008). *Caracterización Física y Social de los Asentamientos Irregulares y sus entornos*. Coordinadora Arq. Martha Cecilio. Proyecto PNUD URU 05/005
- Programa Mejoramiento de Barrios Componentes. (2011). Retrieved from: <http://www.promeba.org.ar/institucional/index1024.html>. Translated by Kellee Usher.
- ProUrbana - Programa de Apoyo a las Políticas Urbanas y de Suelo en Chile del Centro de Políticas Públicas de la Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. (2010). *Efectos del subsidio diferenciado a la localización sobre la ubicación de la vivienda social y en los precios del suelo*. Research Report to the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. Santiago: ProUrbana.
- Puentes, R., and Warren, D. *One-Fifth of America: A Comprehensive Guide to America's First Suburbs* Washington DC: The Brookings Institution Press.

- Ramírez, R. (2012). *Mercados urbanos desregulados, generadores de oportunidades y riesgos*. Paper presented at IX Seminario de Investigación Urbano Regional. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Riofrio, Gustavo and Driant, Jean-Claude (1987). *Que Vivienda Han Construido? Nuevos problemas en Viejas barriadas*. Centro de Investigación, Desarrollo y Asesoría Poblacional Máximo Lima: Peru
- Roberts, B. R. (1973). *Organizing Strangers*. Austin and London: University of Texas Press.
- Roberts, B. R. (1974). The interrelationships of city and provinces in Peru and Guatemala. In W. Cornelius and F. Trueblood (Eds.), *Latin American Urban Research* (pp. 207-235). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Roberts, B. R. (2011). The Consolidation of the Latin American City and the Undermining of Social Cohesion. *City & Community*, 10 (4), 414-423.
- Rosenbarger, B., and Sertzen, P. (2012). *Los Cinco Corazones: Desarrollo integral y salud ambiental a través de la lombricultura comunitaria*. Bjorn Sletto. (Ed.) Austin, Texas.
- Sabatini, F. and Wormald, G. (2004). La guerra de la basura de Santiago: Desde el derecho a la vivienda al derecho a la ciudad. *Revista EURE*, 30(91), 67-86.
- Sabatini, F., Vásquez, H., Robles, S., and Rasse, A. (2010). Gentrificación sin expulsión, fuerza de transformación de las ciudades latinoamericanas: datos e interpretación para Santiago. In Francisco Sabatini, Rodrigo Salcedo, Guillermo Wormald, and Gonzalo Cáceres, (Eds). *Tendencias de la segregación en las Principales Ciudades Chilenas; Análisis Censal 1982-2002*. Santiago: Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.
- Sabatini, F., Mora, P., Casgrain, A., and Polanco, I. (2013). *Hacia una política de fomento del alquiler en Chile*. Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo.
- Sáenz, H. (2009). La práctica del arrendamiento habitacional en 4 barrios populares de Bogotá, *Otra Economía*, III (4-1), 155-173.
- Safa, H. I. (1995). Reestructuración económica y subordinación de género. *Caribbean Studies* 28(1): 197-222.
- Scobie, J. (1974). *Buenos Aires: plaza to suburb 1870-1910*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scobie, J. (1977). *Buenos Aires: Del centro a los barrios, 1870-1910*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Solar.
- SEGOB, Secretaría de Gobernación. (2007). Convenio para el otorgamiento de testamento a bajo costo.

- <http://www.ordenjuridico.gob.mx/Noticias/NoticiasRNT/TestBajoCosto/convenio2.pdf>, p. 4.
- Serrano, L. and Díaz-Saenz, H. (2006). *Cemex Mexico: The path to responsible competitiveness*. Social Enterprise Knowledge Network. Retrieved from: <http://hbr.org/product/cemex-mexico-the-path-to-responsible-competitivene/an/SKE083-PDF-ENG?N=4294958507&Ntt=+&Nao=8080>, p. 22.
- SHF, Secretaría Hipotecaria Federal. (2009). Mercado de vivienda en renta, Dirección de Estudios Económicos de la Vivienda, Mexico, September, pp. 11.
- Skinner, R. (1982). Self-help community organization and politics: Villa el Salvador, Lima. In Peter Ward (Ed.), *Self-help Housing: A Critique* (pp. 209-229). Mansell Press.
- Stovall, D., Strange, S. M., and Thomen. M. (2008). *El Rincón de los Olvidados: Métodos para el estudio de riesgo y vulnerabilidad en asentamientos precarios*. Ed. Bjorn Sletto. Austin, Texas
- Sullivan, E. and Ward, P.M. (2012). "Sustainable housing applications and policies for low-income self-build and housing rehab." *Habitat International* 36 (2): 312–323.
- Tejada Holguín, R. and Lizardo, J. (2004). Los Nudos de la Pobreza en Tres Barrios del Distrito Nacional. Centro de Estudios Sociales Padre Juan Montalvo, S.J. Santo Domingo, República Dominicana
- Topalov, C. (2013). Los grandes conjuntos habitacionales ¿un problema solamente urbano? Casa Galván, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Plantel Azcapotzalco, 27 agosto, Conference, Mexico City.
- Torres, A. (1993). *La ciudad en la sombra Barrios y luchas populares. 1950-1977*, Bogotá: C1NEP.
- Torres, H. A. (2001). Cambios socioterritoriales en Buenos Aires durante la década de 1990. *Eure* (Santiago), 27(80), 33-56.
- Torres, J. and Pérez, E. (2008). Caracterización del mercado de arrendamiento urbano para el segmento de población de bajos ingresos. *Revista INVI*, 23 (063), 53-87.
- Turner, J. F. C. (1968a). The squatter settlement: architecture that works. *Architectural Design*, 38, 355-60.
- Turner, J. F. C. (1968b). Housing Priorities, Settlement Patterns, and Urban Development in Modernizing Countries. *American Institute of Planners*, 34(6), 354-363.
- Turner, J. F. C. (1976a). *Vivienda, todo el poder para los usuarios. Hacia la economía en la construcción del entorno*. Edición española Madrid: Hermann Blume (1977).
- Turner, J.F.C. (1976b). *Housing by People: Towards Autonomy in Building Environments*. London: Marion Boyars.

- Turner, J.F.C. and Fichter, R. (Eds.). (1972). *Freedom to Build: Dweller Control of the Housing Process*. New York: Macmillan Publishers.
- United Nations Division of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (UN_DESA_PD) Rural-Urban Population Database, 1950 – 1965.
http://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/unup/index_panel1.html
- UN- HABITAT. (2003). *Rental Housing: an essential option for the urban poor in developing countries*, UN-Habitat, Nairobi.
- UN-HABITAT. (2007). *Forced evictions – Towards Solutions?* Second Report of the Advisory Group on Forced Evictions to the Executive Director of UN-HABITAT. Kenya: Advisory Group on Forced evictions.
- Valladares, L. and Moran, A. (2006). *El Crecimiento de la Ciudad de Guatemala, 1944-2005*. Guatemala City: CEUR-USAC.
- Varley, A. (1998, September). *Land and democracy: new responses to illegal urban development in Guadalajara, Mexico*. Paper presented at meeting of *Latin American Studies Association*, Chicago, Illinois.
- Varley, A. (1998, July). Decentralization or fragmentation? Reflections on urban land reform in Mexico. Paper presented at meeting of *Comparative Policy Perspectives on Urban Land Market Reform in Latin America, Southern Africa and Eastern Europe*, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Varley, A. and Blasco, M. (2003). Older women's living arrangements and family relationships in urban Mexico." *Women's Studies International Forum*, 26(6), 525-539.
- Violich, F. (1987). *Urban Planning in Latin America: The Challenge of Metropolitan Growth*. Cambridge Mass: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Ward, P. M. (1976). The Squatter Settlement as Slum or Housing Solution: Evidence from Mexico City", *Land Economics*, 52, 3, 330-346.
- Ward, P.M. (Ed.). (1982). *Self-Help Housing: A critique*. London: Mansell.
- Ward, P.M. (1976). The Squatter Settlement as Slum or Housing Solution: Evidence from Mexico City. *Land Economics*, 52(3), 330-346.
- Ward, P.M. (1990). *Mexico City: The Production and Reproduction of an Urban Environment*. World Cities Series. London: Frances Pinter.
- Ward, P.M. (1993). "The Inner-City in Latin America: Differences of Degree, or of Kind?" *Environment and Planning A*, 25, 1131-1160.
- Ward, P. (1998). *Mexico City*. Chichester and New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Ward, P. M. (1999). *Colonias and Public Policy in Texas and Mexico, Urbanization by Stealth*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Ward, P.M. (2004). *México, Megaciudad: Desarrollo y política 1970-2002*. El Colegio Mexiquense, Miguel Angel Porrúa.
- Ward, P.M. (2005). The Lack of ‘Cursive Thinking’ with Social theory and Public Policy: Four Decades of Marginality and Rationality in the so-called “Slum”. In Roberts, B. and Wood, C. (Eds.). *Rethinking Development in Latin America* (pp. 271-96). Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Ward, P. M. (2009). Hacia una segunda etapa de la regularización de los títulos de propiedad en México. (O, visto de otra manera) ‘¿Ay mamá, por qué moriste sin dejar un testamento? ¡Ya hay que hacer la regularización de nuevo!’” In Iracheta, A. (Ed.). *2do Congreso Nacional de Suelo Urbano* (pp. 123-39). El Colegio Mexiquense, Mexico.
- Ward, P.M. (2012a). Housing and Urban Regeneration in the First Suburbs and “Innerburbs” of the Americas. In *International Encyclopedia of Housing and the Home* (pp. 559-572). Elsevier.
- Ward, P.M. (2012b). Housing Policies in Developing Countries. In *International Encyclopedia of Housing and the Home* (pp. 219-227). Elsevier.
- Ward, P.M. (2012c) “A Patrimony for the Children”: Low Income Homeownership and Housing (im)Mobility in Latin American Cities. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers (AAAG)*, 102(6), 1489-1510.
- Ward, P. M. (2014). The Reproduction of Informality in Low Income Self-Help Housing Communities in the USA. In Loukaitou-Sideris, A. and Mukhija, V. (Eds.). *The Informal City in the USA*. Boston: MIT Press.
- Ward, P., Giusti, C., and de Souza, F. (2004). Colonia land and housing market performance and the impact of lot title regularization in Texas. *Urban Studies* 41(13), 2621-2646.
- Ward, P. M. and Jiménez. E. (2011). Self-help Housing Policies for Second Generation Inheritance and Succession of the House that Mum and Dad Built. (In collaboration with Erika Grajeda and Claudia Ubaldo Velázquez.) *Habitat International*, 35, 467-485.
- Ward, P. M., Way, H. and Wood, L. (2012). *Final Report and Statistical Appendices to the Texas Department of Community Affairs and the Texas Legislature, The Current Prevalence of Contract for Deed in Texas Colonias*. Available at: <http://www.lahn.utexas.org/Texas%20Colonias/TDHCA.html>
- Ward P. M., Jimenez E., Di Virgilio, M. (2014 under review) Methodology for Intensive Case Studies of Household Dynamics and Housing Consolidation. *Field Methods*.

Wilson, W. J. (1999). *The Bridge over the Racial Divide: Rising Inequality and Coalition Politics*. The University of California Press.

Wilson, R. H., Ward, P. M., Spink, P. K., and Rodríguez, V. E. (2008). *Governance in the Americas: Decentralization, Democracy, and Subnational Government in Brazil, Mexico and the USA*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Ziccardi, A. (Ed.). (2013). *Ciudades del 2010: Entre la sociedad del conocimiento y la desigualdad social*. Mexico DF: UNAM.