Expert opinions and recommendations
On the logic of the
Slum Prosperity Framework (SPF)

INTRODUCTION

The framework infuses principles of prosperity – culmination of proposed ideals that were conceived through content analysis – to have an idea of the degree of order in practice that is necessary to guide pursuits for slum intervention and improving prospects for prosperity. Does it seem logical to use (applicable) propositions of principles that should guide quests for prosperity as part of the basic design for a slum-prosperity framework?

It does, but it occurs to me that 'logical' and 'applicable' aren't necessarily the same thing, so you might have to be clear which you mean and/or how they might be related. For me, you can make something sound logical as an intellectual position, but this doesn't necessarily imply practicality?

Following the above, it might be interesting to do this in two parts. First, develop a 'logical' conceptual framework – from literature review? – to establish how a concept of prosperity can be related to slum interventions; and then second, develop a means to make this practical in practice? Prosperity and slum are not usually terms that are considered in the same place, so there's a degree of novelty and potential innovation here.

The SPF proposes the use of the SPM[1] to comprehensively describe the slum through the sets of properties, as a basic action for intervention in slums. it's **role** in describing the slum (the cognitive aspect of the slum it captures), it's **definition**, **why** it is important to capture, some useful background **information** about it and in relation to Developing Region slums, suggestions of **what to look for** to describe it, and the property **type** to guide how to look for it and document it. Does it seem logical to engage in doing this activity as an initial strategy for slum intervention?

It does, and this seems to reinforce the point I was making above, about developing a conceptual model and then a means of application.

Is your manual gathering information in support of your conceptual development, or is the manual intended to influence change?

The operational SPM proposes tags/anchors between properties that describe the slum, which should be explored to capture how they can affect/influence/trigger each other. For clarity, stakeholders should use this information to form a

---

[1] The SPM is also proposed as a standalone framework for describing slums to effectively intervene not necessarily for the pursuit of prosperity.

Aisha abubakar
Department of Architecture

Expert opinions and recommendations
On the logic of the
Slum Prosperity Framework (SPF)

narrative of the slum by following a proposed hierarchy for presenting the properties in the narration. These links and proposed hierarchy of slum properties are logical connections identified in theory and from content analysis. Doing this provides stakeholders with a heuristic profile where effects and impacts of actions can be considered in addition to knowledge about the slum. Does it seem logical to propose that stakeholders take steps to avail themselves with such rich information and applicable frames of action whilst approaching slum intervention?

I think the effectiveness of this will depend to a degree on the priorities and capabilities of stakeholders.

I would assume that there will need to be pretty careful processes applied to the identification of appropriate stakeholders, the method of engagement with them and what it is realistic to expect from them. There will presumably be significant ethics implications in operationalising this?

The narratives present stakeholders with a throve of basic, interactive and applicable knowledge about a slum that help to provide a sense of direction on its general character, aspects that are influential to it, and those that have a wide impact in it. Does it seem logical to engage in doing this activity as an initial strategy for slum intervention?

Getting insight into the attitudes, experiences, priorities etc of slum dwellers at an early stage in the research seems crucial to me.

As above, I think this depends on what you want to get from stakeholders, and then how you use these findings and for what purpose. If it's to gain local insights into the experience of slum occupation, this may have different methodological implications from gaining insights that can be directly related to future processes of intervention.

Essentially also, the narration of the slum provides a slum map that can be analysed to position it in relation to areas of prosperity within which actions can be taken.[2] Prosperity indicators were analysed (through content analysis) and proposed as a tool to guide this action. It encourages stakeholders to consider all the properties of a slum that indicates a prosperity situation, and degrees to which slum properties hinder or enhance prosperity. Stakeholders can consider the most logical paths to implement and move the slum from a prosperity situation ('a' for instance) to a more progressive one ('b' for instance) and improve livelihoods as a whole. Does this seem like a logical action that can augment endeavours towards effective and inclusive slum intervention?

It does seem logical, but it might be worth clarifying exactly what kinds of interventions you have in mind here, and with what anticipated outcome.

---

[2] The potential to combine the SPM into a dynamic framework across areas of prosperity that match slum properties was also part of conceptual analysis done.

Aisha abubakar
Department of Architecture

Expert opinions and recommendations
On the logic of the
Slum Prosperity Framework (SPF)

The SPF also proposes that the design of intervention to improve livelihoods, should consider the needs of the people that are basic for survival first and how this can impact on other life requirements, within the considerations for action. Does it seem logical to encourage stakeholders to approach slum intervention in a manner that takes basic human needs into consideration?

I would have thought that consideration of basic human needs would be an essential starting point here. Little else could be accomplished until this is in place?

I may have missed this, but who are your stakeholders? Are they slum dwellers, or external agencies that have power to change through interventions? Or both?

Cities take different paths to prosperity, and economic considerations are a driving influence in slum management choices for cities. the SPF seeks to see how slum communities and the varying dimensions within which they exist can play a key role in and become assets in the processes of enhancing prosperity. this as well embeds and further enhances economy. In this way intervention design will not only be appropriate to requirements of both slum and city, but also build human and place capacities for resilience. Does it seem like a logical action that can augment endeavours towards effective and inclusive slum intervention?

I think this will depend on how you define prosperity in the context of slums and the wider city environment. I'd imagine that conceptions of prosperity may be very different indeed depending on personal circumstances? It would be interesting to try to draw this out.

In addressing the complex nature of slums, and effectively pursuing prosperity, I argue that it is important to have a framework which is systematic, yet flexible and responsive. The framework proposes the four actions for prosperity in slums as activities that can be implemented in a systematic manner or as a progressive monitoring and assessment tool of the slum character, and achievements and improvements attained due to intervention – reviewing and adapting, re-assessing, changing, and mapping change. Does it seem logical to guide stakeholders towards intervention in slums in this way?

Possibly, but it's now occurring to me that at some point in the story it might emerge that there may be a need to identify what top-down interventions might be necessary – larger infrastructural interventions, for example, but that these may need to be implemented in sufficiently responsive ways so as not to obstruct or disincentive localised forms of bottom-up intervention. Can the optimal middle ground be identified through the methods you're proposing?

Aisha abubakar
Department of Architecture

Expert opinions and recommendations
On the logic of the
Slum Prosperity Framework (SPF)

For clarity of representation and efficient implementation of the SPF, it proposes the use of the Social Network Analysis (SNA) mapping, analytical, and monitoring tools to support the actions for prosperity. With your knowledge of challenges that slums communities face, and those that city administrations face in slum management, does it seem logical to propose the use of SNA as a method and tool to use to augment slum management?

I don't really have enough expertise here to contribute, but this does seem to hinge on finding methods that can accommodate a productive middle ground between top-down and bottom-up forms of intervention.

Would you like to provide feedback on the proposed activities for effective intervention and enhancing prosperity in the slum and city?

Would you also be interested in further communications to let you know the outcomes of research or other information regarding it that is of interest to you?

Of course – good luck!!

Aisha abubakar
Department of Architecture

Expert opinions and recommendations
On the logic of the
Slum Prosperity Framework (SPF)

Aisha abubakar
Department of Architecture