Leveraging Smart Urban Planning for Climate-Resilient and Affordable Housing in Rapidly Growing Cities: A Policy Framework for Abuja, Nigeria

Agbatar Grace Mngueshima; Prof Abegunde Albert; Daniel Adamu PhD; Prof. Igyuse
Department of Urban and Regional Planning,
Federal Polytechnic Wannune, Nigeria
Email: gracebologo@gmail.com
Phone/WhatsApp: +2348036025080
https://doi.org/10.56201/ijgem.vol.12.no10.2026.pg472.482

Abstract
Rapid urban growth increasingly forces low- and middle-income households into hazard-exposed locations or unaffordable formal markets, making "resilience" and "affordability" inseparable planning problems. This paper examines how smart urban planning—understood as data-enabled, risk-informed, and institutionally coordinated spatial governance—can support climate-resilient and affordable housing delivery in fast-growing cities, using Abuja, Nigeria, as an illustrative policy case. A structured narrative review and targeted policy–legal analysis synthesise evidence across climate adaptation, housing affordability, land governance, and smart-city data governance, focusing on mechanisms rather than technology adoption alone. The synthesis shows four recurring constraints: (1) weak enforcement of risk-sensitive land-use controls, (2) land and infrastructure sequencing failures that inflate serviced-land scarcity, (3) fragmented data ecosystems that exclude informal residents and undermine trust, and (4) affordability programmes that neglect land value dynamics and tenure security. The paper's main contribution is a practical framework that couples climate-risk mapping with inclusion safeguards, serviced-land pipelines, and equity-sensitive land value tools (including land readjustment) to expand safe, serviced, and affordable housing options. Policy implications emphasise that smart planning must be judged by distributive outcomes—who gains safe access to land and services—rather than by digitisation metrics.

Keywords: *Smart urban planning; climate resilience; affordable housing; land governance; spatial data governance; Abuja*

1. Introduction

Affordable housing deficits in rapidly growing cities are no longer only "supply" problems; they increasingly reflect how urban land, infrastructure, and climate risk are governed as a coupled system (UN-Habitat, 2011; UN-Habitat, 2020). In many fast-urbanising contexts, households absorb the consequences of planning failure through three channels: (a) exposure to floods, heat, and other hazards because safe land is scarce or expensive; (b) exclusion from formal housing markets due to serviced-land shortages and rent inflation; and (c) insecurity created by fragmented land administration and inconsistent development control (IPCC, 2022; World Bank, 2017). These channels interact: when risk-sensitive land-use controls are weak, hazard-prone

land becomes the default "affordable" option; when infrastructure investment is delayed or spatially inconsistent, land values and housing costs rise disproportionately in serviced areas; and when data systems undercount or misrecognise informal settlements, planning decisions can intensify exclusion rather than reduce it (Taylor, 2017; OECD, 2020).

"Smart city" agendas have promised to improve these outcomes through sensors, geospatial analytics, digital registries, and real-time coordination. Yet the evidence suggests that technology adoption alone rarely resolves structural drivers of unaffordable, risk-exposed housing. Instead, digitisation can repackage existing inequalities if planning institutions lack enforceable rules, inclusive data governance, and accountability for distributive outcomes (Cardullo & Kitchin, 2019; Wernick & Artyushina, 2023). The core analytical problem is therefore not whether cities can use data, but whether they can use it to expand equitable access to safe land, resilient infrastructure, and affordable housing pathways under conditions of rapid growth and institutional constraints (Meerow, Newell, & Stults, 2016; Tedeschi, 2024).

This paper focuses on Abuja, Nigeria, because it exemplifies the governance pressures of fast-growing administrative and economic hubs: rapid peripheral expansion, escalating land values, uneven infrastructure extension, and growing exposure to climate-related flooding and heat stress. Nigeria's planning and housing governance is shaped by formal legal instruments (including the Nigerian Urban and Regional Planning Act, 1992) and national housing policy frameworks that articulate objectives around access, affordability, and housing-sector coordination (Federal Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, 2012; Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1992). However, policy intent does not automatically translate into affordable, climate-safe outcomes when land delivery and infrastructure sequencing are misaligned or when enforcement is politically constrained—challenges documented in Abuja's mass-housing and public–private partnership experiences (Ukoje & Kanu, 2014). Abuja therefore provides a useful case for examining how "smart planning" can be redirected from technology-led modernisation to outcome-led, risk- and equity-sensitive governance.

The paper advances four core claims. First, climate resilience and housing affordability must be planned jointly, because the market mechanism that "prices" hazard risk often pushes low-income residents into unsafe locations rather than reducing exposure (IPCC, 2022; Hallegatte, Vogt-Schilb, Bangalore, & Rozenberg, 2017). Second, the principal affordability bottleneck in rapidly growing cities is frequently serviced land, not building technology; smart planning must therefore prioritise serviced-land pipelines and infrastructure–land synchronisation (UN-Habitat, 2011; World Bank, 2024a). Third, data-driven planning can improve targeting and enforcement only if data governance is inclusive, rights-respecting, and trusted—otherwise it risks reinforcing invisibility or punitive recognition of informal residents (Taylor, 2017; OECD, 2023). Fourth, land value dynamics must be explicitly governed through transparent instruments (for example, land readjustment and related value capture tools), because ignoring land values undermines both affordability and the financing of resilience infrastructure (Souza, Ochi, & Hosono, 2018; World Bank, 2024b).

Aim: To develop and critically justify a smart urban planning framework that improves climate-resilient and affordable housing delivery in rapidly growing cities, using Abuja as an illustrative policy case.

Objectives:

- To synthesise evidence on how climate risk and housing affordability interact through planning and land markets.
- To evaluate how smart planning tools (GIS, digital platforms, data systems) affect housing outcomes under capacity constraints.
- To identify governance and land-instrument pathways that expand safe, serviced, and affordable housing options.
- To propose a transferable planning framework with actionable recommendations for Abuja and comparable cities.

Research questions:

1. How do climate risk and housing affordability interact through planning and land markets in rapidly growing cities?
2. How do smart planning tools (GIS, digital platforms, and data systems) affect housing outcomes under capacity constraints?
3. What governance and land-instrument pathways expand safe, serviced, and affordable housing options?
4. How can a transferable planning framework be developed to provide actionable recommendations for Abuja and comparable cities?

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows: Section 2 reviews literature on climate-resilient housing, affordability and land markets, smart planning and data governance, and land-based instruments for rapid growth contexts, concluding with the research gap and contribution. Section 3 outlines the review design and policy–legal analysis approach. Section 4 presents synthesised findings aligned to the research questions. Section 5 discusses implications for theory and practice and sets out policy and implementation implications. Section 6 concludes with recommendations and directions for future research.

2. Research gap and contribution

Three gaps motivate this paper. First, resilience and affordability are still frequently treated as separate policy domains, even though land and infrastructure decisions link them tightly in rapidly growing cities. This separation encourages adaptation investments that inadvertently raise housing costs or shift risk burdens to low-income households (IPCC, 2022; Anguelovski et al., 2018). Second, smart-city and smart-planning literature often emphasises technological capability (data, platforms, analytics) more than the institutional and rights conditions under which these tools improve distributive outcomes in housing and land governance (Cardullo & Kitchin, 2019; OECD, 2023). Third, land-based delivery instruments such as land readjustment are discussed in policy circles but are less often integrated into a coherent smart-planning framework that explicitly manages climate risk, serviced-land scarcity, and inclusion safeguards together (World Bank, 2024b; UN-Habitat, 2019).

This paper contributes by synthesising these strands into a policy-ready framework for climate-resilient and affordable housing delivery under rapid growth. The framework is anchored in two lenses—urban resilience (system's capacity and risk governance) and data justice (visibility, participation, discrimination)—and operationalised through actionable planning and land instruments suited to Abuja's governance realities while transferable to comparable cities.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research design

This study adopts a structured narrative review with an embedded policy–legal analysis for Abuja. A narrative review design is appropriate because the research questions are mechanism-focused—how planning, land governance, and data systems jointly shape resilience and affordability—requiring integration across disciplines (urban planning, climate adaptation, housing policy, and digital governance). The Abuja policy case is used illustratively to stress-test the plausibility of the proposed framework against institutional and legal constraints rather than to claim causal attribution from primary data.

3.2 Data sources and sampling

Two categories of sources were used. First, peer-reviewed literature on climate-resilient urban development, affordable housing and land markets, smart cities and data governance, and land-based instruments (including land readjustment and land administration digitisation). Second, authoritative policy and legal sources relevant to Nigeria and the Abuja context, including national housing policy documents and planning legislation. The legal and policy baseline includes the Nigerian Urban and Regional Planning Act (No. 88 of 1992) and the National Housing Policy (2012), which articulate statutory expectations for plan preparation, development control, and housing-sector coordination (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1992; Federal Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, 2012).

Source identification followed three steps: (1) targeted keyword searches using combinations of "smart planning", "GIS", "data governance", "climate risk", "flood", "heat", "affordable housing", "serviced land", "land value capture", "land readjustment", "land administration digitisation", and "tenure security"; (2) backward and forward citation tracing from highly cited and recent review or policy anchor texts; and (3) purposive inclusion of Nigeria/Abuja-relevant studies on housing delivery and implementation constraints to ensure contextual grounding (e.g., Ukoje & Kanu, 2014). Priority was given to recent (approximately 2015–2025) peer-reviewed sources and major institutional reports, while older sources were included selectively where foundational (e.g., core smart-city and resilience framing).

3.3 Measures and instruments

Because this is a synthesis paper, "measures" are conceptual and policy-operational rather than statistical. The review extracted recurring variables and mechanisms described across sources, including:

- Climate risk governance mechanisms (risk mapping, zoning restrictions, adaptive standards, infrastructure redundancy).
- Affordability mechanisms (serviced-land supply, land value dynamics, tenure and transaction costs, incremental housing pathways).
- Smart planning mechanisms (data integration, planning support systems, monitoring, institutional coordination).
- Data justice and governance mechanisms (visibility of informal residents, participation, privacy, accountability, redress).
- Land-based instruments (land readjustment, value capture approaches, land administration digitisation safeguards).

For Abuja, the policy–legal analysis considered how these mechanisms interact with statutory

planning responsibilities and housing policy priorities set out in national instruments, and with documented implementation challenges in mass housing schemes.

3.4 Data analysis

Analysis used thematic synthesis. Extracted mechanisms were coded into four analytical clusters aligned to the research questions: (1) risk–affordability coupling mechanisms, (2) governance conditions for effective smart planning, (3) land and infrastructure delivery instruments, and (4) inclusion safeguards and rights risks. Within each cluster, the synthesis compared points of consensus and disagreement and identified boundary conditions (e.g., where an instrument works only with strong valuation capacity or where digitisation increases exclusion without accessibility safeguards). The output is a consolidated framework linking tools (what cities do), governance conditions (how they do it), and outcomes (who benefits and who is protected).

3.5 Ethics

This study relies on secondary sources and public documents and therefore does not involve human participants, personal data collection, or interventions requiring formal ethical review. Nevertheless, the framework explicitly incorporates privacy, accountability, and non-discrimination considerations consistent with the ethics literature on data governance and human-rights-based approaches to smart city technologies (Taylor, 2017; Wernick & Artyushina, 2023).

3.6 Limitations

The main limitation is that the paper does not provide new primary empirical measurements for Abuja (e.g., household surveys or spatial econometric analysis). As a result, the findings are best interpreted as policy-relevant synthesis and framework development rather than causal estimation. A second limitation is that implementation feasibility varies across institutions; the framework identifies prerequisites (legal clarity, valuation capacity, participation mechanisms) but cannot guarantee political adoption. Finally, the synthesis is constrained by the availability and quality of published evidence on digitised land governance impacts across contexts; emerging evidence is incorporated, but further empirical work remains necessary (Pfeifer et al., 2020; Kavuri & Ramanathan, 2024).

4. Results / Findings

4.1 Climate risk and affordability are produced by the same spatial decisions

The synthesis indicates that climate vulnerability and housing unaffordability often share a common cause: the governance of land allocation and infrastructure extension. When risk-sensitive zoning is weak or selectively enforced, hazard-prone land becomes the “affordable” frontier, not because it is safe or efficient, but because it is under-regulated and under-serviced. This produces a predictable pattern: low-income households bear exposure, while formal markets capture the value of safer, serviced areas (IPCC, 2022; Hallegatte et al., 2017). For Abuja, documented implementation constraints in mass housing delivery suggest that formal supply can expand without proportionate affordability if land and infrastructure costs are not managed and if delivery targets are misaligned with household purchasing power (Ukoje & Kanu, 2014).

4.2 Serviced land pipelines are the binding constraint for scalable affordability

Across the housing and planning evidence base, the most consistent bottleneck for affordable delivery at scale is not building technology but serviced land availability. Where trunk infrastructure (roads, drainage, water, sanitation) is not planned and delivered ahead of plots, the number of developable parcels is rationed and land values escalate. This dynamic is particularly damaging under rapid population growth because it fuels speculative holding and pushes households toward informal or peripheral solutions that then require expensive retrofitting (UN-Habitat, 2011; World Bank, 2024a). The practical lesson is that "smart planning" should treat serviced land delivery as a monitored pipeline—sequenced, mapped, and tied to performance milestones—rather than as an ad hoc by-product of development approvals.

4.3 Smart planning improves housing outcomes only under inclusive data governance

Smart planning tools—GIS-based suitability analysis, hazard overlays, and development monitoring—can materially improve decision quality, but only when data governance is inclusive and trusted. The review highlights two failure modes. First, invisibility: informal settlements and renters are undercounted in official datasets, leading to investment decisions that ignore real demand and vulnerability (Taylor, 2017; Tedeschi, 2024). Second, punitive visibility: where informality is mapped primarily for enforcement, data systems can intensify evictions or service denial rather than support safe upgrading and inclusion (Wernick & Artyushina, 2023). Evidence on smart city participation shows that many initiatives limit residents to passive roles, reducing legitimacy and weakening the behavioural compliance needed for planning rules to work (Cardullo & Kitchin, 2019).

OECD policy work on smart city data governance reinforces that effective smart planning requires clear rules on data access, privacy, accountability, interoperability, and mechanisms to ensure that data use improves residents' well-being rather than only administrative efficiency (OECD, 2020; OECD, 2023). For housing, this means that data platforms should be designed to answer equity questions—who lacks safe access, where services are missing, which risks are concentrated—rather than only to optimise traffic or revenue collection.

4.4 Digitised land administration can strengthen tenure—or accelerate exclusion

Digitised land administration is frequently promoted as a transparency and efficiency reform, and professional guidance recognises its potential to improve service delivery and reduce transaction costs (FIG, 2022). Yet the synthesis shows that digitisation outcomes depend heavily on rights safeguards, accessibility, and power relations. Human rights–oriented land governance analyses document that digital systems can become tools for land grabs or rapid market consolidation when they enable faster reallocation of rights without due process or when communities lack meaningful participation and legal protections (Pfeifer et al., 2020; Bludnik, 2022). Comparative legal analysis similarly warns that digitisation must address the digital divide and procedural fairness to avoid systematic exclusion (Kavuri & Ramanathan, 2024).

For Abuja and similar cities, the implication is that digitised registries and permitting systems should be paired with: accessible service channels (including non-digital options), clear dispute resolution pathways, transparent audit trails, and explicit recognition of diverse tenure forms where legally possible. Otherwise, smart planning may improve administrative efficiency while worsening housing access for those already marginalised.

4.5 Land readjustment and value tools are promising but governance-sensitive

Land readjustment is consistently identified as a potentially powerful instrument to expand planned urban land supply, finance infrastructure, and support compact growth, including for climate adaptation. World Bank analysis positions land readjustment as a land value tool that can support sustainable urban development and climate adaptation when supported by robust legal frameworks and careful design (World Bank, 2024b). The JICA comparative evidence base further shows that land readjustment can be adapted to developing contexts, but its success depends on institutional capacity, transparent valuation, and legitimacy-building participation (Souza et al., 2018). UN-Habitat case law evidence highlights that equity risks emerge when vulnerable rights holders are not properly recognised or compensated and when dispute resolution is weak (UN-Habitat, 2019).

The synthesis therefore treats land readjustment not as a generic solution but as a conditional instrument: suitable where land fragmentation is high, planned expansion is needed, and political conditions allow negotiated replotting, but risky where tenure is contested or where valuation and participation capacity are low. Smart tools can support transparency (mapping, valuation models, project tracking), but they cannot replace legal safeguards or legitimacy.

5. Discussion

The findings support a central argument: smart urban planning can contribute to climate-resilient and affordable housing only when it is reframed from a technology programme to a distributive governance strategy. Under the urban resilience lens, the priority is not merely to "predict" hazards but to reduce exposure through enforceable spatial rules and to increase adaptive capacity through coordinated infrastructure and housing pathways (Meerow et al., 2016; IPCC, 2022). Under the data justice lens, the priority is to ensure that data-driven governance does not reproduce invisibility, exclusion, or discriminatory enforcement, particularly against informal residents and renters (Taylor, 2017; Tedeschi, 2024).

This reframing clarifies why many smart-city initiatives underperform on housing outcomes. If planning institutions cannot enforce risk-sensitive zoning, data dashboards do not prevent settlement in floodplains. If serviced land is rationed, digital permitting systems can accelerate approvals for higher-income developments while leaving affordable supply structurally constrained. If land administration digitisation proceeds without rights safeguards, it can facilitate rapid market consolidation, raising barriers to entry for low-income households and undermining tenure security (Pfeifer et al., 2020; Kavuri & Ramanathan, 2024).

For Abuja, these dynamics imply that a credible "smart planning" agenda must start with planning fundamentals: a risk-informed, enforceable land-use regime; a mapped and financed serviced-land pipeline; and governance coordination across land, planning, utilities, and housing agencies consistent with statutory responsibilities (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1992; Federal Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, 2012). The Abuja mass housing experience indicates that formal delivery mechanisms can still miss affordability targets when implementation design is not aligned to household incomes and when the land–infrastructure–finance chain is fragmented (Ukoje & Kanu, 2014). Smart tools can help detect these mismatches early, but only if institutions use them to correct course and if performance is judged against affordability and safety outcomes, not against units "delivered" or platforms launched.

The results also caution against overgeneralisation. Cities differ in legal tenure systems, administrative capacity, and political constraints. A framework that recommends land

readjustment, for example, must specify prerequisites (legal authority, valuation standards, dispute resolution, participation design) and must anticipate risks of elite capture. Similarly, risk mapping and enforcement are constrained by political economy: enforcement can be selective, and hazard restrictions can be contested where residents lack alternative affordable options. Therefore, the framework's practical value lies in sequencing: expanding safe serviced land and incremental housing pathways reduces the political and social costs of enforcement, making risk-sensitive controls more feasible over time.

5.1 Policy/practice implications

Three implementation implications follow. First, cities should institutionalise **risk-informed housing suitability** as a binding planning rule: hazard overlays must translate into enforceable development conditions and serviced-land prioritisation, not merely into reports (IPCC, 2022). Second, smart planning should prioritise **serviced-land pipeline governance**: map, finance, and monitor trunk infrastructure delivery in advance of plot release, and link approvals to infrastructure readiness to reduce speculative scarcity (UN-Habitat, 2011; World Bank, 2024a). Third, cities must adopt **inclusive spatial data governance**: establish clear data access and accountability rules, protect privacy, and create participatory mechanisms so informal residents are visible for service provision without being exposed to discriminatory enforcement (OECD, 2023; Taylor, 2017). Where land administration is digitised, rights safeguards and dispute resolution must be strengthened to ensure efficiency gains translate into tenure security rather than accelerated exclusion (FIG, 2022; Kavuri & Ramanathan, 2024). These implications jointly shift smart planning from an ICT procurement agenda to an outcome-led governance reform centred on safe, affordable access to land and services.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

This paper examined how smart urban planning can support climate-resilient and affordable housing in rapidly growing cities, using Abuja as an illustrative policy case. The synthesis shows that climate risk and affordability co-evolve through the same spatial decisions: land allocation, infrastructure sequencing, and enforcement capacity shape both exposure and prices. It also shows that smart planning improves outcomes only under inclusive data governance; otherwise, digitisation can reinforce invisibility or punitive recognition of vulnerable groups. In addition, the paper finds that serviced land is frequently the binding constraint on scalable affordability, meaning that housing programmes will underperform when land and infrastructure are not coordinated. Finally, land-based instruments such as land readjustment and related value approaches are promising for managing rapid growth and financing infrastructure, but they are governance-sensitive and require legal clarity, transparent valuation, and protections for vulnerable rights holders.

Answers to the research questions: Climate risk and housing affordability interact through governance of land-use control and infrastructure provision; smart planning improves equitable housing outcomes when institutions enforce risk-sensitive rules, deliver serviced land predictably, and govern data inclusively; and feasible pathways include serviced-land pipelines, rights-protecting digitisation, and carefully designed land readjustment/value tools supported by strong safeguards.

Recommendations):

1. **Institutionalise risk-informed zoning for housing** by making hazard overlays binding in development control and plot release decisions, with clear enforcement protocols and appeal mechanisms.
2. **Create a serviced-land pipeline programme** that sequences trunk infrastructure ahead of plot allocation, with publicly tracked milestones and affordability-linked plot release targets.
3. **Adopt inclusive spatial data governance** (privacy, access, accountability, redress) and participatory mapping so informal settlements are counted for services without enabling discriminatory enforcement.
4. **Reform land administration digitisation with rights safeguards** by strengthening due process, dispute resolution, audit trails, and non-digital service access to reduce exclusion risks.
5. **Pilot land readjustment in suitable growth corridors** where legal authority and valuation capacity exist, ensuring transparent benefit-sharing, tenure recognition, and independent grievance handling.
6. **Tie affordable housing delivery to infrastructure and land value tools** so that public investment-generated value helps finance resilience infrastructure and protects affordability over time.

Future research: Future studies should test the framework using primary spatial and household data in Abuja, including hazard exposure mapping, affordability stress analysis, and evaluation of serviced-land pipeline performance. Comparative empirical work across multiple Nigerian and Sub-Saharan African cities is also needed to identify which governance safeguards most effectively prevent digitisation-driven exclusion while improving land and housing outcomes.

References

Anguelovski, I., Connolly, J. J. T., Masip, L., & Pearsall, H. (2018). Assessing green gentrification in historically disenfranchised neighborhoods: A longitudinal and spatial analysis of Barcelona. *Urban Geography, 39*(3), 458–491.

Batty, M., Axhausen, K. W., Giannotti, F., Pozdnoukhov, A., Bazzani, A., Wachowicz, M., Ouzounis, G., & Portugali, Y. (2012). Smart cities of the future. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics, 214*, 481–518.

Bludnik, I. (2022). Digitalisation as a driving force for land grabbing in the Global South. *Procedia Computer Science, 207*, 265–271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2022.09.059

Cardullo, P., & Kitchin, R. (2019). Being a "citizen" in the smart city: Up and down the scaffold of smart citizen participation. *GeoJournal, 84*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-018-9845-8

Federal Ministry of Housing and Urban Development. (2012). *National Housing Policy (Revised)*. Federal Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, Nigeria. https://fmhud.gov.ng/themes/front_end_themes_01/images/download/25080495129.pdf

Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1992). *Nigerian Urban and Regional Planning Act (No. 88 of 1992)*. https://faolex.fao.org/docs/pdf/nig120669.pdf

FIG. (2022). *Digital transformation and land administration (FIG Publication No. 80)*. International Federation of Surveyors (FIG). https://www.fig.net/resources/publications/figpub/pub80/Figpub80.pdf

Ghosh, B., & Arora, S. (2022). Smart as (un)democratic? The making of a smart city proposal from scratch. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space, 40*(2), 318–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/23996544211025173

Hallegatte, S., Vogt-Schilb, A., Bangalore, M., & Rozenberg, J. (2017). *Unbreakable: Building the resilience of the poor in the face of natural disasters*. World Bank.

IPCC. (2022). *Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability (Working Group II contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report)*. Cambridge University Press.

Kavuri, S., & Ramanathan, A. (2024). Land: Governance, digitization and human rights – A comparative study. *Comparative Law Review, 30*, 237–268. https://doi.org/10.12775/CLR.2024.009

Kitchin, R. (2014). The real-time city? Big data and smart urbanism. *GeoJournal, 79*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-013-9516-8

Meerow, S., Newell, J. P., & Stults, M. (2016). Defining urban resilience: A review. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 147*, 38–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.11.011

OECD. (2020). *Smart cities and inclusive growth*. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2020/08/smart-cities-and-inclusive-growth_332850c0/8a4ce475-en.pdf

OECD. (2023). *Smart city data governance*. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2023/10/smart-city-data-governance_fc19e878/e57ce301-en.pdf

Pfeifer, M., Seufert, P., Beringer, A. L., & Herre, R. (2020). *Disruption or déjà vu? Digitalization, land and human rights: Case studies from Brazil, Indonesia, Georgia, India and Rwanda*. FIAN International. https://www.fian.org/files/files/FIAN_Research_Paper_Digitalization_and_Land_Governance_final.pdf

Souza, F. F. de, Ochi, T., & Hosono, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Land readjustment: Solving urban problems through innovative approach*. Japan International Cooperation Agency Research Institute.

Taylor, L. (2017). What is data justice? The case for connecting digital rights and freedoms globally. *Big Data & Society, 4*(2), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951717736335

Tedeschi, M. (2024). Datafication and urban (in)justice: Towards a digital spatial justice agenda. *Geography Compass, 18*(10), e12763. https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12763

Townsend, A. M. (2013). *Smart cities: Big data, civic hackers, and the quest for a new utopia*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Ukoje, J. E., & Kanu, K. U. (2014). Implementation and the challenges of the mass housing scheme in Abuja, Nigeria. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research, 4*(4), 209–219. https://aijcr.thebrpi.org/journals/Vol_4_No_4_April_2014/27.pdf

UN-Habitat. (2011). *Affordable land and housing in Africa*. United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

UN-Habitat. (2019). *Global experiences in land readjustment: Urban legal case studies (Volume 7)*. United Nations Human Settlements Programme. https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/documents/2019-05/global_experiences_in_land_readjustment_urban_legal_case_studies_volume_7_1.pdf

UN-Habitat. (2020). *World cities report 2020: The value of sustainable urbanization*. United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

Wernick, A., & Artyushina, A. (2023). Future-proofing the city: A human rights-based approach to governing algorithmic, biometric and smart city technologies. *Information Polity, 28*(2), 153–171. https://doi.org/10.3233/IP-230036

World Bank. (2017). *Resilient housing: A guide for designing resilient housing*. World Bank Group.

World Bank. (2024a). *Land policies for resilient and equitable growth in Africa*. World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/entities/publication/accfade5-10aa-4a70-81d1-e2b40f636bb4

World Bank. (2024b). *Land readjustment policies: Potential for transformative urban policy in the age of climate adaptation*. World Bank. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099100124053525592/pdf/P180002-1e146c52-162c-45d7-be97-fa2e0ade5b4f.pdf