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I. Introduction

I.A. Background to the meeting

1. The Global Report on Human Settlements is one of UN-HABITAT’s main vehicles for reporting on and dissemination of the results of its monitoring and research activities. The research on substantive issues and policies required for the Global Reports is based partly on partnerships with research institutions all over the world.

2. The Global Research Network on Human Settlements (HS-Net) was set up in November 2004 to provide a global mechanism for channelling expert advice to UN-HABITAT on the substantive content of its biennial Global Reports on Human Settlements, and more generally, to increase global collaboration and exchange of information on human settlements conditions and trends and on progress in the implementation of the Habitat Agenda and relevant United Nations Millennium Development Goals. The composition of HS-Net’s Advisory Board contributes to ensuring adequate regional coverage in the global review of human settlements conditions and trends. It enables UN-HABITAT to continually communicate with researchers and institutions engaged in cutting-edge human settlements research and access the results of past and on-going human settlements research all over the world, as inputs to the Global Report.

3. HS-Net is open to individual researchers, research institutions and networks engaged in human settlements research. The key organizational organs of HS-Net are the Secretariat and the Advisory Board. The Secretariat, based at the Policy Analysis, Synthesis and Dialogue Branch of UN-HABITAT manages HS-Net on a day-to-day basis. The Advisory Board consists of multidisciplinary researchers in the human settlements field, representing the various geographical regions of the world. The key role of the Advisory Board is to advise UN-HABITAT on the substantive content of the Global Reports and on the various activities of HS-Net. The Advisory Board held its inaugural meeting in Nairobi, Kenya in November 2004 and subsequent meetings in New Delhi, India (September 2005), Vancouver, Canada (June 2006) and Monterrey, Mexico (October 2008).

I.B. Objectives of the meeting

4. The Fifth Advisory Board meeting had three key objectives:

   a. Review of the first draft chapters of the 2009 Global Report on Human Settlements (Revisiting Urban Planning);

   b. Review of the first draft outline of the 2011 Global Report on Human Settlements (Cities and Climate Change); and

   c. Review of core HS-Net activities.

I.C. Participants

5. The meeting was attended by:

   a. Members of the HS-Net Advisory Board;

   b. Members of the HS-Net Secretariat;

   c. Authors of the chapters of the 2009 GRHS; and

   d. Invited Human Settlements Experts.
I.D. Opening of the meeting

6. Dr. Graham Tipple of the School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape of Newcastle University (and main host of the meeting) and Vice-Chair of the HS-Net Advisory Board, opened the meeting by welcoming participants (see Annex I) to Newcastle University and Newcastle city. Subsequently, he requested all participants to introduce themselves. He then invited Professor Paul Younger, Pro-Vice Chancellor (Engagement) of Newcastle University to present his welcome address.

7. Professor Younger further welcomed participants to the University and the City. He then presented an overview of the history, development and current activities of the University and provided participants with some background information about the city.

8. This was followed by an additional welcome address by Dr. Naison Mutizwa-Mangiza, Chief of the HS-Net Secretariat (at the Policy Analysis Branch of UN-HABITAT). He thanked all those present at the meeting for their participation and forthcoming contributions during the course of the meeting. He was especially grateful to members of the HS-Net Advisory Board for their extensive and valuable inputs towards the preparation of the 2009 GRHS. He further expressed thanks to members of the Policy Analysis Branch for organising the meeting as well their continued work on the 2009 GRHS.

9. He then went on to outline the purpose as well as expected outcomes of the meeting (see I.C.1 below).

10. Finally, he clarified the structure of the meeting sessions each of which would last 90 minutes. Each session would constitute of a 10 minute presentation by the chapter author(s) and 15 minutes of summary comments by Board members who reviewed the chapter in detail followed by 60 minutes of open discussion and a 5 minute wrap up.

11. Subsequently, the HS-Net Chair, Professor Winnie Mitullah welcomed participants and then outlined the work of the Board as well as HS-Net. She also thanked all meeting participants for their attendance and the Secretariat for organising the meeting.

I.D.1. Purpose and expected outcomes of meeting

12. The overall purpose of the meeting was to review the first draft chapters of the 2009 GRHS and the draft outline of the 2011 GRHS.

13. Meeting participants were expected to identify key gaps and omissions in the draft chapters of the 2009 GRHS and the outline of the 2011 GRHS and provide concrete indications on how these could be addressed.

14. Consolidated comments on the first draft chapters of the 2009 (including those arising during the meeting) would be shared with participants after the meeting.

15. In addition, progress with HS-Net activities for the period since the last Board meeting (October 2007-September 2008) would be reviewed.

I.D.2. Adoption of the Agenda

16. The programme for the meeting (Annex II) was revised such that the second day of the meeting (25 September 2008) would end earlier than initially scheduled.

I.E. Closing of meeting

17. In closing, Dr. Naison Mutizwa-Mangiza and Professor Winnie Mitullah both thanked meeting participants for their attendance and valuable inputs during the various sessions.
II. Summary of discussions

18. The discussions summarized below were conducted during the three days of the meeting. The items contained in subchapters II.A.2, II.A.3, II.A.4 and II.A.5 were concluded on day 1, those in subchapters II.A.6, II.A.7, II.A.8, II.A.9, II.A.10 and II.A.11 on day 2 and those in subchapters II.A.12, II.B and II.C on day 3.

19. During sessions of the meeting on the 2009 GRHS (sessions 2–12), authors presented an overview of the chapters, HS-Net Board members that reviewed the chapters in detail provided their feedback and invited expert(s) presented their comments. This was followed by an open discussion involving all meeting participants.

20. During the session on the 2011 GRHS (session 13), Dr. Ben Arimah of the HS-Net Secretariat presented an overview of the draft outline. This was followed by inputs from all participants of the meeting.

21. The session discussing HS-Net activities (session 14) was only attended by Board members.

22. The summary of the discussions below has been organized around specific issues rather than individual contributions during the various sessions.


23. In August 2008, the first draft chapters of the 2009 GRHS were submitted to UN-HABITAT and subsequently shared with Board members and other experts for review. A group of Board members (2 to 3) was appointed to review each draft chapter in detail and submitted a more comprehensive set of comments in writing to UN-HABITAT prior to the meeting. Some invited experts also provided written comments before the meeting. All written comments were distributed to the participants and will be incorporated into the consolidated comments to be sent to each of the chapter authors.

II.A.1. Overall comments on the 2009 Global Report on Human Settlements

24. The report needs to have a clear message or common vision for the future of urban planning.

25. There is a need to ensure continuity between ideas and issues across the chapters. In other words, the linkages between the chapters should be made clearer. Some of this could be done by the various consultants, but it would also require a major input from UN-HABITAT in the end.

26. All chapters should provide a clear and strong justification for the theme being examined. There are sometimes significant overlaps between the chapters (e.g. governance between chapter 4 and chapter 5).

27. The conceptualisation of urban planning is varied across the chapters and should be more consistent.

28. The report should be less theoretical/conceptual/academic and more empirical and policy oriented. To this end, more case studies should be included throughout the report.

29. Diversity is reviewed in the chapters in different ways (e.g. by levels of development, by region etc). Could a standard approach be adopted in reviewing diversity?

30. Background literature indicated by UN-HABITAT in the terms of reference, in particular previous issues of the Global Report on Human Settlements, State of the World Cities Report, and other United Nations reports, should be reviewed. Several chapters could find useful quotes in the Habitat Agenda or in other pieces of negotiated text from United Nations conferences.
32. There is a need to standardise the structure and contents of the illustrative boxes. Furthermore, lessons learnt should be drawn out from each of the case studies discussed in the report.

33. It is important to note that the urban issues being addressed by planning are different in various parts of the world. Hence the importance of examples from various regions.

34. In particular, the review of experiences should cover developing, developed and transition countries in a balanced manner. There is a dominance of western experiences and viewpoints in several of the first draft chapters.

35. Participants stated that all chapter authors should make an effort to include more material from the regional studies (and case studies) prepared for the GRHS 2009. Some of these studies include material that is very relevant for several chapters.

36. Land and property development issues are central to urban planning and should be reviewed in detail somewhere in the report.

37. The issue of housing was very scantily covered in the entire report. There is need for several chapters to include a discussion of housing supply and demand mechanisms and impacts for planning.

38. The literature on urban economics seems to be somewhat neglected in the report, whereas sociology, political science and urban planning are well represented. Literature on ‘weak market cities’ may be relevant to the report.

39. Women are an important group but so are other vulnerable groups like the youth, elderly and children. If a decision is made to highlight the plight and challenges of women in the report, then the same level and intensity of discussion and analysis should also be given to each of the other vulnerable groups.

40. Urbanization in developing countries should not be demonized in the report.

41. The role of cities as beacons of knowledge production and dissemination and the potential of urbanization to develop human resources in developing countries should be emphasised.

42. There should be a balance between “industrial-based knowledge” and expertise of developed countries (lessons from developed countries to developing countries) with “inherited knowledge” and proven-to-work solutions of developing countries (lessons from developing countries to developed countries).

43. Planning is not value neutral. The integrity and ethics of planners should be scrutinized.

II.A.2. Chapter 1 (Urban Challenges and the Need to Revisit Urban Planning)

II.A.2.a. Introduction

44. Professor Vanessa Watson presented Chapter 1 of the GRHS 2009. She started by outlining the brief given to her by UN-HABITAT, as well as the central argument of the report. Thereafter, she presented the structure of the chapter, covering: the introduction, which sought to contextualize and justify the report; nature of urban shifts and challenges of the 21st century; need for planning to change; revived interest in planning in the face of new urban challenges; the new approaches that offer potential; key issues and requirements for a revised urban planning; and normative principles of planning. She made several suggestions to the existing chapter. These include having a section on: the preconditions for changed urban planning in the introduction, and moving the section on key lesson and directions to the concluding chapter.
II.A.2.b. Discussion

45. The discussion was led by Dr. Graham Tipple, Ms. Paola Jiron, Mr. A.K, Jain and Professor Suocheng Dong—all members of the HS-Net Advisory Board, and the invited expert: Robert Upton. Subsequently, the discussion was thrown open to the floor.

46. The discussion noted that the chapter was authoritatively written in a well-informed manner. Various areas were suggested for improvement.

47. It was noted that the chapter could begin with a snappier or punchier start, which could attract the reader to a report of this nature. In this regard, the guiding values of planning, which were presented much later in chapter could be used to good effect.

48. The purpose of this chapter should focus on:

   a. Explaining the rationale of the entire report;
   b. Emphasizing the need to revise urban planning as spatial coordination due to the failure of the ‘planning for separation’ which dominated urban planning for decades;
   c. Discuss and decide upon the definition of all seminal terms addressed in the entire report not just ‘urban planning’.

49. There should be a high priority role for this chapter, particularly in terms of providing a clear link with other chapters. This applies not only to Chapter 1, but to other chapters, as the linkage between the various chapters does not appear to be evident.

50. It was observed that the reference of Abidjan to Ibadan as a shanty-town corridor encompassing 70 million people appears rather harsh and might not be appropriate. This area covers large areas of unsettled land, and many towns here were established from the 15th century.

51. The discussion also noted that there is very little information on Latin American (and Caribbean) cities. Furthermore, Latin American cities are too diverse that the term global South might not be an appropriate generalization. This diversity also applies to cities in many parts of the world. Indian cities are also known to be highly diverse. Perhaps, replacing the terms global North and global South with developed and developing countries might be helpful in this case.

52. It would be useful to have more information on East Asia, particularly as it relates to China. For instance, there is the need to clarify China’s doubling urban population. Furthermore, major institutional changes have occurred in China over the years; some of these need to be reflected in the report.

53. More attention should be given to climate change as one of the major global challenges facing cities in the 21st century.

54. A key point raised throughout the discussion pertains to the problems people in the city face, and how the issues of everyday life/living are reflected in planning? Planning systems must address everyday needs. It was thought that this should be the starting point of the report. Closely related to the preceding is the issue of ‘conditioned planning’. This relates to planning according the existing conditions.

55. It was suggested that the transformative practices of the everyday lives of citizens is an important concept that could be discussed in this chapter. This is related to the above observation that planning must be relevant to issues of everyday living in the city.

56. The discussion on labour markets should emphasize the flexibility of the labour market, where people have multiple jobs. This comment was made with reference to Latin America, but applies to cities in many parts of the world including those in developed countries. In the US for instance, the issue of multiple jobs has become increasingly important, as households seek to meet their mortgage obligations in the face of the current financial crisis.
57. The type of planning and who decides on planning issues were raised. For instance, the type of planning in Europe is not the same as in Latin America. In the case of the latter, planning is state run and highly centralized; with the planning ministry at the national level deciding on what should be the planning priorities and not the local governments. This also applies to many developing countries outside Latin America.

58. A major issue raised with respect to Chapter 1 and all other chapters relates to the audience that report seeks to address. Given that report primarily targets government officials, city-level policymakers and UN-HABITAT partners, it was noted that the language should be devoid of verbosity, and written in a user-friendly manner that is accessible to, and appeals to a wide range of possible audiences. In this respect, technical terms and planning jargon need to be explained. While the language of the report should be highly accessible, it was emphasize that the report would no be a manual or primer for urban planning practitioners. It was further noted that the report should be written in such as way that it wakes up influential thinkers and decision-makers to the urgency of urban problems.

59. The issue of gender, which was largely absent from this and other chapters was discussed. The decision reached was that gender should be mainstreamed into the various chapters throughout the report, rather than having a single chapter devoted to gender as it relates to planning.

60. There might be a need to emphasize the possible link between economic development and planning. Since the former tends to drive or influence the latter. In other words, more developed countries have better developed and more functional planning systems.

61. In attempting to define urban planning, it was noted that the definition of urban planning encompasses more than what planners do. In proposing a definition of planning, it was suggested that reference be made to the Report of the Global Planners Network (GPN). Any definition of planning must be empirical, and discussed against theory.

62. The following definition of urban planning was suggested:

Urban planning can be seen as a “mediator” that reconciles the demands, visions, objectives of the different sectors and interest groups while enabling protecting and sustaining the “collective public good” for all citizen groups. It controls individual action to protect “collective good” as defined by the shared values across the various sets of values within a society.

63. It was suggested that the distinction should be made between planning as separation of uses and planning as spatial coordination. The former has failed, while the latter holds good promise.

64. There are huge dangers in planning being characterized by a single set of values that are context specific. Planning is a value-driven activity. It deals with a conflict of values, and therefore a key purpose of planning to resolve/mediate these conflicts.

65. It was emphasized the report needs to avoid the silo mentality by showing how planning is linked to other professions and departments (Chapter 4).

66. The discussion noted that it is important to emphasize what the new approaches to planning would achieve, given the resilience of some of the older approaches to planning. It is also important that the Report takes cognizance of the fact that there are different strands of planning. These are even evident within modern approaches to planning.

67. The concept of forward planning needs to be used with care, given that it appears to be an old fashioned concept. The issue of spatial quality is important and this should be emphasized.

68. It was noted that a more reflective approach to Chapter 1 could be adopted. For instance, is planning always under review? Why is it that some approaches or ideas in the past have not worked?
At the end of this discussion, Dr. Naison Mutizwa-Mangiza made some clarifications concerning the report.

a. The Global Report on Human Settlements is mandated by the General Assembly of the UN.
b. The purpose of the report is to inform governments of changing urban conditions and trends.
c. Evaluations show that the report is frequently used by researchers and students rather than by practitioners and policymakers. For this reason an abridged version of the report would be prepared for practice-based communities, government officials etc.
d. The report should be empirical as much as possible. It should provide an indication of practices that work and those that do not. What new ideas have emerged?
e. In the case of this Report, it should show the extent to which planning is taking account of gender.

II.A.3. Chapter 2 (Understanding the Diversity of the Urban Context)

II.A.3.a. Introduction

Professor Ambe Njoh presented an overview of Chapter 2. The key focus of the chapter relates to the diverse urban circumstances that planning has to respond to. He noted that orthodox town planning has a tendency for discouraging diversity. The presentation noted the different conceptualization of urban diversity by disciplines such as planning, sociology, economics, cultural anthropology and urban geography. Various aspects of the diversity characterizing the urban context were examined across regions of the world.

II.A.3.b. Discussion

The discussion following this presentation was initiated by Dr. Dina Shehayeb and Professor Winnie Mitullah — both HS-Net Advisory Board Members — and Dr. Rose Gilroy the invited expert. Afterwards, the discussion was opened to the floor.

The discussion noted that from the onset, it needs to be clearly stated why this chapter focuses on diversity. In other words, why is a chapter on urban diversity necessary?

Providing a definition of diversity from the perspective of this chapter might be useful. In other words, how is ‘diversity’ conceptualised in this chapter? Does it draw on one or more of the different definitions provided on pp. 4–5? It might be necessary to include a paragraph on the implications of how urban planners’ conceptualize of urban diversity vis-à-vis other professionals.

It was proposed that diversity should also be seen from two perspectives: diversity of multiculturalism, which should be incorporated into planning practice; and differences in the nature of cities across the world, which in turn implies that the notion of best practices are ill-advised, hence city planning must be contextual.

It was suggested that city size can be discussed as an additional dimension of urban diversity. It this case, the focus could be on large, medium and small size cities, with emphasis on their planning implications.

It was suggested that the chapter discuses the urban challenges that cut across the various regions, and those that are more localized.

The discussion observed that the regions of the world were not addressed or examined systematically in the various sections of the chapter. For instance, the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) were not treated as distinct region. Despite the shortcomings of the MENA
regional study, it was suggested that the author could draw on this for information relating to the urban diversity characterizing the region. This applies to all regional studies. Similarly, the depth of discussion across the section varies remarkably. Some aspects are more emphasized than others. For instance, in the case of Latin America, data on fertility and mortality are presented, but not in the case of other regions.

78. Issues pertaining to gender and the needs of the disabled should be discussed in this chapter. For instance, in the case of gender, it was mentioned that in Latin America, women in informal settlements play a key role in the preservation of family and community life (this is likely to apply in the case of other developing regions).

79. Some cultural biases were noted in the choice of constructs relating to urban diversity in developing regions of the world. These include the reference to chaotic and unplanned urbanization in the South; and the association of violence with ethnic minorities, slums and poverty appears to be over generalized. Furthermore, it was noted that Wirth’s description of urbanism as a way of life (1938) does not provide an adequate description of urbanism in Africa.

80. The discussion observed that several strong cultural stereotypes were made in various parts of the chapter, which appear insensitive; and that a report of this nature should not be seen to reinforce these stereotypes. During the editing process, UN-HABITAT will remove all such statements from this and other chapters.

81. It was noted that the discussion on ethnic communities made no mention of Native Americans, Australians, Canadians and South Americans.

82. Lessons learnt do not only have come from the global North/developed countries. These can also come from the global South/developing countries (See p.9).

83. In discussing the recent trends in urbanization in East and Central Europe, the disintegration of the Soviet Union could in part, serve as a useful explanation. Further information needs to be provided on Russia as it pertains to urban diversity. Perhaps the regional study on transitional countries should provide further insights in this respect.

84. More attention needs to be given to the factors driving urban sprawl in the US and Canada. In the case of developing countries, no mention is made of the concept of rural-urban interface, yet, it partly covers issues of urban sprawl and peri-urban growth/development.

85. More discussion is required on the important trend of an increasingly ageing population. This is a feature of the urban diversity characterizing developed countries. The case of Japan was specifically mentioned, which is caught between population decline and an increasingly ageing population. In this regard, it should be interesting to discuss the spatial and policy implications of an ageing population.

86. It was felt that the possible role of policy in shaping cultural diversity should be discussed in the various regions, given the crucial role that policy can play in contributing to the integration or lack integration of migrants.

87. The discussion observed that the concept of social mixing was only mentioned at the beginning and end of the chapter with a list of its potential (p. 44). This list requires further elaboration or discussion within the chapter; if not, it should be left out.

88. It was noted that more emphasis should be given the process and consequences of urbanization in the North (developed countries). For instance, the miseries (problems) of urban areas in the North have not been fully captured. These need to be elaborated upon. In the South, the management of urbanization is the real issue rather than urbanization itself.

89. More emphasis should be given to how planning deals with the question of diversity. The planning outcomes in this regard should be assessed in terms of their impacts on different people/group needs.
II.A.4. Chapter 3 (The Emergence and Spread of Contemporary Urban Planning)

II.A.4.a. Introduction

90. Professor Ambe Njoh presented an overview of Chapter 3, which focuses on the emergence and spread of Western European urban planning to other parts of the world. The presentation covered the conduits for the diffusion of planning, as well as the nature of urban planning during the pre-colonial and colonial periods. The author noted that based on comments received from UN-HABITAT, he had started addressing: the modern/contemporary approaches to urban planning that have emerged in the post-colonial era; and urban planning that emerged outside Europe.

II.A.4.b. Discussion

91. The initial discussion was led by Professors Tunde Agbola, Louis Albrechts and Alfonso Iracheta—all HS-Net Advisory Board Members, as well as Mr. John Pendlebury, the invited expert. Thereafter the discussion was opened to the floor.

92. The discussion noted that the conduits or channels for diffusing European planning models should be linked to the regions, and this could be used as a means for organizing the chapters. Furthermore, the depth of the discussion and coverage varies from one region to another. It was also noted that the section focusing on reflections should be more representative of the various regions. It might also be useful to identify some of the limitations of planning covered under the different periods of discussion.

93. The discussion on the conduits for diffusing European planning models should be more explicit in terms of whether this is referring to the diffusion of planning ideas or planning systems. Clarity or separation is required, as the two were diffused differently.

94. The dominance of English journals should be emphasized as part of the conduits of for diffusing Western planning, as this has major implications in perpetuating certain planning traditions.

95. There is the need to re-examine the role of British Universities as conduits for propagating Eurocentric urban planning within former British colonies, as not all universities might have played this role.

96. Professional and academic organizations/associations should not only be discussed as conduits for diffusing Western planning models, but also as opportunities for encounters. The conferences of AESOP, ACSP, APSA, APERAU and the World Planning School Conferences provide such opportunities from the academic perspective. For professional organizations, ISOCARP plays a similar role.

97. There is a need for greater clarity in the use of concepts (terms) such as: spatial concepts; planning approaches; best practices; instruments; plans (master plans, land use plans etc.). Similarly, the term modern needs to be clarified. Does this include recent developments? For instance, strategic (spatial) planning emerged at different points in time in different parts of the world.

98. The discussion of the emergence and spread of urban planning over time should include a discussion of the dominant influences at each point in time. Some of these include religious symbolism, industrial revolution, rapid urbanization, ecology and sustainability, economic development, poverty etc.

99. The discussion noted that the chapter is presented in a (100%) unidirectional way—with the Western world seen as the origin of urban planning, and other parts of the world as passive receivers. While true for majority of receivers, it was noted that there are increasing number of cases where the confrontation of ideas/concepts enrich initial concepts. Examples in this regard...
include strategic planning in Nakuru (Kenya), Ho Chi Minh (Vietnam); the bottom-up strategy in Kerala (India); and Integrated Development Planning in South Africa.

100. It was noted that the chapter does not provide a clear overview of the (current) leading concepts in different parts of the world. For instance, it would be useful to know how well have ideas, concepts models etc. have been adapted to local culture, traditions and institutional context.

101. A key point that kept cropping up during the discussion, was that the chapter focuses mainly on planning ideas from the 19th to early 20th Century, especially within the colonial period; but with very little in terms of new/contemporary ideas and planning approaches that emerged in the 1990s. It was suggested that in revising the chapter, the section on colonial planning approaches be reduced, and more emphasis be given to the modern or contemporary approaches to planning. It was suggested that post modern planning and neo-liberal deregulation be included as part of contemporary approaches to planning. In the realm of urban planning, neo-liberal deregulation has meant a growing reliance on private sector and markets to identify and define problems and prescribe solutions.

102. There should be a clear link between Chapters 3 and 1, in terms of the new approaches that offer potential that are briefly highlighted in the latter. In other words, the new approaches pre-faced in Chapter 1 should correspond to the new approaches discussed extensively in Chapter 3.

103. The chapter focuses almost exclusively on British influence on planning (and to a lesser extent on the French influence). This is understandable, given the vastness and sphere of influence of the British Empire. However, there is the need to discuss (if only briefly) the influence of other ‘colonial’ powers such as the Spanish, Italian, German, Dutch and Portuguese. Furthermore, mention should be made of Constantinos Doxiades (1913–1975), the Greek consultant who through the Ekistics movement played a major role in designing plans for cities in five continents across the world.

104. It was suggested that boxes could be used to illustrate aspects of pre-colonial planning in various regions of the world.

105. Mention should be made of Islamic urban planning/urban design, which took roots since the 7th Century. Regarding the MENA region, it was felt that the principles and purpose of urban planning in cities such as Cairo (Al-Qahira) in 969 CE and many others in the region that were founded during the Islamic Caliphate period should be explained since these are the roots of cities in the region before being exposed to European planning in the 18th (French expedition to Egypt 1798) and 19th centuries. Some building codes and regulations from pre-colonial periods still exist and are part of contemporary practice.

106. The role of international organizations such as UN-HABITAT and the World Bank among others as it relates to the development and dissemination of contemporary/modern approaches to planning should be given adequate consideration. A key example in this regard is the Urban Management Programme. This is hardly mentioned.

107. The discussion felt that more attention/deeper analysis ought to be given to the origins of urban planning in the West. Similarly, more discussion is required on urban planning movements (e.g. the Garden City movements), particularly as it provides a basis for contemporary urban planning practice.

108. It was noted that the discourse on architecture is entirely different from that of planning, and as such, it should be removed from the chapter. In other words, the focus of the chapter should be entirely on planning.

109. It was suggested that the author makes reference to the work of Richard Harris on the urban historical geography of Africa and other former British colonies.
II.A.5. Chapter 4 (The Institutional and Regulatory Framework for Planning)

II.A.5.a. Introduction

110. Professor Simin Davoudi — the leader of the team from Newcastle University preparing the draft version of Chapter 4 for the GRHS 2009 — made a presentation of the Chapter focusing on a proposed revised structure derived from the written comments received before the meeting on the first draft version of the Chapter. She elaborated upon how the first major topic to be discussed in the Chapter — Governance — is mechanism/structure of managing urban change and development, and stressed that urban planning is also about implementation, not only preparation of plans. In a sense, she stated, planning should be seen as “place governance”. Furthermore, governance is an issue of power relationships. Effective governance should thus be more about “power to act” than “power over others”. Yet, it is essential to note that planning practitioners and institutions are active players, yet they are also influenced by a number of other actors.

111. She noted that the second major focus of the Chapter — Institutions — is about the specific configuration of agencies and organizations, but also about norms and practices. Thus, “similar” organizational arrangements may lead to very different planning outcomes. The design of planning systems must take account of both. As a consequence, there can be no one single model for planning systems. She elaborated on the critical issues to be discussed with respect to this, including inter alia: the location of planning agencies within the government structure, the degree of vertical and horizontal integration, the functional and administrative borders, decentralization; appropriateness of tools and resources, quality of human capital, nature of legal systems, and land and property markets.

112. She stressed that the third major focus of the Chapter — Planning regulation — should not be seen as purely regulatory as such, but also (perhaps in a more positive sense) as protective and developmental. The discussion of this topic would focus on where regulatory power is located, and how it is accepted by people. It would also look at what is an appropriate balance of public/private rights, including which provisions are made for compulsory purchases and at the legal systems defines who has right to develop land. The Chapter would also look at the relationships between informality and regulations, the dynamics of power relations and the importance of flexibility and collaborative practices.

II.A.5.b. Discussion

113. The discussion that followed was initiated by brief presentations by three members of the HS-Net Advisory Board (Dr. József Hegedüs, Professor Elliott Sclar and Professor Samuel Babatunde Agbola), and one presentation by an invited expert (Professor Christopher Rodgers). After that the floor was opened for discussion. The bulk of the discussion was focusing on the written first draft of the Chapter, rather than on the revised structure presented in the Introduction.

114. Several participants noted that the first draft was overly theoretical and academic. For the report to have impact among policy makers and a wider audience it is essential that the language of the Chapter is addressing its intended audience. The GRHS 2009 is not a report for planners about planning. Thus, the authors of the Chapter should realize that the “language of the Chapter is NOT separate from its content”. Several participants noted that the Chapter has to be reduced considerably in length (in line with the terms of reference).

115. Participants also noted that the Chapter should explicitly acknowledge that “planning happens all the time”. The planning arena is very nuanced. It is often difficult to know who is involved. A major issue is thus on how to institutionalize informal planning practices. With respect to planning culture, it is important to note that there are many different such cultures. There may be a need to include a box or boxes to illustrate this diversity. Furthermore, the Chapter should address issues like:
a. How to build governance capacity for planning?
b. How does this link to decentralization?
c. Planning practices and institutions are key players in shaping urban institutions (and are, in turn, shaped by institutions)
d. How can planning assist in the creation of new forms of governance from chaos?
e. With respect to concepts, the Chapter should review institutions and regulatory systems in the view of alternative model of managing collective affairs.
f. How can planning be more effective in societies where power is diffused among multiple actors?

116. Participants stressed that the Chapter should deal with how the planning process deals with political systems, including elections and vested political interests. It was also noted that various policy arenas influence planning implementation. Furthermore, the Chapter should note that the quality of political leadership is often poor, and even poorer at the lower levels of government.

117. With respect to the key messages of the Chapter, it was stressed that issues of empowerment and impartiality should be included. It was also noted that many planners are the enemies of their own plans. If plans are conceived as detrimental to the interests of planners themselves, the planners may (even actively) work against the implementation of plans. Furthermore, it is important to point out that interdepartmental coordination within government is difficult. Furthermore, different professional disciplines may be at odds with each other.

118. The Chapter should strive towards promoting democratic planning systems. A major focus of a discussion of the institutional and regulatory framework of planning should thus be on how to include everyone in the various aspects of the planning process. There is a shift towards increasing emphasis on partnerships, networks, etc., and less reliance on formal structures.

119. It was noted that there seems to be a lack of discussion on decentralization in the first draft. There is a need to look at the actual and potential roles of various levels of government. How can the various levels of government get to agree on what needs to be done? And, how can one achieve collective action when not sufficient to rely on the state?

120. Participants noted that some updating was necessary in Section IV.D.5 with respect to “planning gain”. In this respect issues related to transparency of decisions, equity and perceived fairness, as well as community involvement are essential.

121. Participants stated that the Chapter should acknowledge that there is a diversity of legal systems as well as other regulatory frameworks. With respect to the link between planning and legal systems several important issues were raised, including, *inter alia*:

a. With respect to legal systems it is important to know where (and how) to draw the line between the law and policy. How wide a definition is given to each?

b. Also, it is important to note that the normally basic legal principle of precedence in common law is less important within planning law, as very few planning decisions are made in the same legal setting.

---

1. One of the participants, Professor Christopher Rodgers, stated that he would communicate directly with the authors of Chapter 4 and provide additional specific details on relevant legal matters (this was done on 8 October 2008).
c. The discussion on the human rights impacts of planning should be expanded. This has major implications both in terms of institutional structures and in terms of how individuals interact with planning systems.

122. The Chapter should focus more on the operational aspects of plans. How can a “revisited” urban planning lead to a better implementation of plans? “Good planning” practices have to pay much more attention to implementation. It is thus essential to discuss implementation weakness or failure. The Chapter should include boxes from the various regions that highlight best (as well as worst) practices with respect to planning. This will highlight the importance of implementation of plans as well as the regional and sub-regional diversity in planning systems. The Chapter should also include cross-references to Chapter 9, i.e. how effective was the plan.

123. There were also several more specific comments, including, *inter alia*:

a. Several participants noted that they appreciated the focus on the enabling power of planning outlined in the Introduction to this session of the meeting. How can planning create enabling power, rather than control and a top-down approach?

b. One participant noted that the draft Chapter assisted with responding to one of the major questions raised by the GRHS 2009 — why do we need to revise the planning process?

c. One participant noted that the report should elaborate more on the Japan example in the first draft. Why could the planning approaches developed in Japan not be implemented there, but only in areas under Japanese occupation in East Asia?

d. With respect to essential cross-cutting issues like gender, environment, etc. — the Chapter should comment on whether planners have the necessary tools to address these.

e. The Chapter is focusing too much on land-use planning.

II.A.6. Chapter 5 (Planning, Participation and Politics)

II.A.6.a. Introduction

124. The author, Professor Carole Rakodi, presented an overview of the first draft of Chapter 5. Subsequently, in addition to seeking general comments, she requested guidance on whether the chapter should focus on the vast literature on participation and politics or successful examples and experiences; on the Global South or also on the Global North and on normative statements or policy recommendations. She also queried how it would be possible to adopt a balanced focus on processes, activities, outcomes and potentials of planning.

125. The discussion that followed was initiated by brief presentations by three members of the HS-Net Advisory Board (Professor Alfonso Iracheta and Mr. A.K.Jain), and one presentation by an invited expert (Professor Jean Hillier). After that the floor was opened for discussion.

II.A.6.b. Discussion

126. Some participants emphasised the inherently ‘political’ nature of planning and that planners should not be considered as incorruptible.

127. However, one participant noted the need to understand and clarify the differences between politics, the process of participation and planning as an end product.

---

2. A third Advisory Board reviewer, Professor Richard Stren, was unable to attend the meeting but submitted written comments.
128. Some participants felt that the role of planning in striking a balance between the long term vision of planners and shorter term political aspirations should be more clearly stated in the chapter.

129. A participant indicated that the focus of the chapter is skewed towards governance and there was a need for more emphasis on participation.

130. Several participants called for the chapter to make a clear case for why participation is necessary in urban planning. This was especially the case because participation entails significant costs. Some of the rationales for participation identified by participants included the value of the knowledge gathered through participation for decision making within contexts of huge risks and uncertainties and the role of participation in enabling planners to access people normally unable to voice their views through conventional channels.

131. Several participants noted that the chapter is overly conceptual and academic in its orientation and uses language which is not easily understood by practitioners. It was proposed that a more policy oriented approach is adopted to help decision making by planners and planning officials. In relation to this, the need for a more empirical review of experiences in the form of illustrative boxes and case studies was noted.

132. Some participants felt the chapter was ‘Eurocentric’ in its approach when reviewing experiences and case studies. It was therefore proposed that the review of experiences is broadened to include recent developments in Latin America, India, China and Thailand with regards to participatory planning. One participant emphasised the importance of reviewing current case studies and examples in participation and planning while another emphasised the need for illustrative boxes on successful cases of citizen participation (in particular in relation to planning for major infrastructure projects). One participant however cautioned that the presentation of case studies can be biased depending on the underlying viewpoint and this may prevent readers from easily grasping the reality the ground.

133. The need to recognise the context specificity of participatory planning experiences and therefore avoid the promotion of one ‘model’ of participation in planning decision making was emphasised by several participants.

134. It was suggested by participants that the type of political regime and economic policy should be considered as key determinants of approaches and outcomes of participatory planning. Under certain political regimes, public participation may be in its infancy while under others it is strongly embedded in a rights culture.

135. Several participants proposed a review of the impacts of the ascendancy of the market and the rolling back of the state on planning, participation and politics in greater detail. For instance, one participant noted that within a market centred planning system, the dominance of real estate actors in land use, allocation and pricing perpetuates the proliferation of squatter settlements, land speculation, social segregation, social unrest and exclusion of the poor (the role of the ‘crime economy’ in relation to real estate markets (in Latin American and Eastern European countries).

136. Another participant indicated that the rolling back of the state and related ‘good governance’ reforms may favour capitalist production, serve to perpetuate discrimination against certain groups and even increase divisions between the advantaged and the disadvantaged.

137. Furthermore, a call was made by one participant for a clearer distinction between the notions of the ‘state’ and ‘market’ as the two are not always mutually exclusive.

3. Professor Alfonso Iracheta of the HS-Net Board offered to translate relevant case studies from the America-Europe Movement on Cities and Regions project for inclusion in Chapter 5 if requested to do so.
138. It was noted, by one participant, that positive lessons may be drawn from centralized urban planning and governance systems even though these may not be widely popular at present. However, another participant stated that participation is contingent upon a capable state which can deliver on agreed upon actions. Within the context of context of failed states, where the state is incapable of delivering outcomes agreed upon through participation, people have to do things for themselves.

139. Several participants called for further examination of the potential pitfalls of participatory planning including the following:

a. Participation can create a fragmented and inefficient system where politicians are reluctant to make decisions against particular groups and this can be a hindrance.

b. Participation can be exploitative and misused to benefit certain interest groups. Therefore, there is a need to consider the real motives behind participatory planning processes.

c. Participatory planning may exclude certain groups:
   i) Marginalised or disadvantaged groups such as women, minorities and indigenous communities may be excluded from participatory processes.
   ii) Future generations are often not included in the making of decisions which have impacts and consequences in the coming decades.
   iii) Property owners are more likely to have a right to express their voices whereas landless people may enjoy fewer rights.
   iv) ‘Good governance’ may favour and give power to capital (including overseas capital), market knowledge and entrepreneurs at the expense of local people and agencies.

d. Therefore, it was proposed that
   i) Examples of affirmative action to address this should be highlighted. There are also examples of public authorities pro-actively seeking to assist marginalised groups to participate in decision making. It was also proposed that the right to cities movement be examined.
   ii) One participant also noted that informality is an important node of discourse, power and regulation in the global South and requires further investigation.
   iii) Procedural justice should be examined as a useful concept for planning decision making. It is concerned with the fairness of not only the outcome but also the procedure which resulted in the outcome.

140. Participants also noted the following specific issues:

a. The need to link the Report with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Habitat Agenda.

b. The informal/clandestine aspects of planning should be recognized.

c. The role of lobbying in participation, and its links with corruption, should be considered, especially in the context of the US.

d. Recent work on “democratic network governance” by Jacob Torfing and Eva Sørensen from Denmark may provide a useful framework for analysis.

4. Examples of affirmative action to address this from New Zealand, Australia, UK, Canada and the US were provided by Jean Hillier in written comments submitted to UN-HABITAT.
e. The need to recognise that participation has already been taking place in some contexts and that planners may simply have to steer this process.
f. UN-HABITAT should provide guidance on the expected structure and contents of illustrative boxes.

141. In response to the above comments from participants, Professor Rakodi made the following remarks:
   a. Participants should either provide the illustrative case studies mentioned or indicate where these can be accessed.
   b. Issues of metropolitan government and governance are relevant here but it is unclear to what extent this should be dealt with in the chapter.
   c. There is a need to reconsider where the issue of planning ethics fits in the Report. If planning is being considered as a professional practice rather than as an activity, then ethics can be considered in the planning education chapter.

142. On behalf of UN-HABITAT, Dr. Naison Mutizwa-Mangiza:
   a. Emphasised that the objectives of the chapter were to review global trends in participatory planning (forms of planning in different parts of the world, differences between them and what has given rise to these differences); successful experiences of participatory planning and approaches with potential for propagation.
   b. Explained that case studies in the Report are expected to do two things: illustrate key trends or positive policy responses.

II.A.7. Chapter 6 (Planning and Sustainable Urban Development: Linking the Green and Brown Agendas)

II.A.7.a. Introduction

143. The author, Professor Peter Newman, presented an overview of the first draft of Chapter 6.
144. The discussion that followed was initiated by brief presentations by three members of the HS-Net Advisory Board (Dr. Deike Peters and Mr. A.K. Jain), and presentations by invited experts (Ms. Maggie Roe and Ms. Jenny Crawford). After that the floor was opened for discussion.

II.A.7.b. Discussion

145. Overall, participants felt that the entire chapter should be more clearly linked to urban planning.
146. It was proposed that the chapter advocate more strongly the vital role of pro-poor planning for sustainable urbanization.
147. However, several participants emphasised that a wider approach which includes the three dimensions of social, economic and environmental sustainability was necessary. In particular, several participants proposed that the focus of the chapter should be broadened beyond transportation issues to include land-use, housing, water, solid waste management and recycling. Furthermore, it was felt that the contested nature of the concept of sustainability should be noted in the chapter.
148. Participants also suggested that the review of transportation should consider recent developments such as the Bus-Rapid System (BRT) revolution since 2000 as well as transport challenges at the metropolitan level. It was also noted that the advocacy of electric based transportation, which is not entirely carbon neutral, needs to be reconsidered.
149. Several participants felt that challenges faced by poorer cities and informal settlements such as water and sanitation, natural resource dependent livelihoods and resource depletion should be considered in greater detail. In relation to this, one participant noted that the gender dimensions of sustainability should be reviewed in the chapter.

150. Some participants felt that the conceptualisation of the green and brown agendas needed to move away from a strictly dualistic conceptualisation of the two agendas.

151. The importance of examining the conflicts and synergies between the green and brown agendas and the role of planning therein was emphasised by several participants. Urban planning, according to one participant, was particularly instrumental in mediating conflicts between the green and the brown agendas.

152. It was suggested that the diversity of the green and brown agendas at the global scale be examined more thoroughly. Another participant noted that the potential for synergies between the green and brown agendas is linked to demographic and social profile of places.

153. Several participants questioned the presentation of 7 ideal city types in the chapter. Whilst useful as policy agendas it was felt by one participant that the city types do not reflect issues of affordability. It was also noted that there are substantial overlaps between the city types. Furthermore, one participant noted that there were more examples of ‘city types’. One participant proposed that the chapter consider renewable energy, low carbon, density of land use etc. instead of ‘city types’.

154. In terms of the scope of the chapter, one participant felt that it should review issues beyond the neighbourhood and local scale.

155. Another suggested that international agendas and decisions (including those of the United Nations) should be considered.

156. One participant suggested that the examples and case studies in the chapter should be assessed in more depth and lessons learnt drawn out from each clearly.

157. In particular, the importance of discussing new and innovative ideas and approaches was emphasised as some of the ideas reviewed in the chapter have been around for some time. For example, with regards to green infrastructure, one participant noted that there have been significant advances that needed to be illustrated in the chapter (e.g. Holland and the UK).

158. The value of north-south learning to enable developing countries to learn from the mistakes made by developed nations with regards to environmental sustainability was highlighted by one participant. It was also suggested that important lessons from developing countries with regards to environmental sustainability, such as traditional construction in informal and old cities, be reviewed. Another participant supported this view by pointing to the importance of informal construction and service delivery.

159. However, one participant noted that the information presented in case studies is shaped by the source as well as the underlying perspectives. Some participants further felt that there was a dominance of western perspectives and thinking in the chapter.

160. One participant highlighted the importance of infrastructure led planning as the basis for sustainable urban development. The participant further noted that decentralisation may not be suitable for infrastructure related planning.

161. Participants also noted the following specific issues:

   a. The review of Vauban’s case should be shortened significantly given that the city is small with mostly wealthy inhabitants and may not be widely representative.

   b. The chapter needs to make reference to the work and documents of the UN in the fields of human settlements, ecology and the environment (e.g. Stockholm and Rio Conferences).
c. The land use dimension of sustainable urban development, including density, sprawl, mixed land use, is missing.

d. The issue of governance needs further attention.

e. Although mentioned, the Climate Change needs to be discussed in greater detail.

f. Environmental justice issues should be considered in the chapter especially (e.g. spatial displacement as a consequence of carbon offsetting interventions).

g. Knowledge, evidence and data are absolutely critical for linking the green and brown agendas. Tools of measurement and evaluation and who is involved in evaluation are all important.

h. Metropolitan areas and megacities need to be considered.

i. It was also proposed, by one participant, that planners need to engage across different sectors and with different professionals (e.g. with environmental managers and ecologists and engineers and land managers and forests and marine managers).

j. Relatively cheap and easy strategies for sustainability should be highlighted e.g. pedestrianization for example.

k. Whilst decentralisation and localised approaches are often effective, this is not appropriate for certain initiatives such as large scale infrastructural development.

l. The contradictions between economic and environmental concerns and potentials for a balanced approach should be highlighted.

II.A.8. Chapter 7 (Planning, Informality and New Urban Forms)

II.A.8.a. Introduction

162. The author, Professor Carole Rakodi, presented an overview of the first draft of Chapter 7.

163. The discussion that followed was initiated by brief presentations by three members of the HS-Net Advisory Board (Dr. Graham Tipple, Mr. A.K. Jain and Dr. Dina K. Shehayeb), and presentations by invited experts (Professor Ali Madanjpour and Mr. Colin Haylock). After that the floor was opened for discussion.

II.A.8.b. Discussion

164. Some participants felt that the language used in the chapter was overly sophisticated and could be adjusted to suit the non-specialist reader of the report.

165. Several participants noted the need to clarify the purpose and focus of the chapter. In particular, they questioned whether the intended focus of the chapter was on informality or urban expansion (or urban development form). Subsequently, most participants suggested that the primary focus of the chapter should be on informality. Therefore, it was noted that several sections in the chapter were unnecessary and should be removed (e.g. section 7.3).

166. Participants however felt that the scope of the discussion on informality should be broadened beyond enterprises to include other dimensions of informality such as employment, transportation and construction. In addition, land and housing were identified as key manifestations of informality in cities which needed to be examined in greater detail, including in relation to security of tenure. Also, the need to examine informal vertical expansion was noted by one participant.

167. Some participants called for a clear definition of the ‘characteristics’ of informality which determine when an activity, land or structure becomes informal. For example, it was indicated that informality may be a product of the stipulations within planning law and regulatory systems. One participant therefore suggested that there may be a need to re-examine planning systems and
include provisions so that things which are already in existence do not become illegal overnight. In relation to this, another participant pointed to the need to examine the extent to which definition of ‘informality’ in different contexts can be exclusionary.

168. Furthermore, one participant noted that the various challenges of informality ranging from administrative to legal issues should be considered.

169. One participant proposed a sociological understanding of informality especially at the household level is necessary. He indicated that at this level the duality between formal and informality disappears.

170. One participant noted that the standpoint from which informality and illegality is defined and characterised should be clarified. For instance, a settlement may be considered as a slum by some and a foothold in the city by others.

171. Some participants emphasised the need to examine informality amongst middle and upper income groups (e.g. desert reclamation in Egypt).

172. Several participants called for a more detailed examination of the nexus between informality and formality in the city. In particular, it was emphasised that current thinking has moved from a dichotomy between formality and informality towards an examination of the spectrum, co-existence and linkages between the two.

173. With regards to the review of urban expansion, one participant noted that the diverse meanings and manifestations of the ‘centre-periphery’ in different contexts should be considered. Another participant emphasised that urban expansion does not only take the form of green expansion but often necessitates building over existing infrastructure.

174. One participant felt that land ownership patterns should be examined as a key factor determining patterns of urban expansion. Also, it was noted that informal transportation systems should be considered in terms of their relationship with urban expansion.

175. Several participants pointed to the need for the chapter to review and assess the role and effectiveness of and lessons from existing approaches to informality including retrofitting, renewal and regeneration and regularization (e.g. Mumbai). However, one participant noted that the review of approaches should not be Eurocentric but rather consider approaches from developing countries (e.g. revitalising historic urban centres).

176. One participant noted that regulation was necessary to effectively respond to informality while another suggested that the potential and advantages of legal regulation of informality should be examined. Furthermore, the need to review the interface between the formal regulation and informality was noted.

177. Some participants also called for a review of the benefits arising from the informal sector, such as economic benefits (e.g. the informal construction sector). One participant noted that economic change is often led by the informal sector but this is ignored higher up by planners. Another indicated that, within the context of rapid urbanization, the informal sector, and the social networks therein, serve as substitutes for what the formal sector is unable to provide. Furthermore, one participant noted that there were useful lessons to be drawn from the informal sector, such as informal financing mechanisms.

178. Participants also noted the following specific issues:

---

5. The Delhi Master Plan (2021) was mentioned as an example of how the issue of illegality has been addressed. The Plan, which had already been submitted to UN-HABITAT, will be shared with the author of Chapter 7.
a. The chapter should consider the classic inverted development of the informal sector (i.e. the sequence of development which goes occupation, construction, servicing, planning).
b. The response of the informal sector to new technology should be examined.
c. Social segregation and exclusion should be reviewed as one of the challenges of urban expansion.
d. The discussion on institutions needs to be cut down.
e. The social capital elements of social networks should be further elaborated.
f. The chapter should be linked to the issues of participation and politics (chapter 5) but also sustainable urban development (chapter 6), infrastructural provision (chapter 8) and legal concerns (chapter 4).
g. Overlaps with other chapters of the Report need to be synthesised (e.g. pages 7–9 overlap with the historical review in Chapter 2).
h. Some of references in the chapter were thought to be outdated (e.g. McGee (1991)).
i. The illustrative boxes in the chapter should be shortened.
j. The chapter should make reference to relevant UN reports and ideas.
k. Liveability is an important issue in terms of access to services, education, and security of tenure.

179. In response to the overall comments, Professor Rakodi noted that the title and focus of the chapter remains ambiguous and needs clarification. She expressed her discomfort with focusing on informality alone in the chapter. Furthermore, she noted that there were overlaps with Chapter 8 which needed to be ironed out.

II.A.9. Chapter 8 (Planning, Spatial Structure of Cities and Provision of Infrastructure)

II.A.9.a. Introduction

180. Professor Alison Todes — the consultant preparing the draft version of Chapter 8 for the GRHS 2009 — made a presentation focusing on the structure of the first draft of the Chapter. The presentation focused on how the development of infrastructure shapes the spatial forms (and accessibility) of cities. The Chapter addresses how the development of infrastructure is affected by informality, privatization and mega-projects, and includes a section reviewing contemporary approaches to linking spatial planning to urban infrastructure development.

II.A.9.b. Discussion

181. The discussion that followed was initiated by brief presentations by three members of the HS-Net Advisory Board (Dr. Dieke Peters, Ms. Paola Jiron and Dr. József Hegedüs), and two presentations by invited experts (Professor Nina Laurie and Professor Cliff Hague). After that the floor was opened for discussion.

182. Many participants stated that they liked the Chapter and several stated that among the chapters reviewed; this was perhaps the one which was most advanced. All the major points to be covered in this Chapter are already included in the first draft. Moreover, it was noted that (to a large degree) infrastructure development is the primary issue that makes planning as such relevant.

183. Some participants noted that the structure of the Chapter, as provided in the table of contents, is not clear, and may have to be reviewed. Perhaps select more descriptive section titles, less academic (and more informative). It was noted that the Chapter needs to be careful in a few places with sweeping generalizations. The second draft should attempt to prioritize the
information provided in the Chapter. It was also noted that the Chapter includes some confusion with respect to aspiration vs. description.

184. Several participants highlighted the need for boxes with empirical examples in the second draft, including on non-regional issues. Furthermore, it was noted that the Chapter should be able to “blow people away with amazing statistics”. It was noted that the data presented should have a global coverage. On page 4 of the first draft, data are presented for some regions only. It was stressed that, in particular when data are readily available, data should be presented for all regions.

185. One participant suggested that the Chapter include reference (and perhaps a box) on the experience of the Netherlands. Here attention has always been paid to inclusion of bicycle routes and public transport. This means that much attention has been devoted to space, how systems connect, so that the bike competes effectively with bus and car. The report may want to draw some conclusions on what produced this focus. How did the built environment of Amsterdam get produced? The formal planning process should be put aside; instead we should look at how cities are being produced. Chapter 8 should thus include a clear link to the discussion of informality in Chapter 7. The Chapter should thus start with a discussion of the dynamics and processes creating cities, and only then identify the potential roles of formal planning initiatives.

186. It was noted that the Chapter has a major emphasis on transport; there is thus a need to cross-reference and rationalize it with respect to Chapter 6. The Chapter should also include more coverage on urban services, and not only infrastructure in the narrow sense. There is thus a need for the Chapter to define infrastructure more clearly (and in a wider sense). There should be more coverage of issues such as water, sanitation, electricity, telecommunications, solid waste management, schools, clinics, etc. In particular, the Chapter have to somehow address the relationship between transport and housing, with respect to urban planning. Furthermore, the Chapter should also provide a wider discussion of the relationship between housing and infrastructure in general. Moreover, the Chapter seems to focus somewhat more on infrastructure as such, in its own right, rather than because people want it. Chapter seems to view the city as static rather than a dynamic entity. Perhaps focus more on infrastructure developments, upgrading revitalization and densification in already existing settlements. With respect to the development of modern telecommunications it was noted that mobile phones are no longer just forms of communication, they are also becoming financial institutions in their own right. How does this affect infrastructure planning?

187. Several participants noted that they liked the part on mega-projects, but that it was important to note that there are mega-projects at several scales. How “big” is “mega”? It was also noted that the development and decision-making process involved with mega-projects often undermines urban planning. For example, it was noted that the methods of assessing impacts, etc., are often changed considerably with respect to the approval of mega-projects. The economic interests involved in such projects may lead to developments that are paying less attention to the needs and aspirations of normal residents.

188. Several participants commented on the “unbundling” concept, and noted that there are both positive and negative forms. Furthermore, some are even less accountable to the general public than the traditional public sector supply. Thus, to a very large extent, “unbundling” is a governance issue. There should be more discussion of public-private partnerships with respect to the development of public transport and other infrastructure developments. Perhaps need for more attention to privatization of infrastructure and services. The role of donor organizations in moving countries towards privatization should be included in the second draft. Also, there should be more of a discussion around the response of social movements to the issue of “unbundling” of infrastructure.

189. There were also several more specific comments, including, *inter alia*:
a. The Chapter should also take account of the important potential contributions of post-conflict and post-disaster issues related to infrastructure development and planning.

b. The Chapter should include a discussion of accessibility for vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, such as the elderly, disabled, etc. It was also note that gender issues should be addressed in more detail.8

c. It is important that the Chapter address the relationship between poor planning decisions (and implementation) on the quality of life of the poor. The example of Santiago, Chile, is highlighted where restructuring was required only a decade after initial development.

d. It should be noted that peri-urban areas are productive places in their own right, they are not only residential areas for people travelling to the urban centres. In extension of this; how can planning address infrastructure delivery in areas outside city limits?

II.A.10. Chapter 9 (The Monitoring and Evaluation of Urban Plans)

II.A.10.a. Introduction

190. Dr. Mark Seasons — the consultant preparing the draft version of Chapter 9 for the GRHS 2009 — made a presentation of the Chapter focusing on addressing some of the main written comments received in advance on the meeting on the first draft version of the Chapter. Among the issues he raised was the importance for planners to justify and prove the importance of their work. He noted that there seems to be a general lack of information generally “evaluating evaluations”. It seems that very little evaluation is actually being done, in particular in terms of evaluation off realized impacts of plan implementation. Asks for assistance from the participants in identifying examples of evaluations globally. Who are doing what in the field of evaluation and monitoring of projects internationally. He also notes that he has to rethink the difference between monitoring an evaluation, as the first draft is nearly exclusively dealing with evaluation.

II.A.10.b. Discussion

191. The discussion that followed was initiated by brief presentations by two members of the HS-Net Advisory Board (Professor Aloysius Mosha and Professor Winnie Mitullah7), and two presentations by invited experts (Dr. Suzanne Gunn and Professor Cliff Hague). After that the floor was opened for discussion. The bulk of the discussion was focusing on the written first draft of the Chapter, rather than on the revised structure presented in the Introduction.

192. Several participants stated that they enjoyed reading the Chapter. Yet, the first draft is far too heavy on in terms of both style and content. It is overly technical (and theoretical), while the empirical side is nearly absent. In particular, it was noted that the first draft lacks illustrations in the form of tables and figures, and that the boxes that have been included do not contain empirical information as such, but are rather dealing with issues of intent.

193. Many participants noted that the boxes included were from developed countries only. The second draft should have more boxes from developing countries. The Chapter needs more examples of good practice (or perhaps even better, bad practice); examples of how monitoring and evaluation can show that “planning works”. Furthermore, illustrative boxes should also show how the monitoring of plan implementation has led to improvements or how evaluation of actual

6. One of the participants, Professor Nina Laurie, stated that she would communicate directly with the author of Chapter 8 and provide details on recent relevant gender material from Australia.

7. A third Advisory Board reviewer, Belinda Yuen, was unable to attend the Board meeting, but sent written comments.
planning outcomes has led to improvements in future practice. Boxes could also be used to illustrate how evaluation of alternative plans has led to better plans.

194. There is a need for a diagram/figure to illustrate the monitoring process within urban planning.

195. Several participants noted that there is a need to increase the emphasis in the Chapter on monitoring and not only evaluation. It should also distinguish between different forms of monitoring, i.e. output monitoring, outcome monitoring, impact monitoring, results-based monitoring, etc. One participant noted that perhaps monitoring is more important than evaluation.

196. One of the main outcomes of the Chapter should be that it exemplifies how and why planning is useful. Are there any facts or empirical evidence that can illustrate this? Would cities be worse off if there were no planning profession? One participant noted that in most developed countries every public service are undertaking monitoring and evaluation, except planning…

197. It seems as if most planners forget about implementation, and by consequence (or perhaps because), they see monitoring and evaluation as someone else’s job. Thus, monitoring and evaluation is usually overlooked in planning design. Many participants thus stated that the Chapter should address in more depth the issue of who should undertake monitoring and evaluation. And why? Is it the job of planners only? One participant noted that monitoring and evaluation should be undertaken by planners themselves. Other stakeholders may not understand. There is a need for a small set of good indicators for this purpose. Yet, planners should only evaluate a few central issues. Neighbourhoods and communities can deal with monitoring and evaluation of more detailed indicators. One participant noted that in India (Delhi), management groups are assigned responsibility for monitoring.

198. Many participants called for the involvement of other stakeholders involved in the monitoring and evaluation process, in more participatory evaluation approaches. Monitoring and evaluation should involve the target groups directly. Did they believe that they were being helped through the implementation of plans? In this connection, federations of slum dwellers could monitor quite effectively. However, it is important to stress that monitoring and evaluation should be done with capacity-building.

199. Planning practitioners seems to value (and undertake) *ex ante* evaluations, i.e. evaluating alternatives before they settle on a plan. Several participants noted that, perhaps this is not enough. *Ex post* evaluations are much more valuable for decision-makers. It was noted that many planners are measuring outcomes for the sake of planners themselves. Why is planning important for other people’s agenda? For whom are we preparing evaluations? Should planners measure outcomes for the sake of planners and planning?

200. It was also noted that elaborate monitoring and evaluation systems may be overly costly and impractical. Comprehensive, but unaffordable, monitoring and evaluation systems are not the answer. Monitoring and evaluation have to be realistic. Thus, don’t build overly sophisticated monitoring and evaluation models; instead make them qualitative, participatory, and perhaps most importantly, comprehensible to politicians (and the general public).

201. Several participants note that the seconds draft should include a discussion of internal vs. external monitoring and evaluation. Related to this, the Chapter should address the issue of monitoring vs. corruption or other forms of interference. There is a need to address issues related to political bias in information gathering. Several participants noted that monitoring is not a technical activity only. It is also a political one, or perhaps in practice mostly a political activity. Evaluation is also a matter of political will. There are several legal and ethical consequences of this, which should be addressed in the Chapter.

202. It was stressed that organizational politics are also important for the field of monitoring and evaluation. This has implications for institutional location. It is important to note that planning organizations can do self-evaluation. There is then the danger of a focus on self-preservation.
Monitoring and evaluation can thus become a major part of the political process within (and outside) the planning organization; one about accountability relationships, and also about organizational politics. Self-evaluation can thus lead to manipulation of indicators and targets. There is thus considerable room for external evaluations.

203. Several participants stated that the next draft of the Chapter should take more note of the activities funded by external (donor) agencies. These often have demanding monitoring and evaluation requirements, driven by their corporate needs vs. what’s most useful on the ground. In this respect, as well; who are planning and who are implementing?

204. The Chapter should highlight the issue of why so little formal monitoring and evaluation is going on. Why are planners not monitoring themselves? It is essential to plan monitoring and evaluation from the very beginning of the planning process. But how can this be done? One participant noted that, even though the Chapter may have problems identifying specific cases, the fact that monitoring and evaluation is still being done should be stated. The Chapter may thus suggest ways of improving the learning process from monitoring and evaluation activities. Furthermore, the Chapter could identify areas where additional research is required.

205. Further to the above, other participants noted that a lot of monitoring and evaluation is in fact going on; the issue is more that it is not properly documented in the public realm. There are also lots of implicit evaluations being carried out. Moreover, impact assessments are in fact happening to a large extent. In some countries (i.e. UK) strategic evaluation of planning is required. It was also noted that there is in fact a lot of monitoring and evaluation going on in projects (USAID, World Bank, UN-HABITAT, etc.). The literature on this may be more in the field of urban development rather than urban planning \textit{per se}. The author may want to review this literature as well.

206. Several participants noted that there seems to be no evaluation of long term impact of planning policy. Are there \textbf{any} examples of municipalities looking back to assess the impact of planning? There may thus be a confusion of issues discussed in the Chapter. The author should clarify what is normally done (and what is not) in terms of monitoring and evaluation in the second draft. The discussion of whether evaluations are happening or not may, in fact, relate more to the definitions used in the Chapter than of to is actually happening on the ground. The author should thus reassess the operational definitions of monitoring and evaluation used in the Chapter (as he suggested himself in his introduction to the session).

207. And then, although lots of impact assessments are carried out; this still does not address quality of decision-making (nor of what should be done with evaluation outcomes…).

208. Several participants highlighted the importance of good and reliable indicators. Among the issues raised were that:

a. The guidelines at the end of the Chapter should highlight the importance of good indicators.

b. Several participants noted that there should be more reference to UN-HABITAT indicators, nor is there any reference to UN-HABITAT’s Global Urban Observatory, or to other UN reports (which, it was noted was a requirement of the terms of reference).

c. The discussion of indicators should also note the gender aspect of indicators.

d. It was noted that many things are being measured (i.e. in the UK), although quite often it is the wrong things. This leads to skewed decisions.

209. There were also several more specific comments, including, \textit{inter alia}:

a. That the Chapter should highlight the challenges of undertaking monitoring and evaluation in developing countries, particularly due to financial constraints. Thus,
provide boxes (or general text) to illustrate how monitoring and evaluation is undertaken in countries facing different economic realities.

b. Several participants referred to the case of China, where formal monitoring and evaluation seems to be lacking. What are the lessons from a lack of monitoring and evaluation in a country undergoing such rapid economic growth? Yet, is this really correct? Some participants noted that there was in fact a systematic monitoring and evaluation going on in urban projects in China. Both municipal governments and institutes undertake this and report to expert commissions. Need to use the China case study more extensively in the second draft.

c. One participant noted that population forecasting, which had been included as a box in the first draft was not relevant for the Chapter, and should be removed.

d. The Chapter should include more specific links to other chapters.

e. The Chapter should focus more on the importance of distributional outcomes — by age, gender, etc., that can cause inequality, discrimination.

f. Monitoring and evaluation is a continuous process.

g. Some monitoring and evaluation systems seem reasonable in theory, yet, they may be difficult to apply in practice. Which monitoring and evaluation tools should be used in each specific situation?

h. The recommendations from monitoring and evaluation exercises should also consider effectiveness vs. efficiency.

II.A.11. Chapter 10 (Planning Education)

II.A.11.a. Introduction

210. Professor Bruce Stiftel — the consultant preparing the draft version of Chapter 10 for the GRHS 2009 — made a presentation of the Chapter focusing on the data collected during a global survey of planning schools and presented in the first draft. He noted that the survey did not include planning schools in the Middle East and North African region due to lack of collaborating partner institutions. He also made an effort to address some of the written comments received in advance on the meeting on the first draft version of the Chapter.

211. Among the issues he stated that he would address in the second draft was that he would provide more informed opinions about the data presented and other issues on planning education. He would also review more literature on developing countries to improve the regional coverage of the Chapter. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, he noted that the second draft would review the recommendations of other Chapters and address these in terms of implications for planning education of the future.

II.A.11.b. Discussion

212. The discussion that followed was initiated by brief presentations by three members of the HS-Net Advisory Board (Professor Aloysius Mosha, Professor Elliott Sclar and Professor Louis Albrechts), and one presentation by an invited expert (Professor Cliff Hague). After that the floor was opened for discussion.

213. Several participants stated that they appreciated the survey done of planning schools, but noted that the Chapter was mostly a collection of raw data — “a look in the rear view mirror” — and that they had expected more of an analysis of what can be done to solve the challenges indentified in other chapters of the GRHS 2009. With respect to the lack of data in the report on North African and Middle Eastern countries, one participant noted that the author might be able
to get access to such information from the Arab Urban Development Institute (in Rabat, Morocco). There was general agreement that there is a lot of work to be done by the author before submitting the second draft of the Chapter.

214. Several participants noted that the Chapter should clearly state what are the main issues related to planning education today. The first draft does not give any direction of where planning schools should go to address the challenges at hand. Furthermore, the Chapter should discuss the impacts of globalization or new forms of urbanization (or other issues to be discussed in Chapter 2) for urban planning and urban planners?

215. A representative of the Secretariat noted that it is essential that the Chapter is empirically based. The survey is thus very useful. The Chapter should explain how planning education differs in different countries (including issues of accreditation). Based on this, Chapter 10 should provide examples of how planning schools (and other institutions involved in the education of planners) are, and in the future can improve, the ways urban planning addresses the problems at hand (derived from other chapters).

216. Several participants raised issues related to the content of planning school curricula, such as: What are the key skills required from planners? How can skills be integrated into the curriculum of planning schools? What are appropriate methods of learning? How can future planners best acquire the required skills? The Chapter should also explore the potential of more flexible learning modes and teaching methods. One a more political note, concern was raised with respect to the issue of who is responsible for deciding planning school curricula. What are the politics of this?

217. Some participants noted that there is a danger that the planning profession is currently getting more serious academically, but that it in the process it may be becoming less relevant for the work at hand; i.e. should planning schools have an academic orientation or be for practitioners? Several participants noted that to be relevant in the future, it is important that planning school curricula are related to issues at hand. It was also noted that a major part of planning education should be to ask questions, not just to implement models. One participant also pointed out the importance of research, in order to improve planning education.

218. Several participants stressed that the second draft of the chapter should include a section on how planners can learn to communicate with other stakeholders; i.e. commercial actors, NGOs, CBOs, slum dwellers, etc. Furthermore, the first draft does not make any reference to how planners (and planning) can deal with other professions.

219. Some participants discussed the appropriate education level for planners; i.e. should planning be an undergraduate or post-graduate profession? They also raised the issue of access criteria to planning courses, and noted that it should not be necessary to require a degree in another subject to become a planner. This would also reduce costs (see below).

220. Several participants voiced concern about the “one world” approach promoted in the first draft of the Chapter, and noted that the author should be extremely careful on this. Several other participants stated that the Chapter should highlight the importance of ethics in planning. This should receive increased attention in planning schools. It was also noted that future planners should be better trained in economics.

221. Several participants stressed that it is essential for the second draft of the Chapter to note that planners do not learn only from planning schools. They also (or perhaps even primarily) learn on the job. Planning education should thus be seen as wider than the initial training.

222. However, many participants noted that the first draft of the Chapter was focusing exclusively on professional planners *per se*. They thus asked: Should planning education be for “planners” or for “those who plan”? They noted that planning is an interdisciplinary profession. A lot of planning education is undertaken outside planning schools. The second draft should thus
extend beyond the professional planners, and also include any reference to part-time education, training of non-planners in planning skills, and to barefoot planners. Furthermore, the second draft should also discuss the development of learning networks, and the importance of international planning aid. Related to this, it was noted that the survey included in the first draft of the Chapter only included formal planning schools. Yet, a lot of planning is actually undertaken by other disciplines than planning. How should this be justified/explained in the Chapter? (and in fact in the report at large).

223. Some participants noted that a major justification why the Chapter should discuss planning education outside the formal planning schools is the fact that professional planners are short supply and very expensive to educate. Thus the Chapter should discuss how planning skills can be made more affordable? It was noted that the first draft of the Chapter does not make any reference to the costs of formal planning education (nor costs of other forms of training in planning skills).

224. One participant noted that in Latin America urban planning is linked to architecture. Thus there is a strong focus on the physical structure of cities. There is a need for a theory of the city and not only a theory of planning. He had to fight against other professions to establish an independent planning school.

225. The Chapter needs more discussion around the issue of accreditation for planners. It was noted that in North America planners do not want accreditation (because they feel that the accreditation process can be manipulated), while many planners in developing countries believe accreditation is essential to improve quality. However, it is important to note that there are a lot of professions that are involved in urban planning. It is unlikely that these are interested of being accredited as planners. Yet, who is to say that they are less important for urban planning? In addition to the issue of accreditation it is important that the second draft of the Chapter assess quality controls of planning schools.

226. There were also several more specific comments, including, *inter alia*:

a. The Chapter should also include a section on the role of professional bodies.

b. The Chapter should also include a discussion of how many planners are required. This would include all categories of planners, from part timers to the PhD level. And, furthermore, where should these be located within the government (or other) structure?

c. Several participants noted that there is lots of material in non-English journals. How can this material be made more widely available? How should this be addressed with respect to improving planning education? Although it is often stated that the English literature is “everywhere”, it should be noted that in many European planning schools (in Germany, France, etc.) very little English literature is being used.

d. The Chapter should make a point of the fact that education is a major international export item. In some countries education is a major earner of foreign exchange. This situation is likely to become even more pronounced in the future, partly as a result of globalization.

e. Several participants noted that the first draft had a strong focus on the US and a few other developed countries, and that the second draft has to include more material on developing and transitional countries.

f. The Marxist literature on planning is completely missing, and so is that of the French and Latin American traditions.
g. There is also a body of United Nations material on training for urban planning which should be reflected in the second draft.\(^8\)

h. A major part of planning education is the training of politicians. Their lack of skills is often a major obstacle to successful implementation of plans.

II.A.12. Chapter 11 (Towards a New Role for Urban Planning)

II.A.12.a. Introduction

227. Professor Vanessa Watson presented Chapter 11 in five parts as follows: the main urban issues which planning will have to deal with in developing, developed and transitional countries (issues that are common and unique to these countries were identified); key findings and conclusions emanating from the chapters in the report; the main elements of a revised role for planning, and how would these differ in emphasis in various parts of the world; the broader contextual and institutional changes would have to occur to allow planning to become more effective; and the steps that UN-HABITAT could take to implement a revised role for planning.

II.A.12.b. Discussion

228. The initial discussion was led by Professors Alfonso Irecheta and Winnie Mitullah—both HS-Net Advisory Board Members, and Mr. Robert Upton the invited expert, after which the discussion was opened to the floor.

229. The discussion noted that apart from summarizing the main findings, the concluding chapter should pickup the main principles, ideas or philosophies running through the main chapters. This could form the thread running through this chapter, which was thought to be missing.

230. It was felt that the conclusion should also address the lessons learnt, key issues and implications of the Report. Chapter should be framed more in terms of a policy statement rather than an executive summary.

231. It was suggested that greater emphasis should be given to Sections 4 (Main elements of a revised role for urban planning) and 5 (The contextual and institutional changes needed to make urban planning more effective). This is both sections constitute the core of what needs to be done in order to make urban planning more effective, and as such, they need to be discussed in greater detail.

232. It was noted that the (proposed) future of planning is likely to be politically oriented, and that this should emerge from UN-HABITAT’s mandate. Whatever the case, issues pertaining to pro-poor planning, participatory planning, links between the brown and green agenda, rights approach, informality and poverty should constitute the main focus for the future of urban planning in developing countries.

233. The question was asked if it was better to organize the conclusions thematically or by region. While results could be presented thematically, they should also be synthesized for different parts of the world. It was noted that discussing the findings by region might be more interesting for the Governing Council of UN-HABITAT.

234. One of the key messages that this chapter should convey is that planning is not necessarily about making plans, but providing solutions to the everyday problems experienced by city

---

\(^8\) UN-HABITAT had sent the author electronic copies of a series of four Sub-Regional studies on Education for Sustainable Urban Development prepared by UN-HABITAT in 2008 (e-mail of 22 June 2008). None of these were reflected in the first draft of the Chapter.
It was suggested that this chapter should address the future of the Report after publication. In other words, how will this Report be used?

UN-HABITAT’s position regarding urban planning should be reflected in this chapter. The conclusion should also discuss how UN-HABITAT should address the agenda for taking planning forward. In so doing, it is important to identify possible means of support and discuss the strengthening of the relevant capacity. It was noted that the preceding is too important to be tied to planning schools. In response, Dr. Naison Mutizwa-Mangiza noted that this would be done by the Policy Analysis Branch in conjunction with other units within UN-HABITAT.

In identifying the broader contextual and institutional changes, it might be necessary to identify why planning has not always achieved much success. It is likely that the success of planning could be linked to the level of development, as the institutional and regulatory framework underlying urban planning in developed countries is less problematic than that of developing countries.

It was suggested that chapter should not focus on the argument of the planning versus the market, as this seems outdated. Rather, the chapter should dwell on the institutional context within which planning would operate.

The conclusion must also project a certain idea of planning, which should be linked to the rationale for revisiting urban planning. It was suggested that the conclusion could draw on the GPN self diagnostic empirical work. The conclusion should also discuss the urban planning issues of relevance at the grassroots level.

Some reservation was expressed with the title: Revisiting Urban Planning, as it gave the impression that planning was dead, and needed to be revisited, when indeed, planning has been revised or revisited on a continuous basis. It was suggested that Positioning Urban Planning could be an alternative title.

The question was asked if it was better to organize the conclusions thematically or by region. While results could be presented thematically, they should also be synthesized for different parts of the world. It was noted that discussing the findings by region might be more interesting for the Governing Council.

The question was asked as to whether the conclusion should cover broader issues of crime, HIV/AIDS, MDGs etc., which are thought to be cross-cutting?

The discussion on the scale of planning should give greater emphasis to the regional dimension, as many urban problems often transcend city boundaries. Regional governance is an important issue. This is because as cities have become bigger, and the successful cities are those that have a regional planning process in addition to urban planning processes.

The chapter should define/outline (broadly) the role of the different tiers of government in the contextual and institutional changes needed to make planning more effective. What can, and should be at the international level.

It is important to avoid proposing a one solution fits all for the various regions. The solutions must take cognizance of the prevailing context/specificity of the various regions.

It was noted that the chapter appears economically and politically neutral, and it should take a stance. Given mandate of UN-HABITAT in preparing the GRHS, it might not be possible to stance, as it might have ideological connotations.
247. Emphasis should be on content rather than process. It was noted that urban planning is still split between planning as technical and social science. How then is the message from the Report being put across the two orientations?

248. How can the overall messages of this report be carried into specific areas of urban planning such as transport planning, urban design, environmental planning etc.?

249. It was suggested that the chapter should give more attention land use management, given that it was not well discussed in the main body of the Report. More attention also needs to be given to the fact that cities are sites of production, as this does not come out clearly in the various chapters. Cities provide economic opportunities and generate growth. All these need to be emphasized.

250. At some point in time, this chapter should give attention to the crisis of neo-liberal economic policies—particularly the current global financial meltdown, and its implications for urban planning. Indications are that the meltdown of capital markets would have major implications on urban planning at least in the short to medium term.

II.B. 2011 Global Report on Human Settlements — Cities and Climate Change

II.B.1. Introduction

251. The 2011 Global Report on Human Settlements is provisionally titled ‘Cities and Climate Change’.

252. In July 2008, UN-HABITAT commissioned Dr. Patricia Romero Lankao of the Institute for the Study of Society and Environment in the National Centre for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, Colorado, USA, to prepare an issues paper on “Cities and Climate Change” (hereafter referred to as the ‘Issues paper’). The aim of this paper was to review the key issues and challenges related to Cities and Climate Change and provide a conceptual framework for the 2011 report. A draft outline was prepared on the basis of the issues paper.

253. Dr. Ben Arimah of the HS-Net Secretariat presented an overview of the draft outline of the 2011 Report.

II.B.2. Discussion

The following general recommendations were made during the ensuing discussion:

254. One participant proposed that the Report should consider ‘urbanization’ and not ‘cities’ in relation to Climate Change. Accordingly, it was proposed that the title of the Report be revised to “Urbanization and Climate Change”.

255. Participants called for the Report to be more clearly linked to urban development/cities.

256. The Report should acknowledge the crucial role of urban planning in adaptation and mitigation efforts. In relation to this, it was proposed that the Report build on the contents of the 2009 Report given that the latter will review many issues of relevance to the former. Similarly, the Report should also draw on earlier Global Reports (e.g. 2007 Report on disasters).

257. Participants suggested that the Report review the vast information on Climate Change already available and clearly indicate how it will be adding to this wealth of information.

258. Several participants noted that while cities contribute to carbon emissions, this should not be overstated and the role of cities in arresting climate change should be highlighted. One participant proposed that instead of examining the aggregate contribution of cities towards Climate Change, it may be more useful to examine the role of specific sectors and activities.
Participants emphasised that, as drivers of innovation, cities will be at the forefront of Climate Change adaptation and mitigation efforts. It was proposed that the Report review Climate Change related innovations emerging from cities in greater detail. In this regard, one participant pointed to the importance of focusing on ‘actors’ and the relationships between them and not ‘cities’ in their own right.

Several participants called for the role and importance of individuals in adaptation and mitigation to be recognised. Therefore, it was proposed that the utility of education and behavioural change in addressing the challenges of Climate Change be emphasised in the Report.

It was noted that Climate Change is a global concern but its impacts are greatly differentiated at the local and regional levels. Therefore, it was suggested that the ways in which the costs and gains of Climate Change will be distributed across cities, countries and regions of the world be examined in greater detail. In particular, one participant noted that the costs of adaptation and mitigation are likely to be higher for developing countries. Poorer countries may also have to pay for technologies from developed countries.

Furthermore, the differentiated impacts of Climate Change related interventions on different groups of people should be considered in the Report. Similarly, the benefits and losses for different urban sectors and actors (e.g. the private sector) should be examined.

It was highlighted that a greater review of existing interventions to address Climate Change, the constraints therein and ways forward is necessary. This should not only focus on the content of interventions but also their implementation. Furthermore, the report should avoid propagating a unidirectional export of adaptation and mitigation strategies from developed to developing countries.

It was emphasised that the Report needs to consider how to mobilise support for Climate Change actions through reshaping political agenda’s at global, national and local levels. This is particularly important in light of expected trade-offs between present and future environmental concerns and interests and therefore conflicts. If progress is to be made with Climate Change issues, political mechanisms are required to negotiate and mediate these differences. The Report should especially pay more attention to the international dimensions of collective action on Climate Change.

Current thinking on Climate Change tends to emphasise the need to take informed actions based on precautionary principles. However, planning needs to take actions without all the information being available despite the risks of doing so.

One participant stated that the Report should recognise that interventions to address the challenge of Climate Change may not deliver benefits to the wider public. For example, the private sector may be at the forefront of developing more efficient technologies but this is primarily oriented towards profit making.

Participants also made the following specific suggestions:

The linkages between cities and the implications for Climate Change should be considered (e.g. vis-à-vis transportation concerns).

It is important to consider the tensions between adaptation and mitigation as these are not always in synergy.

The vulnerability of coastal cities should be emphasised.

Strategies for adapting industrial structures and production to reduce GHG emissions should be outlined.

The implications of Climate Change for daily city life and consumption should be reviewed.
272. International collaborative actions on Climate Change should be considered.
273. The Report should consider the historical incidence of disasters and responses to these.
274. The linkages between poverty and Climate Change should be more clearly outlined.
275. The economic effects of Climate Change need to be considered (e.g. effects of rising energy costs and how cities adapt; anticipated impacts on economic activities etc.).
276. The gender dimensions of the Climate Change challenge need to be examined in further detail.
277. The consequences of Climate Change for migration should be reviewed. For instance, population destabilisation and conflict are anticipated consequences which will have spill over effects on urban areas.
278. The link between the Report and UN-HABITAT’s Sustainable Urban Development Network (SUD-net) should be made clearer.
279. The impact of the export of high consumption lifestyles from developed countries to developing countries should be considered as one of the factors exacerbating Climate Change.
280. In addition to the more technical solutions/interventions, the utility of spiritual and cultural dimensions of environmental protection should be reviewed (e.g. fear of the divine, belief in the role of human beings in protecting the earth etc.).

II.C. HS-Net core activities

II.C.1. Introduction
281. Dr. Edlam Yemeru of the HS-Net Secretariat made a presentation of the HS-Net Annual Report for the period from September 2007 until October 2008 (the report is contained in Annex IV to this report). The main points addressed were:
   a. HS-Net membership drive and publicity, including, *inter alia*:
      i) Membership of the HS-Net has increased from 103 to 148 members since the last Board meeting
      ii) Two issues of the HS-Net Alert, the quarterly brief used to keep HS-Net members informed of HS-Net activities and other related developments, have been sent out in 2008.
      iii) A continued shortage of Secretariat staff to coordinate HS-Net activities. The Secretariat had initiated a process to recruit interns, but this has been put on hold due to a lack of office space for interns.
      iv) Steps have been taken to disseminate HS-Net publications amongst selected target institutions and associations.
   b. The Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series (HSGDS), where she noted that some progress had been made within the last few months:
      i) HSDGS no. 3 (“Municipal finance and urban development”, by Mona Serageldin (team leader), David Jones, Francois Vigier, Elda Sollos, Shannon Basset, Balakrishna Menon and Luis Valenzuela) was published in September 2008; and
      ii) HSGDS no. 2 (“Broad-based partnerships as a strategy for urban liveability: An evaluation of best practices”, by Willem Van Vliet–) and HSGDS no. 4 (“Governance reform from below: Multilevel politics and the ‘New Deal’
campaign in Toronto, Canada”, by Martin Horak) are both to be published by 31 October 2009.

c. 2008 UN-HABITAT Lecture Award, where she noted that the winner of the 2008 Award — Professor Anthony Gar-On Yeh, Chair Professor at the Centre of Urban Studies and Urban Planning, University of Hong Kong — will deliver his lecture on 4 November during the fourth session of the World Urban Forum in Nanjing, China.

d. 2006 & 2007 UN-HABITAT Lecture Awards, where she noted that DVDs of the 2006 and 2007 Lecture Awards disseminated to target institutions and associations shortly.


f. Global Report on Human Settlements 2009 — Revisiting Urban Planning, where she outlined the status and future activities related to the preparation of this report. See the HS-Net calendar of activities 2008–2009 for details on future Advisory Board activities related to this (see Annex IV to this report).

g. Global Report on Human Settlements 2011 — Cities and Climate Change, where she noted that a background paper had already been discussed by the Board. See the HS-Net calendar of activities 2008–2009 for details on future Advisory Board activities related to this (see Annex IV to this report).

II.C.2. Discussion

282. The discussion that followed was organized around the following four main themes: HS-Net membership drive and publicity; The Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series; the UN-HABITAT Lecture Award; and the Global Report on Human Settlements.

283. In addition to these agenda items, on an issue of procedure, the Board also agreed that e-mail communication from Board members to the HS-Net Secretariat should NOT be copied to all members. Many Board members felt this was unnecessary and filled the inboxes of other members.

II.C.2.a. HS-Net membership drive and publicity

284. Several participants raised concern with respect to the current raison d’être of the HS-Net, with respect to general members. One participant stated that he was unaware of the HS-Net wider membership. One participant noted that the original reason for the HS-Net was to get access to research and researchers. Yet, for various reasons (including Secretariat staff limitations) it is more appropriate to keep a low profile. So far the Network has not been able to offer its members anything concretely, with the exception of two issues of the HS-Net Alert. To address this, it was noted that it was more appropriate to ask which needs can addressed by HS-Net. A member of the Secretariat then noted that it would be appropriate to involve the members in the preparation of the Global Report.

285. Further discussions on this matter led to the decision to refocus the purpose of HS-Net membership to be a general discussion forum on future Global Reports exclusively. Thus members of HS-Net would in the future be invited to provide comments and inputs to Global Reports. Membership of the HS-Net would be required to participate in such discussions. Future

9. The Secretariat will thus have to rephrase relevant HS-Net information material (brochures, website, end-matter in HSGDS and LAS publications).
HS-Net membership would thus be likely to be related to the popularity of the topics of upcoming Global Reports.

286. Following discussion in earlier Advisory Board meetings it was agreed that Board members should contribute to the recruitment drive to the HS-Net, from the perspective of the themes of future Global Reports.

287. One participant noted that he was unable to access parts of the HS-Net website including the list of human settlements experts. A representative of the Secretariat stated that she would investigate further to resolve this matter.

288. With respect to the issue of Secretariat staffing some participants raised the issue of whether it would be possible to locate interns — to work with the Policy Analysis Branch — elsewhere, such as in the UN-HABITAT Brussels or Geneva office or in other institutions. A representative of the Secretariat responded that the Secretariat would investigate this option further and report back to the Advisory Board.

II.C.2.b. The Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series

289. Many participants raised concern with respect to the small number of submissions to the Series. This led to a wider discussion detailed below.

290. Several participants asked whether it was possible to have issues of the Series co-edited by external parties. There may be many institutions that may want to publish papers in the Series, and even pay for it if they get their names and logos on the cover. Such external institutions could even be fully responsible for funding, editing and publication of papers in other languages. They may even be willing to pay for translations to English. In other cases governments and various agencies may be willing to pay for translation of specific papers. Representatives of the Secretariat stated that they would investigate this matter further.

291. Another participant asked whether it was possible to link up with an external professional publisher. A member of the Secretariat noted that this would be very costly, and was currently not an option.

292. The Secretariat was requested to ensure that the HSGDS papers were being publicised in UN-HABITAT periodicals such as the Habitat Debate to encourage wider readership of the Series.

II.C.2.c. UN-HABITAT Lecture Award

293. Several participants voiced concern with respect to the nomination and selection process. It was felt that the process was too mechanistic, and that several Board members were not convinced that the right candidate was being selected in the end. Furthermore, several participants noted that there were too few nominees for the 2008 Award.

294. One participant noted that she had chosen not to vote for any of the nominees as she did not feel qualified to assess candidates that to her felt completely unknown. Other participants also noted that they would like to know the nominees better before making the final selection. A pre-selection teleconferencing was suggested as one option for better review of candidates.

295. Other participants stated that they believed the nomination and selection process for the 2008 Award was the best so far and that it would not be realistic to create a more elaborate (and time-consuming) selection process.

296. The Board concluded that new avenues should be found to encourage a larger number of nominees for future Awards. It was also agreed to create a regional pre-screening Committee of
the Board (of some three to five members)\textsuperscript{10} to review the nominees and prepare a short-list of a maximum of five nominees. The Committee would then prepare an appropriate write-up on each of the short-listed nominees. Only details on the short-listed nominees (and the write-ups on these) would then be submitted to the full Board for it to make the final selection of a winner. It was hoped that this would create more attention to the Award as it would create a number of “short-listed candidates for the UN-HABITAT Lecture Award” in addition to the “UN-HABITAT Lecture Award winner”. The Board noted that many nominees would appreciate being able to add this to their CVs.


297. Some participants raised concerns about the review process of the 2009 GRHS before and during the 5\textsuperscript{th} Advisory Board meeting. They had submitted their comments to the Secretariat in a frank and open manner, only to find out that the comments were sent to Chapter authors unedited (although with the name of the reviewer removed). Yet during the meeting it became clear for everyone who had submitted which comments and it created some awkwardness with respect to their relationship with the chapter authors. The reviewers had believed that their comments would be edited and consolidated by the Secretariat before the meeting, although they realized that this turned out to be impossible in practices, due to time limitations. A representative of the Secretariat clarified that this had indeed been the intention of the Secretariat, but that some late submissions and pressures of work in the week before the Board meeting had made consolidation impossible to effect.

298. Other participants believed that the comments made on the Chapter by reviewers should be prepared without the name of the reviewers included. Reviewers should not be scared of defending their comments during the meeting.

299. The Board requested the Secretariat, in the future, to disseminate terms of references for consultants to the Board members together with the draft chapters to assist them to conduct a better review of future Global Reports.

300. The Board also encouraged the Secretariat to increase the cooperation between the Global Report and the team responsible for preparing the State of the World Cities report. This might provide additional empirical examples for future Global Reports.

301. Several participants suggested that UN-HABITAT might want to use Board members to undertake mini-launches for future Global Reports. This might be a cheap option to ensure wider attention to the Global Reports.

\textsuperscript{10} It was suggested that this Committee should be composed of the Advisory Board members from the relevant region, i.e. the region for which an Award winner will be selected in any particular year, plus other interested Board members.
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## Annex II. Programme of 5th HS-Net Advisory Board Meeting

### 24 September 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Speaker (s)</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Invited Expert (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SESSION 1</td>
<td>Opening &amp; Adoption of Agenda</td>
<td>1. Paul Younger</td>
<td>Graham Tipple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1045</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Naison Mutizwa-Mangiza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Winnie Mitullah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESSION 2</td>
<td>GRHS 2009: Chapter 1</td>
<td>Vanessa Watson</td>
<td>Winnie Mitullah</td>
<td>Robert Upton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045–1215</td>
<td><em>[Urban Challenges and the Need to Revisit Urban Planning]</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESSION 3</td>
<td>2009 GRHS: Chapter 2</td>
<td>Ambe Njoh</td>
<td>Paola Jiron</td>
<td>Rose Gilroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315–1445</td>
<td><em>Understanding the Diversity of the Urban Context</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESSION 4</td>
<td>2009 GRHS: Chapter 3</td>
<td>Ambe Njoh</td>
<td>Louis Albrechts</td>
<td>John Pendlebury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445–1615</td>
<td><em>The Emergence and Spread of Contemporary Urban Planning</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESSION 5</td>
<td>2009 GRHS: Chapter 4</td>
<td>Simin Davoudi</td>
<td>Graham Tipple</td>
<td>Chris Rodgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630–1800</td>
<td><em>The Institutional and Regulatory Framework for Planning</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HS-Net Advisory Board Members Dinner**

### 25 September 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Invited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SESSION 6</td>
<td>2009 GRHS: Chapter 5</td>
<td>Carole Rakodi</td>
<td>Paola Jiron</td>
<td>Jean Hillier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900–1030</td>
<td><em>Planning, Participation and Politics</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESSION 7</td>
<td>2009 GRHS: Chapter 6</td>
<td>Peter Newman</td>
<td>Aloiysius Mosha</td>
<td>Maggie Roe, Jenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045–1215</td>
<td>*Planning and Sustainable Urban Development: Linking the Green and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crawford &amp; Cliff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown Agendas*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESSION 8</td>
<td>2009 GRHS: Chapter 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330–1500</td>
<td><em>Urban Governance and Sustainable Development</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1215–1315: Lunch**

**1615–1630: Coffee**

**1030–1045: Coffee**

**1215–1315: Lunch**

---
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| SESSION 8 | 1315–1445 | 2009 GRHS: Chapter 7  
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SESSION 9 | 1445–1515 | 2009 GRHS: Chapter 8  
"Planning, Spatial Structure of Cities and Provision of Infrastructure" | Alison Todes | Dina Shehayeb | Nina Laurie & Cliff Hague |
| 1515–1530: Coffee | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SESSION 10 | 1530–1700 | 2009 GRHS: Chapter 9  
"The Monitoring and Evaluation of Urban Plans" | Mark Seasons | Winnie Mitullah | Suzanne Gunn & Cliff Hague |
| SESSION 11 | 1700–1830 | 2009 GRHS: Chapter 10  
"Planning Education" | Bruce Stifel | Louis Albrechts | Cliff Hague |
| Reception hosted by the Institute for Research on Environment and Sustainability — IRES | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 26 September 2008 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SESSION 12 | 900–1030 | 2009 GRHS: Chapter 11 & wrap up  
"Towards a New Role for Urban Planning" | Vanessa Watson | Graham Tipple | Robert Upton |
| 1030–1045: Coffee | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SESSION 13 | 1045–1245 | 2011 GRHS  
"Cities and Climate Change" | Naison Mutizwa-Mangiza | A K Jain | --- |
| 1245–1400: Lunch | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SESSION 14 | 1400–1545 | HS-Net Activities | Edlam Yemeru | Dina Shehayeb | --- |
| 1545–1600: Coffee | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SESSION 15 | 1600–1630 | Closing | 1. Naison Mutizwa-Mangiza  
2. Winnie Mitullah | --- | --- |
| Lord Mayor Reception | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

Part I: Introduction

Chapter 1: Why Cities and Climate Change

Climate change has been publicly perceived as a global issue driven by energy use, land use changes and other human activities inducing transformations in the atmosphere composition and the carbon cycle. This chapter provides a justification for this report. It includes some of main reasons that a report on cities and climate change is needed to bring together divergent views and information sources from the natural and social sciences to create a cohesive analysis tool that can be used as a guide to policy makers that are engaged with this issue on the urban, national and global fronts.

- Climate change as major challenge facing humanity
- Climate change as an environmental and development issue
- Global issue with profound local ramifications
- Why cities and climate change?
- What are the main climate change-related hazards facing cities and main physical and societal determinants of cities’ vulnerabilities
- Through which mechanisms do cities contribute to climate change? In other words what are the main emitters and underlying drivers of cities’ emissions?
- What are the societal and environmental factors explaining urban impacts on climate change?
- What are the factors constraining or enhancing the effectiveness of cities’ adaptation and mitigation responses and how do these fit into national and global perspectives?
- Cities offer immense opportunities for mitigation and adaptation efforts
- Purpose: To achieve better understanding of the dynamics and understanding of the interactions between cities and climate change. To explore and fully maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change in order to pursue more sustainable and resilient development paths both within urban areas and across the global.

Chapter 2: Framework for Addressing the Dynamics and Interactions between Cities and Climate Change

This chapter presents an integrated framework for addressing the dynamics and multiple linkages between urban centres and global warming, and describes some of the main actors in the climate change arena.

- Science of climate change
- Identify the various links between cities and climate change
- Adaptive capacity of cities
Key actors in the climate change arena

- International multilateral and bilateral organizations and institutions (UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol)
- The three tiers of government (national, subnational, city level)
- Multilevel-governance of climate change (Cities for climate Protection, C40)
- Households and community-based organizations including NGOs
- Private sector

The dynamics and institutional contexts in which these actors operate

Definition of key terminology

Part II: Trends in Climate Variability and Linkages between Cities and Climate Change

Chapter 3: Trends in Climate Variability and Change

This chapter describes the recent tendencies in climate variability and change as presented by IPCC experts. What are the recent tendencies in climate variability and change, and what knowledge do we have on their regional and temporal dynamics?

The following should be examined on a regional and temporal basis

Anthropogenic concentrations of greenhouse gases

Rising temperatures

Incidence of severe weather conditions

Rising sea levels

Melting and thawing

Other environmental changes

Projections of futures changes of the above

Chapter 4: Impacts of global warming on urban centres

The Impacts of global warming on urban centres vary remarkably across regions, countries and even within countries. This chapter identifies the tendencies in climate hazards within cities as they affect (fit into patterns of) economic activities, infrastructures and groups that are particularly vulnerable to climate change. The IPCC posits that climate change will affect cities through rising sea levels, increased hazard from tropical cyclones, flooding, landslides, heat and cold waves, as well as challenges of urban water quality and storage. The section should describe those hazards, as well as the underlying vulnerabilities, explaining how they impact urban centres. It describes the main components and drivers of urbanization. It provides some of the reasons why urban areas can be vulnerable to climate and other hazards, but at the same time can be sources of more effective measures to cope with (adapt to) and mitigate climate change.
What climate change risks do cities face?
- Sea level rise and coastal risks
- Water resources and systems
- Exposure to increase in the frequency and intensity of heavy rainfall, tropical cyclones, storms, droughts, heat waves and other extreme weather events
- Related health risks
- Industries, economic activities, services and the built environment
- Food security

Which cities are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change?

What underlying vulnerabilities explain the diverse impacts (of the above) predicted across and within cities?

What segments of the urban population and sections of the city are most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, and why?

Extent to which cities face with a dichotomy in climate change:
- Urban development increases the risk of climate change climate risks to some cities and urban dwellers.
- Cities can also be sources of processes and innovations that can make them resilient to the risks of climate change.

Chapter 5: Cities as drivers of global warming

This chapter identifies how cities contribute to climate change. It presents existing information, data gaps and criteria used to model and measure total and per capita GHG emissions within and across cities. It describes such factors explaining the weight of different sectors on total GHG emissions as the economic base of a city, its form, and the layout/structure of its transportation system. It presents some of the approaches developed to understand the social and environmental drivers of urban emissions. It provides some predictors and determinants that may explain why some cities emit more carbon than others, namely population, affluence, technology, climate, and institutional settings among others.

How big a contribution do cities make to GHG emissions?

What are the sources of information of cities’ GHG emissions and what data gaps?

What are the criteria and tools used to measure emissions? What is their role in the different calculations of total emissions?

What are the main sources of emission?
- Energy generation
- Industry
- Agriculture
- Forestry
- Transport
- Buildings
- Waste and wastewater

Are there city-level data on main emitters?
• What is the role of such factors as the economic base of a city, its morphology/form, and the layout/structure of its transportation system in the weight of different emitting sectors in total emissions?

• What are the main underlying drivers of cities’ emissions?

• What is the relevance of three factors as determinants of carbon emissions, namely population, affluence as measured by GDP per capita, and technology, as measured by both energy intensity (E/GDP) and carbon intensity (C/E) of the energy system; what is role of these factors in the emissions trajectories of diverse cities?

• What is the structure and configuration of the energy systems within cities and how strong is their influence on those cities’ emissions?

• What other determinants are relevant? (E.g. climate factors, institutional settings).

• Do these and other factors diverge across cities?

Part III: Policy Responses to Climate Change

Chapter 6: Mitigation Responses

This chapter identifies effective policies, strategies and practices aimed at reducing or mitigating the emission of greenhouse gases. It examines how cities fit into the picture of national and global climate change mitigation strategies, i.e., how processes operating at the national and global level may constrain and/or enhance a city’s ability to mitigate emissions; what is the role of scientific knowledge in local climate policy decisions, and what other factors explain the huge gap between the rhetoric and reality of local climate policy? (What about priorities see concept note, p. 49)

• What actions, policies and technologies have been designed to curb emissions at the international, national and urban levels? Emphasis should be on how cities have responded to the mitigation challenge of climate change.

• What has been the role of the private sector and the government?

• What are the technological and market processes at play that might constrain or create possibilities to curb emissions?

• How effective have been those responses, and why? For instance, do cities have the institutional capacity to manage this issue?

Chapter 7: Adaptation responses

This chapter focuses on cities’ adaptation options and constraints. It presents two approaches to the analysis and management of these responses: risk management and adaptation strategies. It examines how cities might adapt and, for instance, protect vulnerable populations from increased adverse weather related events that are predicted with climate change.

• Examine the assessment tools and approaches to coping with climate hazards:
  - Disaster risk management
Adaptation strategies

- Existing adaptation options and responses
  - Urban management and policies
  - Disaster risk management
  - City-wide climate initiatives
  - Adapting physical Infrastructures
  - Insurance and public financing
  - Community-based adaptation

- What constraints do cities face in reducing their vulnerability or strengthening their resilience to climate change?

Chapter 8: Linkages between responses and development: The way forward

This chapter identifies the multiple relationships between adaptation, mitigation and sustainable development. For instance, it explores the synergies and trade-offs between a) actions addressing the mitigation challenge and other dimensions of policy and development; b) measures targeting adaptation and policies dealing with other such development issues as urban planning and economic growth; and c) policies dealing with mitigation and adaptation. It proposes future policy directions at the local, national and international levels. Finally, it describes existing uncertainties and future research priorities.

- What are the linkages between mitigation responses and other policy dimensions?
- What are the relationships between adaptation responses and policies dealing with urban planning, and poverty?
- What are the synergies and trade-offs between adaptation, mitigation and (sustainable) development?
- Explore future policy directions with respect to the goal of achieving climate resilient cities. What can be done at the local, national and international levels in this regard?
- What are the current knowledge gaps and uncertainties in area of cities and climate change and what are the research priorities for the future?

Introduction

During its fourth meeting, the HS-Net Advisory Board reviewed the calendar of activities to guide the work of the network during the 2007–2008 period. This report describes progress made with activities planned for execution in this period (see Annual Report Annex 1).

HS-Net (Membership Drive and Publicity)

- The network currently has a total of 148 members, up from 103 in 2007. The details of members are indicated below and can also be accessed through the ‘Human Settlements Experts Database’ at the HS-Net website (www.unhabitat.org/hs-net):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Type</th>
<th>Individual Membership</th>
<th>Institutional Membership</th>
<th>Network Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Areas of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa and the Arab States</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and former Soviet Union States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Two issues of ‘HS-Net Alert’, the quarterly brief used to keep HS-Net members informed of HS-Net activities and other related developments, have been sent out in 2008. The brief contains the following sub-sections: HS-Net Website, Downloads, HS-Net News and Other Announcements.

- The Secretariat continues to face a shortage of staff to coordinate HS-Net activities. A proposal was made during the fourth Board meeting that interns should be recruited to contribute towards the execution of HS-Net work. The Secretariat initiated a recruitment process but the process has been put on hold due to a lack of availability of office space for interns.

- It was proposed, during the fourth Board meeting, that HS-Net publications should be distributed amongst selected target institutions and associations, including associations of planning schools, in order to further publicise HS-Net and attract members. The Secretariat has compiled such a list which it intends to use to disseminate its publications (the Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series and the UN-HABITAT Lecture Award Series) in October 2008.

Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series (HSGDS)

- In addition to the first issue published in 2007, the following issue has been published:
  - Municipal finance and urban development, Mona Serageldin (team leader), David Jones, Francois Vigier, Elda Sollosi, Shannon Basset, Balakrishna Menon and Luis Valenzuela

- Two additional issues of the HSGDS are to be published by 31 October 2009:
  - Broad-based partnerships as a strategy for urban liveability: An evaluation of best practices, Willem Van Vliet

11. 6-7 October, 2007, Holiday Inn, Monterrey, Mexico.
Governance reform from below: Multilevel politics and the ‘New Deal’ campaign in Toronto, Canada, Martin Horak

- It was proposed, during the fourth Board meeting, that the HSGDS should be disseminated more widely. The Secretariat has compiled a list of target institutions and associations which it will use to disseminate HSGDS issues in October 2008.

**2008 UN-HABITAT Lecture Award**

- Seven candidates were nominated for the 2008 Lecture Award. Nominations were reviewed by the Board between April 2008 and May 2008 and a winner selected by 27 May 2008.
- The winner of the 2008 Award is Professor Anthony Gar-On Yeh, Chair Professor at the Centre of Urban Studies and Urban Planning, University of Hong Kong.
- Professor Yeh will deliver his lecture on 4 November (2pm–4pm) during the fourth session of the World Urban Forum in Nanjing, Peoples Republic of China (3–6 November), 2008 (See Annex 2 for a provisional programme of the meeting). The theme of his lecture, ‘GIS as a Planning Support System for Harmonious Cities’, is complementary to that of the Forum, Harmonious Urbanization: The Challenge of Balanced Territorial Development.

**2006 & 2007 UN-HABITAT Lecture Awards**

- In October 2008, the DVDs for the 2006 and 2007 Lecture Awards will be appended to the corresponding issues of the UN-HABITAT Lecture Award Series and disseminated to target institutions and associations, together with issues of the HSGDS.


- The Abridged Edition of the 2007 Global Report will be published in three volumes:
  1. Reducing Urban Crime and Violence: Policy Directions
  2. Enhancing Security of Tenure: Policy Directions
  3. Mitigating the Impact of Disasters: Policy Directions
- The text for the three volumes has been completed and layout and design is currently being finalised. The report is expected to be published by 15 October 2008.


- First drafts of 18 case studies have been prepared for specific chapters of the report. Final drafts of these will be posted at the UN-HABITAT website after the launch of the 2009 Global Report.
- First drafts of 8 regional studies on urban planning have been prepared. Final drafts of these will be posted at the UN-HABITAT website after the launch of the 2009 Global Report.
- First drafts of all eleven chapters of the report have been submitted to UN-HABITAT and circulated amongst all HS-Net Advisory Board members. The draft chapters will be reviewed during the 5th HS-Net Advisory Board meeting.
- Comments from the HS-Net Advisory Board, UN-HABITAT and other experts on the first draft chapters will be consolidated and sent to authors by 13 October 2008.
- Authors are expected to undertake all revisions and submit second draft chapters to UN-HABITAT by 30 November 2008.
- Second draft chapters will be reviewed by the HS-Net Advisory Board, UN-HABITAT and other experts and any final queries sent to authors by 1 January 2009.
- Authors are expected to undertake final revisions and submit final draft chapter to UN-HABITAT by 20 January 2008.

**2011 Global Report on Human Settlements**

- A background paper has been prepared for the report and a draft outline will be discussed during the 5th meeting of the Board (see Annex 3 for schedule of activities for this report)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>MILESTONES</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS-Net Network Membership Drive</td>
<td>October 2007-October 2008</td>
<td>(1) Secretariat and Advisory Board to continue to invite individuals, institutions and networks to join HS-Net (2) Regular updates to be sent to members via email</td>
<td>Membership has increased to 148 from 108 in 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th HS-Net Advisory Board Meeting</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td>The fifth HS-Net Advisory Board meeting held 11–12 October, 2008 during the fourth session of the World Urban Forum (WUF IV) in Nanjing, PRC</td>
<td>Due to changes in the schedule for the preparation of the 2009 Global Report, the venue and dates for the 5th HS-Net meeting were revised such that the meeting will be held from 24–26 September, 2008 in Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series</td>
<td>October 2007-October 2008</td>
<td>(1) At least two additional papers published by April 2008 (2) Ongoing review and revision of submitted papers, call for submissions (3) Published papers posted on the HS-Net Website</td>
<td>One paper has already been published and an additional two will be published by 31 October 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
<td>Revised and posted online by 31 December 2007</td>
<td>7 case studies on Security of Tenure and Forced Evictions available online (<a href="http://www.unhabitat.org/grhs">www.unhabitat.org/grhs</a>). The remaining case studies will be posted online by 30 November 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team of contributors</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
<td>Team of authors assembled by 31 December 2007</td>
<td>Team of authors assembled by February 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>March 2007</td>
<td>Case studies for the report completed by 31 March 2007</td>
<td>First drafts of 18 case studies and 8 regional studies already submitted to UN-HABITAT and shared amongst 2009 Global Report authors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft chapters</td>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>Submitted by contributors by 31 May 2008</td>
<td>First drafts of all 11 chapters submitted by 15 September and shared with HS-Net Board members and other experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of first</td>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>First draft chapters</td>
<td>First drafts of chapters under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td>TIME FRAME</td>
<td>MILESTONES</td>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft chapters</td>
<td></td>
<td>reviewed by UN-HABITAT and HS-Net Advisory Board and feedback sent to contributors by 31 August 2008</td>
<td>review and consolidated comments to be finalised and sent to chapter authors by 13 October 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second draft chapters</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td>Submitted by contributors by 31 October 2008</td>
<td>Second draft chapters to be submitted by authors to UN-HABITAT by 30 November 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of second draft chapters</td>
<td>November 2008</td>
<td>Second draft chapters reviewed by UN-HABITAT and HS-Net Advisory Board and feedback sent to contributors by 31 November 2008</td>
<td>Comments on second draft chapters to be sent to authors by 1 January 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final draft chapters</td>
<td>31 December 2008</td>
<td>Submitted by contributors by 31 December 2008</td>
<td>Final draft chapters to be submitted by authors to UN-HABITAT by 20 January 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011: Theme To be determined</td>
<td>Selection of theme January 2008</td>
<td>Theme for the report selected by 31 January 2008</td>
<td>Theme for the 2011 report was selected by June 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 UN-HABITAT Lecture Award</td>
<td>Dissemination November 2007</td>
<td>(1) DVD finalized and duplicated by 15 November 2007</td>
<td>(1) 2006 DVD duplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) DVD sent to target institutions by 30 November 2007</td>
<td>(2) 2007 DVD to be duplicated by end October 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) The above two DVDs are to be disseminated to target institutions together with the latest issues of the Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 UN-HABITAT Lecture Award</td>
<td>Dissemination March 2007</td>
<td>(1) DVD finalized and duplicated by 31 March 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) DVD sent to target institutions by 30 April 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 UN-HABITAT Lecture Award</td>
<td>Nominations April 2008</td>
<td>(1) Nominations open from 31 October 2008</td>
<td>Nominations for 7 candidates were received and reviewed by the Board between April 2008 and May 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Deadline for nominations will be 30 March 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Nominations reviewed by Advisory Board and Award Winner selected by 30 April 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Announcement August 2008</td>
<td>Award Winner announced</td>
<td>A winner was selected in by 27 May 2005. The press release is scheduled for October 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture Award ceremony October 2008</td>
<td>During the fourth session of the World Urban Forum (WUF IV) in Nanjing, PRC scheduled for mid October, 2008, 13-17 October</td>
<td>The 2008 Lecture Award Ceremony will take place during the 4th session of the World Urban Forum, 3–6 November, Nanjing, PRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissemination October 2008</td>
<td>(1) Lecture published for dissemination during WUF IV, October 2008</td>
<td>(1) The lecture for the 2008 Award will be published as the third issue of the UN-HABITAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td>TIME FRAME</td>
<td>MILESTONES</td>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|          |            | (2) DVD finalized and duplicated by 31 January 2009  
|          |            | (3) DVD sent to target institutions by 28 February 2009 | Lecture Award Series and disseminated in Nanjing.  
|          |            |            | (2) The third issue of the UN-HABITAT Lecture Award Series will be sent to target institutions. |
ANNUAL REPORT ANNEX 2: 2008 UN-HABITAT LECTURE AWARD (PROGRAMME)

“GIS as a Planning Support System for the Planning of Harmonious Cities”

Tuesday, 4 November, 2008, 1400–1600

by Professor Anthony Gar-On Yeh

PROGRAMME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400–1405</td>
<td>OPENING</td>
<td>Professor Winnie Mitullah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Research Professor, Institute of Development Studies, University of Nairobi, Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405–1410</td>
<td>WELCOME ADDRESS</td>
<td>Professor Oyebanji Oyeyinka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Monitoring and Research Division, UN-HABITAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410–1415</td>
<td>PRESENTATION OF AWARD</td>
<td>Dr. Anna Tibajuka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Director, UN-HABITAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415–1515</td>
<td>LECTURE</td>
<td>Professor Anthony Gar-On Yeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centre of Urban Studies and Urban Planning University of Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515–1530</td>
<td>PANEL OF EXPERTS</td>
<td>Dr. Richard Sliuzas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Urban and Regional Planning and Geo-Information Management, International Institute for Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation, the Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Graham Tipple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape Newcastle University, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Suocheng Dong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Geographical Sciences and Natural Resources Chinese Academy of Sciences, Peoples Republic of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530–1555</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555–1600</td>
<td>CLOSING</td>
<td>Professor Winnie Mitullah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Research Professor, Institute of Development Studies, University of Nairobi, Kenya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proceedings, 5th Advisory Board meeting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>MILESTONES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HS-Net Network membership drive              | (1) Secretariat and Advisory Board to continue to invite individuals, institutions and networks to join HS-Net.  
(2) Quarterly issues of ‘HS-Net’ Alert to continue to be sent to members.  
(3) HS-Net publications (of 2007) disseminated amongst target institutions and associations by 1 December 2008. Additional publications also disseminated upon completion. |
| 6th HS-Net Advisory Board Meeting            | Meeting held before end November 2009.                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series     | (1) At least four additional papers published by October 2009 and posted at the HS-Net website.  
(2) Ongoing call for submissions.                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Case studies                                 | All case studies posted at the UN-HABITAT website by 30 November 2008.                                                                        |
| 2009: Revisiting Urban Planning               | Review of first draft chapters  
First draft chapters reviewed by UN-HABITAT, HS-Net Advisory Board and experts and consolidated comments sent to authors by 13 October 2008. |
| Second draft chapters Submitted by authors by 30 November 2008. | (1) Secretariat and Advisory Board to continue to invite individuals, institutions and networks to join HS-Net.  
(2) Quarterly issues of ‘HS-Net’ Alert to continue to be sent to members.  
(3) HS-Net publications (of 2007) disseminated amongst target institutions and associations by 1 December 2008. Additional publications also disseminated upon completion. |
| Review of second draft chapters               | Second draft chapters reviewed by UN-HABITAT, HS-Net Advisory Board and experts and consolidated comments sent to authors by 1 January 2009.                                                              |
| Final draft chapters Submitted to UN-HABITAT by authors by 20 January 2009. | Draft outline of the report ready by end April 2010.                                                                                           |
| Launching of report                          | Final reports posted online by 5 October 2009.                                                                                                  |
| Case studies                                 | Regional studies Final reports posted online by 5 October 2009.                                                                                |
| Regional studies                             | Final reports posted online by 5 October 2009.                                                                                                                                                           |
| 2011: Cities and Climate Change              | Outline To be finalised by UN-HABITAT by 15 December 2008.                                                                                     |
| Team of authors                              | Team of authors assembled by 1 February 2009.                                                                                                  |
| Case studies                                 | Case studies completed by 30 June 2009.                                                                                                        |
| Regional studies                             | Reports completed by 30 June 2009.                                                                                                               |
| First draft chapters Submitted to UN-HABITAT by authors by 31 July 2009. | (1) Secretariat and Advisory Board to continue to invite individuals, institutions and networks to join HS-Net.  
(2) Quarterly issues of ‘HS-Net’ Alert to continue to be sent to members.  
(3) HS-Net publications (of 2007) disseminated amongst target institutions and associations by 1 December 2008. Additional publications also disseminated upon completion. |
| Review of first draft chapters               | Drafts reviewed by UN-HABITAT, HS-Net Advisory Board and other experts and consolidated comments sent to authors by 31 October 2009.                                                                      |
| 2013: Urban Mobility and Transport           | Selection of theme Theme selected in June 2008.                                                                                               |
(2) DVD finalized and duplicated by 31 January 2009.  
(3) DVD sent to target institutions by 28 February 2009.                                                                                      |
| 2008 UN-HABITAT Lecture Award                | Nominations (1) Nominations open from 15 November 2008 to 15 March 2009.                                                                      |
| Announcement                                 | Winner to be announced by July 2009.                                                                                                             |
| Ceremony                                     | Lecture Award Ceremony to take place during end November 2009.                                                                              |