

COMMENTS TO HABITAT III POLICY PAPERS

JANUARY 29TH 2016

**SUBMITTED BY THE INSTITUTE FOR HOUSING AND URBAN STUDIES
(IHS), ERASMUS UNIVERSITY, ROTTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS**

HABITAT III POLICY PAPER FRAMEWORK 1

THE RIGHT TO THE CITY

Par. & Page	Comments inclusive of a proposal for a text/key words or revised wording
p.2 under heading 1	Consider substituting “Oligarchy” as it sounds too rhetoric
p.3 2 nd paragraph	All inhabitants.... Include: those living informally, on the streets
p.5 bullet points	Overall comment, the bullet points throughout the document are not exclusive, there is very much overlap between the different components, also they are formulated at different levels, some very micro level. Some macro level. Some are positive and some are negative
p.6	<p>What is the focus of RTTC? The problem of shrinking cities? Diverse and socially integrated neighbourhoods. Are these a problem or a goal?</p> <p>Forced evictions: why specifically refer to women, it is a problem for all, but women are more prone as they are more often at home when it happens, there are more FFH in slums.</p> <p>Green housing: is this an aim? It can lead to increased land prices and the poor being pushed out.</p> <p>The problem of overtaking of public space by private sector/interests should be addressed</p> <p>Food security and expansion, what do they mean?</p>
p.7	<p>Par.1.2 also offering rental option and sharing options for non-permanent city dwellers</p> <p>Clarify “Land property, capturing plus value, mixed-use urban planning”</p> <p>Clarify “Diversity, land tenure conditions”</p> <p>Par. 1.3 resettlement sites often do not have those facilities and increasingly people are pushed to resettlement in the periphery</p>
p.8	Protection of public space against market forces needs to be added
par 3.2, p.11	Upgrading first option, in case not possible then resettle, but then resettlement close to original location
Par. 3.3, p.12	Prioritization of historic districts and city centers as tourist location: is this negative? Explain. Heritage conservation, tourist promotion and livelihood restoration can be combined which can be positive for the RTTC

P.15	Typo: IPDs= IDPs
par.5.5 p.16	Green building: might increase land values and push out the poor, so also look for prop-poor, low-cost solutions.
par. 1.1 p.17	To restrict the development of mega projects....., or: to support projects hat do provide opportunities particularly for the poor ADD: Improve connectivity of in informal settlement with the rest of the city through street led development (upgrading) Promote densification yes, but then not only for the poorer neighborhoods, but also for the more wealthy neighborhoods.
Par 1.2, p.18	To promote urban mobility.... ADD: public transport that is affordable accessible and sustainable
p.27	Upgrading: improve workplaces in case of work at home, in case of resettlement location and access to employment is crucial! 3.2 living wage, what is that?
Par. 5.1 p.31	Explain the link to the RTTC

Reviewer: [Maartje van Eerd](#)

HABITAT III POLICY PAPER FRAMEWORK 5

MUNICIPAL FINANCE AND LOCAL FISCAL SYSTEMS

Par. & Page	Comments inclusive of a proposal for a text/key words or revised wording
Overview p.2	Reference should also be made to the importance of accessing capital markets and not just land-based instruments. This is also not consistent with the fact that borrowing is mentioned on p.3 as one of the key elements of municipal finance.
Challenge 1 p.4	The logic of clustering together 'rules of the game' and 'capacities' is unclear. The two refer to very different sets of issues. 'Capacities' seems to be a cross-cutting theme that affects all other key elements of municipal finance.
Challenge 1 p. 9	The 'special issues' appear all of a sudden without adequate contextualization. No indication is given to their relation to the key elements of municipal finance.
Challenge 1 p. 9	Section on Public Private Partnerships should be reformulated as it lacks clarity and focus.
Priorities pp. 10-15	All priorities mentioned are relevant but most are extremely general and no critical assessment is made of what may prevent them from being implemented. By way of illustration, 'commitment to establishing and maintaining the rule of law', or 'increasing the supply of capital in broader domestic capital markets'.
Implementation pp. 16-21	There is no clear outline of implementation mechanisms and potential barriers. Many issues mentioned in this section could be seen as priorities and there are many overlaps between the two sections.

Reviewer: [Alberto Gianoli](#)

HABITAT III POLICY PAPER FRAMEWORK 7

URBAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

Par. & Page	Include explanation/your motivation behind your inputs	Comments inclusive of a proposal for a text/key words or revised wording
1.3: p3&5 1.4: p6 2.2, p12 3.2: p18 3.3	Labour market failure is not implicitly addressed. Weak mobility between informal and formal jobs may be hampered by labour market failure. This may result in structural forms of informality and poverty.	p.3. Change sentence in the first para: There are three challenges, and to mobility between formal and informal jobs may be hampered. Page 5: add something about structural vs temporary informality and poverty. Page 12: add how to enable labour markets to work (education, discrimination, legalisation, ..) Page 18. Add how to address labour market failure
1.3, p3& 10 2.7: p16 3.2: p19 3.3	A fourth challenge is that urban economies are strongly influenced by the international economy . This is only mentioned on page 17 (implementation). Page 10 overstates the importance of local governments in local economic development.	Section 1.3. Add that cities can't be expected to solve employment issues in isolation, due to the (inter)nationalisation of economies. Some comments on page 10 may need a more careful formulation. Page 16: (inter)national networks of cities and other actors are not addressed, but are a core part of economic governance! Page 19/20: add city networks
1.4: p 6 2.1: p.9 3.2: p19 3.3	This does not fully address why labour markets fail. The need for integration and social economic networking , beyond physical connectivity, may be stressed a bit more.	Page 6 & 9: add failure of labour markets. Cities also derive strength from social networking and integration. Connectivity has physical and social connotations. Page 19/20: add the development of knowledge networks
1.5, p7	Cities compete in different sectors, demanding different locational factors.	Successful competitiveness may also depend on tacit knowledge networks and creation. Core is that locational factors are city specific.
1.6, p7 2.7, p16	The sections are government centred. Private and civil stakeholders are hardly	Page 7; add private stakeholders Page 8: add private and civil sector capacity

<p>3.2, p19</p> <p>3.3</p>	<p>mentioned, but also need competences and a voice in order to participate</p>	<p>Page 16: capacity, expertise and a VOICE of private, civic and intermediary actors (such as chambers of commerce) is also needed</p> <p>Page 19/20: add competence building of intermediate actors</p>
<p>Overall it is a solid and well informed paper. As expected, it reflects consensus building and a local government focus, which takes away some depth and perspective.</p> <p>Capacity building of other actors within a city and of networks between cities are hardly addressed. Also, private and civil sector initiatives in urban economic development (such as CSR) are not acknowledged. Tacit issues, such as knowledge networks and discrimination in labour markets, deserve more attention as well.</p>		

Reviewer: [Jan Fransen](#)

HABITAT III POLICY PAPER FRAMEWORK 8

URBAN ECOLOGY AND RESILIENCE

Par. & Page	Include explanation/your motivation behind your inputs	Comments inclusive of a proposal for a text/key words or revised wording
Introduction (Pag.2)	<p>There is a disproportionate attention to the effects of flooding/water scarcity when discussing climate change issues. Albeit their key importance, many scholars acknowledge the existence of a multiplicity of hazards and it's their compounded effect that leads to extreme loss and damage to humans as well as biodiversity.</p> <p>New infrastructure is important, but the upgrade of existing and old infrastructure with ecological and resilience principles in mind even more so.</p>	<p>Third paragraph: add figures for other hazards like heath stress, extreme cold, landslides, coastal erosion, among others.</p> <p>Fourth paragraph: add upgrading of existing and old infrastructure with ecological and resilience principles.</p>
Key Concepts (Pag.1)	<p>In the context of urban ecology and urban planning, urban ecosystems are regarded as embedding both human built and ecological infrastructure (Gómez-Baggethun et al., 2013; Cadenasso and Pickett, 2008). Urban ecosystems include all vegetation, soil, and water covered areas that may be found in urban and peri-urban areas at multiple spatial scales (building, neighborhood, city, region), including parks, cemeteries, lawns and gardens, green roofs, urban allotments, urban forests, single trees, bare soil, abandoned or vacant land,</p>	<p>Suggest using the wording "urban ecosystems" with the provided definition rather than urban ecology, which, at least in the definition provided in the draft, does not qualify what the urban is in relationship to its surroundings.</p>

	wetlands, streams, rivers, lakes, and ponds (Gómez-Baggethun et al., 2013).	
Key Concepts (Pag.3)	We currently face more variable environments with greater uncertainty about how ecosystems will respond to human use. We know that ecological regimes can be subject to sharp regime changes, which may more easily occur if the resilience has been reduced as consequence of human activity. In some cases these shifts may be irreversible (or too costly to reverse. These changes may have great impacts on human wellbeing, therefore the capacity of self-repair of ecosystems can no longer taken for granted (Folke, 2004).	Suggest to be cognizant of the possibility that, in the case where important regime shifts happen (a field of growing interest for scientists) continuous survival, adaptation and more importantly growth in the face of disturbance may not granted for humans when it is not for ecosystems that they depend on. The term “growth”, hence, should be put
Key concepts (par.6)	Based on the comment to par.1	The draft should talk about urban ecosystem and resilience in tandem “urban ecosystem resilience”
Challenges b. Review / analysis of key publications / documents (pag.7) Par. 1.b.7	More than cultural constraints, it is more appropriate to talk about different cultural framings.	Understanding how the decision-making of societies at risk is embedded in culture, and how intervention measures acknowledge, or neglect, cultural settings.
Challenges 1.b.1 Governance	With the increasing importance of market led development and the decentralisation of political functions to local governments, cities have been put at the forefront of neoliberalisation and increasingly made responsible for accomplishing international competitiveness. Most of these efforts to stimulate a marketable city through megaprojects reinforce urban spatial and social	Add pullet point on the interplay between new governance patters where market forces driven by international capital are perpetrating urban spatial and social injustices, through green-infrastructure and mixed-use developments. This indeed stifles transformation and new approaches to development.

	injustices. Many of these megaprojects are precisely those that want to foster green-infrastructure and mixed-use developments (Strauch et al., 2015).	
Priorities Par. 2.b.1 Pag.10	The agency that cities (or networks of cities) can have in spurring transformations beyond neoliberal models of development and in terms of challenging the environmental and social wrong doing of the agri-oil-consumer product multinational organizations they host needs to be acknowledged and encouraged more strongly.	Add a point that urban actors should be developing and testing new autonomous governance structures that enable transformations beyond neoliberal models of development and in terms of challenging the environmental and social wrong doing of the agri-oil-consumer product multinational organizations they host.
Implementati on point c. pag. 17 and Annex 3	Consider frameworks that suggest measuring resilience by estimating the costs it takes to go through a shock (ex-post and ex-ante) as illustrated in Bené (2013) Towards a Quantifiable Measure of Resilience	Add consideration of costs estimation (ex-post and ex-ante).

Reviewer: [Veronica Olivotto](#)

HABITAT III POLICY PAPER FRAMEWORK 10

HOUSING POLICIES

Par. & Page	Formulate your comments by including a proposal for a text/key words or revised wording
(para. 2 pag. 5) 1.1	<p>“It is estimated that only 63% of the world population had improved sanitation access in 2010, and is projected to increase only to 67% by 2015.”</p> <p>This information should be updated if data is available in enough countries.</p>
Pag 5	<p>“Migrants often settle in urban areas and recent studies indicate that migrants are disproportionately represented among the urban poor in many informal settlements.”</p> <p>What is meant by migrants, which kind of migrants?</p>
(Page 6 para. 1) 1.2	<p>Building standards are also made inadequate (or ineffective) through evasion of application of standards and through corruption that allows this to happen. Transparency is required. The same applied to building permits procedures.</p>
(Page 7 para. 2) 1.3	<p>It would be useful to have an explanation of what the importance of the mortgage debt-to-GDP ratio is.</p>
Page 11 <i>d. List of targets</i>	<p>According to what is said at the beginning of the policy paper (p. 4): “Equally important, evidence questions the degree to which the international community actually met the MDG slumupgrading target. The United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UNHabitat) has recognized that these goals were set too low and were achieved by the activities of China and India alone”</p> <p>Targets then should be less aggregated and set in such a way that progress of regions and individual countries is monitored.</p>
d. List of targets (cont.)	<p>- Reduce by 20% the population living in inadequate housing by 2030 (in a slum, adequate housing is deemed to include access to water and sanitation, sufficient space, durable structure and secure tenure)</p> <p>Suggest to include open spaces (green areas) access to services (schools, health centres)</p>

	<p>- Reduce by 30% the homelessness population by 2030. The definition of homelessness is missing in the paper. Suggest to include both the quantitative and qualitative definition and make clear which of the two is being used here.</p>
<p>Page 13 iii) <i>Affordability and Accessibility:</i></p>	<p>- Support green infrastructure including the development of energy-efficient housing and technologies</p> <p>Is this the wrong subtitle for the paragraph?</p>
<p>Page 14 b. 1 <i>Financial resources</i></p>	<p>“Governments of developing countries would need to cover \$60.5 billion and residents of slums themselves would cover the remaining \$11.2 billion.”</p> <p>Where is this amount coming from? How was this calculated? It should be explained and also how residents will contribute: “sweat equity”, down payment for infrastructure provision...</p>
<p>Page 15 c.2 <i>Monitoring mechanisms</i></p>	<p>More should be said about which mechanisms are recommended. At present there is only mention of a Panel that will estimate costs of implementing Goal 11 of the SDGs. Something should be said about national level mechanisms.</p>
<p>Page 18 <i>Annex 2</i></p>	<p>Targets should be mentioned in the monitoring framework.</p> <p>(Habitability Issue): indicators should include quality of housing e.g. over-crowding and adequate services.</p>
<p>Page 20 <i>And elsewhere in Annex 2</i></p>	<p>Many of the indicators need to be developed to make them operational. For example, on page 20 (Secondary ... 1. Habitability, Outcome indicators) “security of land tenure” is an indicator but becomes useful when it is operationalised as something like “increase in % of households living in dwellings (or on land) with recognised security of tenure”.</p> <p>Similarly, directly below this indicator is another “population mobility” which needs to be operationalised. No doubt this will be done for all the indicators at a later stage but this should be mentioned here as well as saying who will do this and when.</p> <p>In general, the Outcome indicators should be worded to reflect changes in housing achieved compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>The difference in the nature of the “outcome” and “process” indicators is not clear. They need to be made more distinctive. For example, outcome indicators could be a measure of change in housing (as suggested above) and process indicators could be changes in supporting mechanisms such legislation on land tenure, % of GDP allocated to housing or establishment of new housing finance mechanisms.</p>

Reviewer: [Julia Skinner](#)

