

UNCRD EXPERT GROUP MEETING ON INTEGRATED REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

28-30 May 2013
Nagoya, Japan

Report

Introduction

The United Nations Centre for Regional Development (UNCRD) was established in 1971 based on the agreement between the United Nations (UN) and the Government of Japan dated 18 June 1971. The founding documents of UNCRD - ECOSOC resolutions 1086 C (1965), 1141 (1966) and 1582 (L) (1971) as well as the agreement between the UN and the Government of Japan referred to above – stipulate the objectives and activities of the UNCRD as:

- 1) to serve as a training and research centre in regional development and planning and related fields for developing countries which may wish to avail themselves of its services;
- 2) to provide advisory services in regional development and planning and related fields at the request of developing countries;
- 3) to assist developing countries in promoting the exchange of data on research, practical experience, teaching, and other relevant subjects in regional development and planning and related fields; and
- 4) to assist and cooperate with other organizations, national or international, concerned with regional development and planning and related fields.

These have been the guiding principle of the work of UNCRD for over forty years. Meanwhile several changes have taken place in how UNCRD operates in recent years. The head office for UNCRD in the Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) changed from Division for Public Administration and Development Management (DPADM) to Division for Sustainable Development (DSD) in 2009. The Hyogo Office for Disaster Management Planning closed at the end of March 2011 and the programme has now been integrated at Nagoya Office. The shift of the head office from DPADM to DSD reflects the fact that the work of UNCRD increasingly addressed issues relevant to sustainable development.

After 20 years from the Earth Summit, the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20 Conference) took place in June 2012 and adopted the outcome document, *The Future We Want*, which was endorsed by the General Assembly on 27 July 2012 ([A/RES/66/288](#)). The future programme of UNCRD will be focusing on the implementation of this outcome document as it relates to the work of the Centre. In addition, UNCRD submitted a Voluntary Commitment at Rio+20 in the areas of Integrated Regional Development Planning, together with three other areas: 1) Environmentally Sustainable Transport; 2) 3Rs; and 3) International Partnership for Expanding Waste Management Services of Local Authorities – IPLA. UNCRD will strive to deliver what it committed to together with the partners, which in itself will contribute to further promoting sustainable development.

Following the Rio+20, with the suggestion of the Advisory Committee, UNCRD developed a strategy paper, in which UNCRD established that UNCRD's interventions in developing countries are clustered under three main interrelated and complementary areas of work – (a) **Integrated Regional Development Planning**; (b) **Sustainable Urban Management**; and (c) **Knowledge Management**. It further defines that under the **Integrated Regional Development Planning** thematic area, UNCRD will

undertake activities in areas, such as integrated decision making in addressing social, economic and environmental issues in a holistic way, strengthening and building institutional and technical capabilities, decentralized governance, human security, among others. At the same time, UNCRD aims for improved application of Integrated Regional Development Planning as an effective means of promoting sustainable development.

At Rio+20, the importance of making coherent and integrated planning and decision-making at the national, sub-national and local levels was recognized and to this end, the World Leaders called for strengthening national, sub-national and/or local institutions (para. 101). UNCRD believes that integrated regional development planning offers an effective tool for promoting sustainable development. However, this has not been documented nor debated in intergovernmental process.

In order to better serve towards the promotion of sustainable development, there is a need to revisit the concept of regional development and raise international understanding around the tools it can provide to help developing countries addressing the new challenges of the 21st century. With the outcome of Rio+20 now in our hand, it was considered a good timing to do this exercise and reconsider the tools available for assisting developing countries in promoting sustainable development. UNCRD held the Expert Group Meeting (EGM) on Integrated Regional Development Planning for this purpose.

Keynote Address

The keynote address was delivered by Professor John Friedmann, honorary Professor at University of British Columbia, entitled “Vision for Integrated Regional Development Planning for Achieving Sustainable Development”. Professor Friedmann began his presentation by outlining his association with UNCRD forty years ago and the research work he had done on a regional development approach titled “agropolitan.” He observed much has changed since then and noted that today we are living in a different world. The speech was composed by three parts: (1) the leading ideas and approaches of regional development in the last century; (2) an overview of global changes of recent time to help UNCRD situate itself in the contemporary era; (3) Conclusion and some suggestions that will help UNCRD to promote its new mission of integrated regional development to achieve sustainable development.

Professor Friedmann informed the participants that his first practical experience with regional development began when he took up a job at Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), an agency that was in charge of designing and implementing a river basin regional development planning and policy in southern United States after graduating from University of Chicago. He noted that while working at TVA and conducting research for his dissertation he found out the importance and the role of “interconnected city regions” that are responsible for development.

Professor Friedmann later joined MIT as a Professor in 1961 and was involved in project that would take him to Venezuela as a consultant where he was involved in designing and implementing “growth pole” regional development projects, which he later named as a “core region”. It implied that strategic investment in core regions would generate a process of self-sustained economic growth through spillover effects in the surrounding areas. This approach was well received in many developing countries, including Latin American countries. However, Professor Friedmann indicated that this approach soon disappeared from the radar after the mid-1970s and a new liberal policy that advocated free enterprise, global trade and export orientation became the dominant development strategy. Countries such as South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore whose development policy was mainly

based on export promotion strategy were hailed as success stories and developing countries were urged to follow in their footsteps.

Professor Friedman noted that it was during this time that he and Professor Michael Douglass began working on a regional development strategy called “Agropolitan,” which focused on the interface between rural and urban development. This regional development strategy was, unfortunately criticized by some scholars, who argued that “industrialization was urban” and therefore the surplus labor in rural areas should leave this sector and migrate to urban areas so as to provide labor force for the growing urban industries. Despite receiving harsh criticism, Professor Friedmann noted that this approach was vindicated when in the 80s and 90s the so-called township and village industries in China flourished and improved rural poverty.

Professor Friedman informed the participants that while teaching at UCLA, he collaborated with his graduate student and began research on the concept of what he called “World Cities” and came up with a notion of “World City Formation: an Agenda for Research and Action.” This concept, according to Prof. Friedmann, generated widespread interest among scholars all over the world. However, in 2002 this notion of “World Cities” was criticized by Jennifer Robinson, who argued that the concept of “World Cities” is a phenomenon in a handful places and mostly in developed countries and therefore planners should focus on cities in the South.

Further, Professor Friedman, in his paper, introduced the concept of “city regions” and “periurban” areas. He argued that there is a constant struggle between central core cities and periurban areas as the former expands and encroaches into the latter through physical, economic, socio-cultural and political-institutional means to satisfy its needs. According to Professor Friedmann, the periurban areas support the core cities by providing them with their essential needs such as water, fresh produce, waste disposal, transportation, airports, etc.

Professor Friedmann also addressed the issue of what he called “city of shadows,” the informal settlements. In this regard, Professor Friedman posed the question – “on whose terms should the city and its ring of perurban communities be planned?” According to Professor Friedmann, half of the urban population lives in these irregular settlements and therefore planners should ask themselves whether they should decide planning issues in terms of addressing the interest of those who live the “city of shadows” or based on the interest of the growing middle class.

In light of the changing global economic and world order, Professor Friedman, as a conclusion and the way forward, proposed to UNCRD to focus its activities in either of the following three areas:

- On integration of the periurban areas with the central city;
- Coordinating development of multi-centered urban regions; or
- On smaller, often obscure and neglected cities of developing countries where often the majority of population lives.

Session I: Sketching Out Integrated Regional Development Planning

In the first session, two presentations were made. The first presentation was by Professor Michael Douglass from National University of Singapore, who spoke on “Integrated Regional Development Planning for Sustainable Development in Asia: Innovations in the Governance of Metropolitan, Rural-Urban, and Transborder Riparian Regions.” The second presentation was made by Ms. Birgitte Alvarez-Rivero from Division for Sustainable Development (DSD), UN DESA, who spoke on “Outcome of Rio+20

Conference as relates to Integrated Regional Development Planning: Experiences of National Sustainable Development Strategies.” The session was chaired by Prof. Friedmann.

In his presentation, Professor Michael Douglas, focused on three types of regional settings in Asia:

- Extended metropolitan regions;
- Rural-urban regions; and
- Transborder riparian regions.

Based on the analysis of these three regional settings, Prof. Douglass outlined and attempted to address how regional development contributes to sustainable development.

According to Prof. Douglass, footprints of cities have already reached far beyond their boundaries creating what he calls Extended Metropolitan Regions (EMRs). EMRs are forming vast regions, in which peri-urban regions cannot be considered either urban or rural but a complex system of both regional settings. As a result of EMRs, mega-urban cities are emerging and Asia is home to the greatest number of mega-cities.

At the same time, these mega-cities are located in coastal areas of Asia and consequently exposed to frequent floods and devastating tsunamis. Based on the experience of Jakarta, Prof. Douglass showed how these mega cities are exposed to environmental sustainability problems while their footprints continue to reach far beyond their boundaries. According to Prof. Douglass, most of the mega cities in Asia, such as Jakarta, Delhi, Mumbai, Shanghai and others, are ill prepared for flood related risks and the urban poor are the most affected by floods.

Most importantly, Prof. Douglass argued that decentralization and deregulation of land use policy went in favor of the private sector, thereby giving rise to uncontrolled and unregulated expansion with worsening effects in diverse forms: flooding, declining land value, uncontrolled population and unhealthy habitation of the growing poor.

According to Professor Douglass, to address the problem of flooding, Indonesia has taken some initiatives, which include: Regional Plan Action and 2009 National Zoning; increasing cooperation across some kabupaten boundaries; and increasing the role of civil society in response to flooding and evictions.

The second regional settings, Prof. Douglass presented is rural-urban regions. According to Prof. Douglass this long-held objective of regional development planning designed and implemented to address the aspiration of both the rural and urban population. Among the most popular regional development modules that advocated this approach include the “role of small towns” and “agropolitan”.

According to Prof. Douglass, rural regions in Asia can no longer be viewed as simply agrarian and their main livelihood is not coming from agriculture. Most importantly, the introduction of mobile phone to rural population have revolutionized and changed the way the rural population interacts with the outer world and thereby strengthened rural-urban linkages. On the other hand, global migration and remittances have become important factors in rural settings of Asia.

Based on the case study of Rural-Urban Partnership Programme (RUPP) initiated in Nepal, Professor Douglass highlighted the essence of urban-rural linkages and the role they play in integrating social,

economic and environmental dynamics for local benefits. RUPP was launched in 1997 with the support of UNDP as innovative initiative towards integrated rural-urban regional development. The initiative included capacity building as well as micro-credit components, among others, to support local communities. RUPP had multi-level linkages and structures at the rural areas, including rural-urban market linkages, enterprise development and village-municipal government linkages.

RUPP achieved several accomplishments, which included that by 2003 the initiative was active in 12 out of the 58 municipalities; 33 rural markets were created and over 4000 people were trained on participatory development planning, etc. Limitations of RUPP included the lack of democratically elected national and local governments; political instability due to insurgency by Maoists; relatively small budget (US\$10 million) and the initiative could not reach the remote regions of the rural areas.

The third type of regional setting, which Prof. Douglass addressed, was what he called “Transborder Riparian Regions” in Asia. This transborder regional setting that is based on the great Mekong River basin brings out an issue of global significance, which has potential for: (i) immense collective prosperity if and when planned together and fair and binding agreements are made between countries sharing the resources of the river; and (ii) conflict when each country unilaterally decides on the use of the river water in question for example by building dams. The Mekong River, which flows across six countries has an estimated 4,350 km in length, drains an area of 795,000km² and touches the livelihoods of 60 million people, was presented as a case study.

According to Prof. Douglass, the most common elements in transborder riparian region initiatives includes:

- *Information gathering, processing and dissemination* to promote common understanding of conditions, monitor change and share expertise.
- *Transborder treaties, agreements, compacts, commissions* to create political agreements among countries on various aspects of water governance.
- *Civil Society participation* to include local knowledge, issues, skills, address unanticipated impacts, and build on local institutional capacities.
- *Supra-national governance authority* to transfer forms of authority over water governance to entities above and autonomous from the nation-state.

As a conclusion, Professor Douglass argued that the three regional settings discussed could not provide a model for IRDP. However, important lessons could be drawn from the challenges and success of these three regional settings that could help UNCRD to design its future strategies to assist developing countries to achieve sustainable development.

The third presentation was given by Ms. Birgitte Alvarez-Rivero, Division for Sustainable Development, UNDESA, on “Integrating Regional Development Planning into National Sustainable Development Strategy.”

After outlining the process that led to the Rio+20 Conference, Ms. Alvarez-Rivero referred to the outcome document of the Rio+20 Conference, “*The Future We Want*” and quoted relevant paragraphs IRDP, paragraphs 22 and 101. In particular, the latter talks of the need for more coherent and integrated planning and decision-making at the national, subnational and local levels.

Furthermore, she highlighted the 5 priority areas for advancing sustainable development that were identified in the National Assessments conducted prior to Rio+20, which include:

- Strengthening institutions and governance systems and building capacities for collaboration and coordination;
- Unpacking and operationalizing the “green economy.”
- Reinforcing the connection between the SD Agenda and the MDGs;
- Meaningfully engaging all stakeholders;
- Measuring development progress in an integrated way.

In her presentation, Ms. Alvarez-Rivero described National Sustainable Development Strategies (NSDS) as “a coordinated, participatory and iterative process to achieve economic, environmental and social objectives in a balanced and integrated manner.” Therefore, she explained that the formulation and implementation process is a cyclical and interactive process of planning, participation and action, in which the emphasis is on managing the progress towards sustainability goals, rather than producing a plan as an end product.

She, then, highlighted the principles and characteristics of NSDS which closely mirrors integrated regional development planning processes with sustainable development objectives. They include:

- Integration of economic, social and environmental objectives;
- Coordination and balance between sector and thematic strategies and decentralized levels and across generations;
- Broad participation, effective partnership, transparency and accountability;
- Developing capacity and an enabling environment, building on existing knowledge and process.
- Country ownership, shared vision with a clear timeframe on which stakeholders agree, commitment to continuous improvement (institutionalization)
- Focus of priorities, outcomes and coherent means of implementation
- Linkage with budget and investment process to avoid unfunded mandates
- Continuous monitoring and evaluation.

She further explained that when it comes to monitoring NSDS, it is important that:

- International goals and targets are adapted to national circumstances in order to be meaningful;
- There is coherence between national and international goals and targets.

In the pursuing discussion, it was widely acknowledged that IRDP is a useful tool for sustainable development, in particular, since it attempts to integrate the three pillars of sustainable development (economic growth, social development and environmental protection) and employs participatory planning. With regard to the scale, although it was attempted to differentiate the discussion across the different scale of governance levels (global, national, regional and local), it was considered that a region is defined according to the issues being addressed. It was also acknowledged that there are different scales in both governance and issues being addressed. It was also pointed out that there were interactions between and among these different scales, such as transborder issues. In addition, it was pointed out that there is a growing trend of network of cities to address issues of concern. It was also highlighted, that although it may look useful to identify scale and scope, the reality is very complex and the emerging priority has different dynamics, hence difficult to predict. Therefore, it may be sufficient to set the goal as having a direction. The difficulty in translating what is committed at the national level to regional and local levels as well as harmonizing/integrating regional with national plans are also pointed out as challenges.

It was acknowledged that the deliverables of UNCRD include: knowledge base; capacity building at local, regional and national levels; policy advice; intergovernmental forums; conducting multi-stakeholder consultations; and assisting policy formulation processes.

Due to time constraint, the discussion was inconclusive, but it was agreed that the role and contribution of IRDP to sustainable development would be revisited throughout the Meeting.

Session II: Integrated Regional Development Planning: Nexus with Sustainable Development: Experience of Latin America and Africa

The UNCRD Coordinators of regional offices, Ms. Claudia Hoshino for Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) and Mr. Asfaw Kumssa for Africa, presented the experience of respective regions. The session was chaired by Prof. Michael Douglass.

Ms. Hoshino, the Coordinator of UNCRD LAC Office, presented the experience of Latin America. First of all, she explained the context of LAC region as the following:

- Mid-income economies
- Highly diverse (from highly industrialized to small insular poor countries)
- Highly urbanized (85%), expected to reach 90% by 2050
- Amongst highest inequities in the world with poverty and indigence accounting for 111 million
- Depletion of natural resources and ecosystem due to prioritization of economic development over social development, where the environmental aspects come in third position.

A similar situation is found at subnational (territories/regions) level.

As the region faces a slowdown in population growth, and is reaching stability, in a context of climate change, scarcity of natural resources, there is an opportunity for a transition towards Quality of life – Equity – Environmental sustainability, and creating positive social and territorial synergies.

She then explained that “*The Ordenamiento Territorial*” (Territorial development and planning) focusing on decentralization and territorial policy at national and sub-national levels, is high on the LA policy agenda, where IRDP has a strong role to play.

She further explained the strength of Human Security and Territorial Security as a framework for analysis and action on IRDP. Human security and territorial security depend on the resistance and resilience of a given territory and its inhabitants to multiple threats. The main interrelated and interconnected components of human and territorial security are:

- cultural (affective emotional) security
- food sovereignty and autonomy security
- ecological security
- social security
- juridical institutional security
- energy security
- economic security

The following are the examples of IRDP at the sub-national/territorial level:

- Bogotá-Cundinamarca: a City-Region
- Medellín: Metropolitan Area

- The Caribbean Metropolitan Corridor
- The Sololá Region of Guatemala (integration of municipalities around Lake Atitlan)
- The Central Region of Argentina (integration of 3 provinces)
- Chilean regions: an urban approach to regional planning and project formulation
- The Social Management Plan for the Recovery of the Area affected by the Bogota Landfill

She highlighted the case of: Bogotá-Cundinamarca regional integration initiative as a relevant example of a City-Region. The characteristics of Bogotá, capital of Colombia, are:

- 4th largest city in South America and 6th in Latin America (7.3 million inhabitants)
- 16% of the Colombian population
- 25% of the country's GDP
- Urban land has increased by 30 times in last 50 years
- The Bogota region (Cundinamarca) is self sufficient in water

The challenges of the Bogota region are the following:

- Each territorial unit of the Bogota region has developed independently
- The peripheral territory is the poorest, but major provider of environmental services
- Dysfunctional conurbations
- Incompatibility of land use in the municipal borders
- Incompatibility between actual land use and the Territorial Development plan
- Ecosystem deterioration caused by land-use conflict, such as agro-industrial development on wetland conservation areas (and other strategic ecosystems)

Ms. Hoshino indicated the following as possible solutions:

- Integration: Territorial Planning Strategy for Bogota Region
- Network of cities
- Regional Organization Plan (from individual territories to sustainable regions)

In concluding, she emphasized that IRDP is a process. It is context-specific planning; multi-scalar/intergovernmental; multi-dimensional/multi-sectoral; involves multi-stakeholders; and is prospective. She also emphasized the need to empower subnational governments and build institutional and technical capacity for decentralized regional governance. Also emphasized was the recognized role of UNCRD in building technical and institutional capacity of regional governments and key public and private stakeholders, and facilitating dialogue among these stakeholders to work in cooperation and with a shared vision of the future of the region, and to develop strategic actions and projects that address critical threats and obstacles to attain sustainable development.

Mr. Kumssa, the Coordinator of the UNCRD Africa Office, explained that the Africa Office was established in 1991 in Nairobi, Kenya to assist African countries in their endeavour to design and implement effective regional development policies and programmes.

The main objectives of the office are:

- to serve as a research and training centre in local and regional development in Africa;
- to seek ways to improve regional economies and strengthen local capacity of African countries; and
- to provide a forum for experience-sharing among Africans as well as other scholars and policy-makers.

After independence, Kenya initiated many RD policies, including district focused rural development (from mid-60s to mid-70s). Districts were designated as basic unit for planning at the local level. The project closely worked with the local community and focused on:

- project identification
- improved monitoring and evaluation of projects
- effective implementation
- coordination and integration of social, economic and environmental management policies to achieve sustainable development.

This regional policy managed to bring about integration and coordination of sectoral and regional plans at the district level and promoted participation. It also strengthened institutional framework at the district levels and improved the socioeconomic and environmental conditions of the rural areas.

Some of the challenges faced by the regional policy were the weak capacity at the local levels, and the lack of sensitization. As well, some community-based projects could not be implemented due to financial constraints.

The regional development policy, “**Growth Centres and Service Centres Policies**” in Kenya was designed (from 1970 to 1974) to bring about regional balances between the so called “native lands” and “white highlands.” It was meant to check the rural migration movement towards major cities such as Nairobi and Mombasa. The centres are expected to achieve faster growth and spillover effects on the surrounding areas. As a result, many small towns (such as Nakuru, Eldoret, etc.) have grown to become major competitors of Nairobi and Mombasa.

The arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) regional development policy focused on promoting dry-land farming, harnessing the pastoral resources, strengthen the communities’ resilience to climate shocks, particularly drought and floods. It was also designed to promote sustainable utilization and management of the environment and natural resources. Finally, it aimed at enhancing social cohesion and reducing conflict and promoting education for the pastoral community, etc.

Kenya has also established six river basin regional development authorities.

The Regional Development Authorities are state corporations created by the act of parliament to:

- Design and implement integrated regional development programmes and projects in their respective area;
- Promote effective and sustainable natural resource utilization practices; and environmental management;
- Promote socially inclusive policies;
- Formulate and implement poverty reduction programmes within regional and local economic development frameworks to achieve sustainable development in their respective areas.

UNCRD Africa Office has been providing technical assistance to some of these regional development authorities to build their capacity and prepare their integrated regional development plans. The Kwale district and Mombasa mainland south integrated regional development plan 2004-2034 is a long-term integrated regional development plan prepared through a consultative and participatory process. The main objective of the plan is to identify the region’s resources, their potential and levels of utilization. It also aimed at identifying the regions existing problems and opportunities; and provide a framework for

drawing up short; mid-term and long-term programmes and projects to enable the region to achieve sustainable development.

Recently, Kenya has adopted a new constitution, which divided the country into 47 counties. Administrative and fiscal powers have been devolved to these counties. This makes integrated regional development very relevant for Kenya.

Namibia recognized the importance of integrated regional development and embarked on this policy right after independence in 1996 to promote popular participation, reduce regional and social inequality (created by the apartheid policy) and alleviate poverty. It also aimed at strengthening urban-rural linkages. Most importantly, the government embarked on this policy as a remedy to the exclusion policy of the apartheid era.

Through the Namibia's fourth national development plan 2012/13-2016/17, the country had adopted the overarching goals of attain high and sustained economic growth, increased income equality, employment creation and sustainable environmental management. These priorities emerged from the challenges the country is currently faced with. For instance, Namibia has one of the highest income inequalities in Africa with a gini coefficient of 0.58. The official unemployment rate is also over 50 percent. Being mainly arid and semi-arid, the government would like to encourage environmentally friendly technologies such as solar energy. The urban centers exist as "enclaves" with economic linkages to the capital city and cities across the border, mainly in South Africa.

He, then, presented the challenges of integrated regional development planning in Africa. With the emergence of globalization and the information technologies, high urbanization and the effects of climate change, IRDP should come up with innovative methodologies and approaches to come to grips with these new emerging issues. IRDP should be instrumental to address the lack of human and institutional capacity that affects the implementation of integrated regional development and the problem of harmonization/integration of regional plans with national plans/visions. It should also make pressure on the central government for the latter to devolve power to regional authorities and address its lack of political commitment.

With regard to the way forward, he noted that Integrated regional development planning in Africa should focus on rural-urban linkages. At the same time, special attention should be given to urban development. As a fact, despite being the least urbanized continent in the world, Africa has the highest urbanization rate per annum. In 2007, the African urban population was 373.4 million, a figure that is projected to reach 1.2 billion by the year 2050. Cities and towns are hubs of prosperity – more than 80 per cent of the global activity is produced in cities.

In the pursuing discussion, the relationship between sustainable development and IRDP was revisited. It was noted that the three main focuses emphasized in the presentations were Environmental degradation, Participatory planning and Human Security and examples of regional approaches to these pillars were also pointed out. These issues and more may include spectrum of sustainable development. It was broadly agreed that IRDP addresses sustainable development.

It was also pointed out that the need for IRDP was due to the fact that many problems affect people at the local level hence IRDP specifically addresses the needs at the local level. It was highlighted that IRDP seeks to address community empowerment and capacity development; thus in one way or the other ensures sustainable development. It was also stressed that for any planning whether strategic

development planning, sustainable development planning or IRDP; some of the key elements need to be clarified, including scope, process, objectives, output and timeline. It was emphasized as Prof. Freidmann mentioned in his keynote speech, there is a need to clarify who is doing the planning for whom?

It was also emphasized again that IRDP need to be contextualized and made relevant. This can be realized through participatory planning process.

Session III: Nexus of Urban-Rural Linkages in the Rapid Urbanization and the Role of Integrated Regional Development Planning as a tool for Sustainable Cities and Regions

There were three presentations in this session; the first one was by Professor Masao Takano of Nagoya University who delivered the key presentation on “Integrated Regional Development Planning as a tool for sustainable cities and regions”. The second presentation was delivered by Ms. Carolina Chica, planning secretariat of the City of Bogotá. Ms Chica presented on “Experience of the Regional Integration of Bogotá” Mr. Katsuaki Takai, senior researcher at UNCRD, delivered the third presentation on “Endogenous Regional Development”.

In his presentation, **Prof. Takano** presented a case study in Toyota City on the theme of the session and he explained that the case study is on a rural region, termed as Satoyama, in Japanese, representing one ecosystem including human community. According to Prof. Takano, there are four aspects of integration as the following:

- Integration of field, land use for transportation, community empowerment, forestry, energy, biodiversity etc. ;
- Integration of area: that is both urban and rural integration;
- Integration of stakeholders: inclusive of residents, non-profit organization, companies and government; and
- Integration of process, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

IRDP should take into consideration of the above mentioned four aspects.

In addition, a flow chart of feedback loop of planning and practices was demonstrated. This process requires firstly the community to formulate the future goal. An expert is required to facilitate the decision and agreement of the desired goal of the community. Then scenarios have to be considered to realize the goal. It is vital that experts make simulation by the scenarios and then compare the results. If any discrepancies are found, the whole process needs to be redone again. Future scenarios are then well considered, leading to action plan, implementation and evaluation of results to examine whether community has changed. Regional integration drives the feedback pool. This feedback pool will also allow one to perceive who or which organization is driving the regional development.

He then went on to explain the changes in Japan’s Rural- Urban population. Before 1950, the majority of the population resided in rural areas. However in 1970, after 20 years, 80 % of the population migrated to urban areas. An example of Tayone village in Aichi Prefecture was provided to show a huge reduction in population in 1998. In general, Japan is now extremely urbanized. In addition, majority of the young people moved to urban centre to receive education and only 20% returned back to the village. Furthermore, most paddy fields in rural Japan were abandoned and artificial forests created for logging purposes were poorly managed, resulting in degradation of ecosystems.

With this background, Prof. Takano presented the case study on Toyota City. Toyota city extended its area annexing surrounding rural municipalities in 2005. Hence the city Mayor initiated policies to sustain the environment.

Several projects have been derived from the policies. The notable ones are:

- Toyota City Forest Management Plan for the coming 100 years to empower the rural areas. The stakeholders involved were: volunteers, communities, local government, non-governmental organizations, and landowners. Detail plan was drawn up to log artificial forest. The management of the forest by the local government depended upon the landowners' consensus. However land owners did not agree because logging had no economic value. Through the stakeholders meetings, a consensus was reached that landowners will carry out their own logging activities as well.
- Station wood Project: small scale logging carried out by land owners with the support of NGOs and local government. Such activities signify the cooperation between the people, local government and NGOs
- Empowerment of local community and promoting the shift for urban to rural areas. There are two main programs targeted at attracting young people to migrate to rural areas. The "Young people coming to rural" project employs 10 young people to live in vacant houses and to learn organic agriculture while the Satoyama Koh program aims at making a model of "eco-friendly and fashionable modern Satoyama lifestyle". In addition, the local government opened a website on information bank on vacant houses. This enabled people to apply and reside in the vacant house in the rural areas. As a result of such programs and initiative, the number of young people migrating to rural areas is increasing.

The case of Toyota City demonstrated that integrated planning can be carried out by integrated group of the leaders of various fields.

Finally, Prof. Takano presented the recommendations for IRDP as a tool for sustainable development as the following:

- promoting self-governance by the residents;
- discovering good practices from the grassroots level;
- encouraging driving actors; and
- sharing the mission with driving actors of various fields in cooperation with local government.

Ms. Carolina Chica, Planning Secretariat of the City of Bogotá, presented on "Regional integration experience of Bogota (Capital City of Colombia)".

She first provided the overview of Bogotá. Although Bogotá is one of the biggest cities in Latin America, the area is mostly rural as well. There is socio-spatial segregation at the regional scale where the standard of living is improved in urban areas while the rural areas are experiencing high level of poverty. The city of Bogotá is addressing this spatial segregation through long-term and mid-term strategies. The local government has formulated two main strategies to alleviate poverty. The long-term planning instrument is the Land Use Plan which is a 16-year plan and the mid-term land development plan is a 4-year plan. Both plans address the socio-economic disparity between the urban and rural areas. The Land Use Plan is more structural whereas the local development plan is evaluated after its tenure where

the local administrators evaluates the next 4-year plans, taking into consideration the failures, successes and lessons. The Land Development plans must ensure to incorporate or spell out investment plans.

With regard to Land Use Plan, she explained that the three main Strategies are: main ecologic structure, functional and services structure and socio-economic and spatial structure. The fundamentals in the regional integration strategy includes compact and regional integrated city, integration of transport systems, implementation of climate change actions, inclusive city and simplification of urban norms.

The policy framework of the city intends to increase the number of protected areas, make visible environmental and landscape values of the ecological structure, restrict housing projects on risk areas, consolidate a “net system” of public transportation, take advantages of urban transformation potentials generated by massive transportation corridors, mixing policies and densification and location of low income housing projects in areas with a better accessibility and proximity to work and urban services.

As a mid-term Land Development Plan, Bogota City has formulated **Human Bogotá (2012-2016)**. This medium-term plan has three chapters:

- a) A city that overcomes segregation and discrimination (in social and spatial terms). This chapter outlines a mixture of economic and social development policies and urban transformation polices.
- b) A territory that faces climate change. It is acknowledged that Bogotá is a riparian region consisting of 40 municipalities that shares the Bogotá river basins. Hence the plan initiates environmentally friendly constructions. Therefore emphasis is on environmental sustainability over economic development because environmental sustainability paves way for economic development.
- c) A Bogotá that defends and strengthen the public value. This plan seeks to address citizen’s participation and anti-corruption ethics and more importantly recover the legitimacy of the public service.

She explained that the regional integration of the local development plan is across sectoral and multidimensional issues. Nine of thirty-three programs involved regional integration and goals related to environmental sustainability, food security, infrastructures and economic development and cooperation.

Both instruments are based on a multi-scoped regional approach. There is no definition of a region, however in this case, regional approach is based on the scope of the problems and issues to be addressed.

- i) border scope: This refers to local issues which are based on extension of metropolitan areas and contours rural borders. The main issues are public services delivery and public transport, special planning coordination such as land use plans and land market.
- ii) sub-regional scope: The integration between rural and urban development is emphasized under this scope specifically between Bogotá city and Cundinamarca which is a regional government that surrounds Bogotá. Food production and water production are the focused issue.
- iii) central region scope: This scope is based on Bogotá, Cundinamarca and three areas surrounding Bogotá city. This scope acknowledges the importance of relationship between Bogota and the country as a whole.

The Challenges of implementation of IRDP includes: Difficult coordination amongst local authorities and different levels of government, relationship between territorial planning and financing of the plans,

whereby the national government has the veto power to determine where the funds should be directed and national government interference especially in the mining and large scale urban housing projects.

The third presentation was made by **Mr. Katsuaki Takai**, senior researcher at UNCRD, on “Endogenous Regional Development”.

He explained that there are two types of Regional Development Approach

- a) Endogenous regional development (EnRD): is the process of regional development promoted by the initiative of the local people using local resources based on local biodiversity, culture, traditions and skills aiming towards sustainable development
- b) Exogenous regional development (ExRD) : is the process of regional development promoted by governments utilizing outside resources with legal controls, technical innovation which aims to achieve rapid industrialization

It is very common to combine and use both approaches.

Japan’s modernization began in 1868, when Japan moved away from agriculture-based economy to industrialized economy. Rapid modernization and high economic growth was achieved in the 1960s and 1970s when the national government geared towards industrialization and creating a good business environment for industries. Attempts were made to emulate the west by introducing modern industrial technologies. In doing so, industries were dispersed across the country. However, problems such as air pollution, health deterioration, overpopulation in urban areas and depopulation in rural areas occurred. Furthermore, natural resources were degraded, biodiversity was rapidly being lost, and traditional culture and rural vitality declined, while dependence on government subsidies increased.

Rural revitalization policies were introduced, but it was not sufficient. Therefore in some rural areas, endogenous development approach was introduced. This led to revitalization of these areas, which resulted in community empowerment and enabled the citizens to utilize local resources.

Mr. Takai introduced **One village One Product (OVOP)** policy as an example of endogenous regional development. First, he cautioned that this term can be misunderstood as one village can only concentrate on producing one product however in fact it implies that one village can produce one product first and then concentrate again on producing another product. Concentration of production of one product at one time will trigger production of other goods. Hence it is an incremental approach to production.

The concept was advocated by Governor of Oita prefecture, Mr. Morihiko Hiramatsu, in 1979, when Oita prefecture was experiencing rapid population decline. The goal of OVOP movement was to develop municipal specialty product that can be turned into signature brand-name products that the people can be proud of and to use the products to accelerate community development so as to encourage people to remain in their hometown. The local mayors and residents implemented the concept.

In addition, there are three principles of the concept, which signify its usefulness in contributing to sustainable development. The first is “local yet global,” implying that the products are to be produced locally but acceptable by the global market. The second is self-generating creativity, by which the product must be created and chosen by the citizens. The third is human resource development.

Moreover, the government provides support in several ways, including research and training and extension workers, market and promotion of the products in urban areas, in-country and overseas training, awards and financing system and management guidance.

Success stories of endogenous development includes Oita prefecture of Japan, which produces the best quality mushroom in Japan and Bungo beef, Yufuin in Central Oita, which is known for having one of the best hot spring in Japan, and Ikeda town in Hokkaido prefecture, which was successful in making Tokachi wine. Ger area upgrading in Mongolia, rural-urban linkage in Bhutan and Karst area development in Indonesia are known to be good examples outside Japan.

Several factors of success can be considered. It is important to have local leaders with abilities for planning, coordinating and public relations. Support system by the local government is crucial as well as people's participation and nexus of urban-rural linkages. Endogenous regional development resulted in outstanding human resources development in the local area and capacity development.

Session IV: Emerging Environmental Issues and the Implications for IRDP

In opening the session, the session's Chair, Honorable Dr. Ryutaro Yatsu, Vice Minister, Ministry of the Environment of the Government of Japan (MoE-Japan), remarked that the collaboration between the United Nations Centre for Regional Development (UNCRD) and MoE-Japan had been there for last three decades in the area of regional, sectoral, and environmental planning. Following the 3R Initiative, which was agreed on in G8 Sea Island Summit in 2004 as an effort to construct a sound material-cycle society through reduction, reuse, and recycling (3Rs) of waste, the 3R Initiative was officially launched at the Ministerial Conference held in Tokyo in April 2005. MoE-Japan is very much satisfied with the effort and leadership of UNCRD in promotion of 3Rs in Asia, including convening the Regional 3R Forum in Asia. Urbanization and motorization is a critical issue in many parts of Asia. The Ministry of the Environment of the Government of Japan, together with UNCRD, established the "Regional EST (Environmentally Sustainable Transport) Forum in Asia" in 2005.

Delivering the presentation on consideration of climate dynamics in IRDP, Prof. Y. Hayashi of Nagoya University mentioned that land use planning is key to reduce climate vulnerability and increase resiliency, hence should be integrated in IRDP.

IRDP should take into account the smart growth (growth outside) and the smart shrink (shrink inside) by taking long-term view, factoring in demographic change and associated change in life style over the years. Society and communities should consider smart shrink in the face of ageing and decreasing population so that they adapt to the emerging situation. Measures should be taken to retreat from hazardous areas and re-concentrate into areas with higher quality of life (HQL). Society is becoming weaker and weaker due to impact of climate change and natural disasters. Poverty as well as ageing problem poses difficulty in adaptation. The best way is to adjust our thinking in the way the nature functions.

When it comes to transport and land use planning, there could be various aspects of the integration – (a) land use and transport; (b) infrastructure and land use; (c) avoid-shift-improve strategies; (d) watershed management; and (e) population shrinking. An ideal land use planning characterized by "compact-connected" society is also the key to strengthen resiliency. The 1954 flood in the Netherlands

and 2011 East Japan Great Earthquake offer useful lessons on the need for wise and efficient infrastructure and land use integration.

The Tohoku Tsunami case showed that the people who lived in high areas survived, and the ones who lived near the sea and protected by dykes were more vulnerable. People could therefore choose high, green, and safe places, which have higher social value (regeneration of social bonds) and lower maintenance cost. It is also important to consider human-human integration in communities in the regional planning.

Motorization and urbanization may threaten both the economy and environment in Asian developing countries. The car ownership in the whole world is expected to increase 20 folds by 2050. The number of mega-cities without railways could increase to 50 or more by 2050.

Through the introduction of new railway transit systems and metros, Bangkok has successfully dealt with catastrophic traffic congestion in 1990s. Increasing number of cities worldwide are considering transit oriented development (TOD).

Higher quality of life (HQL) is driven by both economy (economic opportunity, living & cultural opportunity, amenity, safety and security) and ecological security (burden on environment – burden from industry, domestic, transport, heat island, and noise). Urban sprawl and rapid motorization could put urban space at risk and result in lower quality of life (LQL), which is characterized by increasing cost of unnecessary infrastructure and deteriorating landscape and losing identity.

Extending the appreciation to MoE-Japan for its generous financial support for EST and 3R activities, CRC Mohanty, Coordinator of Environment Unit of UNCRD, addressed environment for development with implications to integrated regional development planning. While developing countries face critical challenges in addressing the existing issues (deforestation, land degradation, desertification, loss of biodiversity, depletion of freshwater resources, degradation of coastal and marine resources and fish stocks, etc.), new and emerging issues (climate change, increasing frequency of natural disasters, toxic chemicals and hazardous wastes) compound the existing issues.

Land degradation/desertification and persistent drought condition can compound the issues of agricultural production and food security, which will ultimately affect livelihood security of rural farming community. Similarly, water pollution could lead to depletion of fish stock that will have implication on the livelihood security of local fishing community. Plastics in coastal and marine environment could affect the livelihood security of SIDS communities. These dynamics needs to be considered in IRDP in the context of environment for development. Water security is key to IRDP.

IRDP should also be linked to the environmental income, natural capital and ecosystem values in an environmentally sustainable way. For example, fish, anti-cancer agents from marine organisms, herbal medicines, honey bees as pollinators for agricultural crops, coral reefs for fishery and tourism, and mangrove ecosystem, to mention a few, offer tremendous economic potential for the community, region, and the nation as a whole.

Along with growing scientific understanding, technological progress, filling in the knowledge gaps in various aspects of sustainable development, there have been progressive integration of environmental activities into the broader development framework and macro economic policies, for example, Japan's Fundamental Law for Establishing a Sound Material Society (2003, 2008), Korea's Green Growth Strategy

(2009-2050), Chinese Circular Economic Law (2008), which induce closer cooperation among key Ministries and sectoral agencies – Environment, Finance, Planning, Industry, etc .

The Fourth Regional 3R Forum in Asia in March 2013 highlighted that sustainable resource use will be instrumental for Asia to ensure socio-economic development in a world, in which resources are more constrained and the absorptive capacity of ecosystems is decreasing rapidly. The region is faced with a number of critical challenges when it comes to integration of resource efficiency in overall policy, planning, and development. Many countries have become net importers of raw materials (fossil fuel, metals, timber, and other natural resources), the rapidly increasing volume, changing characteristics of urban and industrial waste, rising population, increasing consumption and per capita waste generation have posed serious challenges for the sustainability of the region. 3Rs offer environmentally friendly alternatives for moving towards resource efficient society and to deal with impact of growing wastes on human health, economy and natural ecosystem.

Integrated waste management and 3Rs actions or policies at national level have regional development implications (as top down) – e.g., effective waste management policies/regulations and 3R programmes at national or sub-national level will have direct impact on human health, land, water, aquatic resources, and livelihood security – vital elements of regional development. At the same time, awareness or responses at regional level will have implications at national level (as bottom up).

IRDP needs to capture new emerging waste streams such as e-waste, and industrial wastes (including hazardous waste construction and demolition waste, end-of-life vehicles, healthcare waste, etc.), which further compound the pressure to the local environment and ecosystem. Composition of waste becomes more complicated as the economically & industrially grow, which is also compounding the issues.

While waste prevention and minimization should be the priority in IRDP, growing waste market provide tremendous opportunity for income and jobs. Effective utilization and exchange of wastes to meet the demand of recycling markets calls for city-city, inter-municipality, industry-industry (industrial symbiosis) cooperation. Kitakyushu Eco-city provides an excellent example towards building a recycling based society. Community based composting could provide multiple benefits in the context of regional development – income opportunity for local community, benefits for local farmers (sustainable farming), protect the local environment and ecosystem, and earn carbon credits (CER) in international markets.

3R and resource efficiency measures could contribute towards IRDP in many ways – (a) help tackle local environmental problems and address climate change; (b) energy security (WtE); (c) preserving natural capital and avoiding resource conflicts; (d) improving economic competitiveness of firms and nations; (e) minimizing disposal costs by minimizing wastes (land fills and incinerators are very expensive methods and end-of-pipe disposal is a sunk cost with no financial return); (f) new business opportunities (resource recovery, recycling, WtE schemes can create green jobs; biotechnology, nanotechnology, renewable energy); (g) pursuing social benefits (environment industry as potential source of employment and long term natural asset protection); and (h) reducing environmental impacts from harmful wastes.

Similarly, transport is a key building block for sustainable development, and access to goods and services through efficient means of transport and connectivity is crucial for poverty reduction. Ensuring better market access for rural communities through improved transport services enhances farmers' lives and

sustainable livelihood. In both urban and rural areas, better planning for land-use and transport systems makes a great difference in facilitating access to jobs, goods and services for men and women alike.

In the context of IRDP, strengthening rural-urban connectivity is key to overall economic development in the countries. At the same time improved intercity connectivity is important to accommodate the rise in transport demand. These can help address the need to connect effectively, farm gate to consumer, manufacturer to customer, and personal mobility needs of people. Regional connectivity of inter-island shipping needs to be strengthened. Inland and coastal waterways have great potential to support more environmentally sustainable transport as does the greater use of rail transport with double tracking and electrification.

Railways play a key role to serve urban and economic development in Asian countries, while at the same time offering opportunities to mitigate emissions, reduce traffic congestion, enhance traffic safety, and improve accessibility and connectivity. Many countries have a huge infrastructure deficit at the current level of urbanization. As the urban population doubles in the next 20 years the pressure to build infrastructure is huge. For instance, India has estimated the finance need to be \$70 billion in the next 5 years, \$450 billion over the next 20 years and the government is planning to support cities through the next round of the Jawaharlal Nehru Urban Renewal Mission (JnNURM) investments.

Better regional cooperation is necessary for addressing high sulphur levels in fuels and improving the freight sector, including cross-border freight transport. At the same time, long haul inter-modal transport (with optimal use of road, rail, maritime transport, logistics centres and dry ports) can be crucial for regional economic integration.

Bus rapid transit (BRT) can provide effective solutions in IRDP as it provides a sophisticated metro-quality transit service at a cost that most cities, even developing cities, can afford.

IRDP should be based on science based decision making. Though the output or future projections of scientific models may not be fully accurate, at least they could provide the overall trends for consideration in IRDP.

There are many critical roadblocks the developing countries face – competing priorities, in particular economic development; lack of capacity at local and national level; competing points of view in building consensus among stakeholders and absence of representatives from major sectors or groups (e.g., youth, women, the private sector, indigenous people, NGOs) on national multistakeholder bodies); confusion and lack of general awareness over various aspects of sustainability; and lack of adequate institutional coordination (in particular among planning, finance and environmental institutions) and absence of integrated institutional framework.

Developing and least developed countries lack required financial, technical, and institutional capacity to address emerging environmental issues, including implementation of measures to achieve resource efficiency and green economy in the context of IRDP. Valuable mechanisms like CSR (Corporate Sector Responsibility) and multi-stakeholders partnerships, in particular PPP, are useful for local, provincial, and national authorities in addressing them.

Session V: Integrated Regional Development Planning towards Increased Resilience

In this session, Mr. Markus Gottsbacher, Senior Program Officer, International Research Development Centre (IRDC), Canada delivered a video presentation on “Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience Building in the context of Integrated Regional Development Planning”, and Mr. Jean D’Aragon, Coordinator of the Disaster Management Planning Unit, UNCRD delivered a presentation on “The Role of Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience Building in promoting Integrated Regional Development; Experiences from Latin America and Africa”. Mr. D’Aragon also chaired this session.

First, in his video presentation, Mr. Gottsbacher introduced one of IDRC programmes “Safe and inclusive cities” (SAIC), which promotes research on linkages between urban violence, poverty and inequality to understand the most important drivers of urban violence (social, cultural, political, economic, gender-based etc), focusing on slums and informal settlements of urban centres, where population are concentrated. He explained that IDRC has implemented researches under the SAIC across Latin America and the Caribbean, South Asia, and sub-Saharan Africa to address key gaps in knowledge and test the effectiveness of violence reduction theories, strategies, and interventions.

According to Mr. Gottsbacher, criminal and organised violence are spreading throughout cities in the trend of rapid growth of urban population happening in low and middle income cities, and social and domestic violence are significant problems, particularly for the most vulnerable group of people, which includes women and youth. He pointed out that the evidence base on what works and what does not to reduce urban violence, poverty and inequality is extremely thin, and the reality does not fit with many of the experiences and theories that we have documented to date.

In respect to disaster risk reduction and resilience building in the context of Integrated Regional Development Planning (IRDP), Mr. Gottsbacher emphasised that it is necessary to understand not only direct impacts (murder, robberies, and assaults) of urban violence on the poor, but also the indirect impacts and cost of violence, such as population displacement, the disruption of social services, reduced economic growth and higher spending on law enforcement. In this regard, he pointed out more research should be conducted to determine how best to address the intersecting challenges of urban violence, poverty and inequality.

Following the video presentation by Mr. Gottsbacher, Mr. D’Aragon presented “The Role of Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience Building in promoting Integrated Regional Development; Experiences from Latin America and Africa”.

Mr. D’Aragon outlined that UNCRD’s new disaster management planning programme works on disaster risk reduction and resilience building of urban poor communities, including poverty reduction, housing and slum upgrading and prevention.

He raised issues about the fact of rapid urban growth in developing countries, particularly in Asia and Africa, will contribute to shape urban slums and informal settlements, which lack access to adequate land, adequate safe housing, infrastructure and services including safe water, sanitation, education and security of tenure.

Regarding the relationship between poverty and natural disasters, Mr. D’Aragon stressed that the poor are often very vulnerable, facing major health and environmental problems, and natural hazards and disasters, including even small events exacerbate urban poverty.

Then, drawing on the theory and on his own past experiences working on housing development in slums and informal settlements, he demonstrated how housing development taking place through formal urbanization or informal urbanization were essentially two very similar (though inverted) processes where, contrary to common belief, the informal urbanization was not necessarily the cheapest option for the urban poor — actually, rather revealing the opposite, even before considering the health, environmental and disaster risks and burdens borne by the urban poor. He emphasized the need for the planners to understand that the main advantage of the housing development through the informal urbanization process compared to the formal process was rather the flexibility offered by the former, allowing the urban poor not only to build their dwelling incrementally but also to spread the overall costs related to housing over a longer period of time.

Mr. D’Aragon also compared some facts and issues about the formal and informal housing sector in regard to their potential contribution to local socio-economic development and protection of the environment. For instance, he mentioned that, in some cases, building materials can account for up to 80% of the cost of a simple standard house, and building codes often encourage the use of foreign — bringing discredit to local and traditional — building materials and technologies. In contrast, he asserted that the informal construction sector, being labour intensive, may create 20% more jobs and build 6 times more per dollar than formal construction sector, and that low-cost housing, mostly built by small-scale building contractors, can generate 30% more income than high cost housing.

Based on these facts, Mr. D’Aragon provided a few suggestions for housing development policies as follows:

- In terms of housing development, building codes and regulation should be performance-based, rather than perspective.
- Government should not fight the informal building sector but rather aim to formalize and gradually integrate it through flexibility, lowering legality requirements.
- Government should encourage and provide technical support to self-builder/ entrepreneur households.
- Government should promote research and innovations in building materials and technologies, particularly those linked to local and traditional building cultures.
- Government should invest in vocational training, building capacities of the small-scale materials and construction sectors, creating skills and income-generating opportunities, particularly for women and the youth.

To illustrate further his ideas about the potential contribution of building affordable adequate and disaster-proof housing to integrated local and regional development, Mr. D’Aragon used case studies of the urban development framework in South Africa and an integrated urban upgrading programme in Brazil, where he had been involved in the past. Some lessons were drawn from those two cases. For instance, Mr. D’Aragon concluded that despite some failures, the national urban development framework of South Africa was very successful in allowing for a wide range of (micro to macro) local and regional initiatives to take place, providing a direction, guidance and enabling environment.

He highlighted that it was imperative that partnerships be established with a widest possible range of actors (central governments, local authorities, civil society, including the urban poor and marginalized communities, the private sector, academia and the international community, including UNCRD) to address efficiently the challenges of urban poverty, vulnerability and disaster risks, lack of adequate

housing, slum upgrading and prevention in an integrated manner. In view of that, Mr. D’Aragon recognized that IRDP can make a valuable contribution towards reaching those goals by providing an interesting framework and useful tools that could help reducing disaster risk and vulnerability of the urban poor and increasing their resilience in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication in line with the *Rio + 20 Outcome Document* and the *HFA 2005–2015*.¹

For instance, IRDP’s approach of defining specific problems in a given region first, selecting the appropriate tools accordingly, leading to identifying and the potential solutions and prioritizing the actions and measures to implement through participatory planning is very much in line with the community-based disaster management process developed and promoted by UNCRD’s Disaster Management Planning Unit. This process involves participatory risk assessments, identifying and understanding the coping capacities of the group, developing community risk reduction strategies, and continued and sustained efforts for those DRR strategies to be integrated into the local or regional plan and territorial planning. This is an issue where IRDP could be particularly meaningful for DRR and resilience building of the urban poor communities with the specific tools and instruments IRDP has developed to facilitate the interactions between all the different actors (from national authorities to the local communities) in the territorial planning process.

In the pursuing discussion, issues around the public-private partnership were raised, and it was argued that more efforts are required for increasing the involvement of the private sector, although some successful cases of the public-private (and even people-public-private) partnership have been observed.

It was acknowledged that in order to incorporate risk management into IRDP, there is a need to understand well and address the complexities of, and interlinkages between the problems of the cities and their informal settlement and slums, the challenges faced by their residents, their causes and identify potential solutions and measures to be implemented as an integrated part of urban planning and management.

With regard to the use of IRDP to help mainstreaming DRR and resilience building at regional level, it was recognized that through IRDP people can be encouraged to become aware of their specific problems and solutions. Moreover, it was pointed out that decision-making at national level is also extremely important to address regional DRR and resilience building. As highlighted in the case of national urban development framework of South Africa, national authorities should provide direction, guidance but also an enabling environment for DRR and resilience building initiatives to take place at the community, town and city and regional levels.

Session VI: Needs of countries for Integrated Regional Development Planning

In this session, the experts from countries and cities made presentation of their own policies on integrated regional development, highlighting needs and challenges.

Chile – Ministry of Public Works Ms. Vivien Villagran Acuña

Overview

- Chile consists of 15 regions, 54 provinces and 346 communes.
- 87% of total population lives in urban area and 13% in rural areas.

¹ United Nations, *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*, 22 January 2005, A/CONF.206/6 (available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/42b98a704.html>)

- GDP per capita is rapidly growing since 2002 and currently the top among South American countries including Argentina, Brazil and Colombia.
- Urban growth is expanding with increasing population (average 1.05%) in the last ten years.
- Quality of infrastructure (roads, air transport, port) is considered good.

Current policy and status

- Central and regional planning instruments are established or in progress at national, regional and local levels, which is conducting development processes.
- Ministry of Public Works is in charge of planning, designing, building and maintaining infrastructure services, connectivity of ground transportation, sea and air, development of waterworks, rural drinking water and public buildings
- Planning instruments include long-term strategic plan (for 20 years), mid-term **Regional Plans of Infrastructure and Water Resources Management** (for 9 years) and short-term specific plans.
- Achievements in the Regional Plans so far include: 1) institutional coordination and 2) incorporation of territorial and systemic approach into planning process.
- Main features of the Regional Plans include: 1) investment for each regional plan for 2012-2021, 2) taking into account potentials and challenges of each region, 3) leadership in and coordination of planning process at regional level, 4) strategy of regional development, 5) participation of public and private stakeholders and citizens in the region, and 6) pilot strategic environmental assessment.
- Budget for each region comes from central budget, and thus budget allocation requires negotiation between central government and the respective region.

Needs and Challenges

- Strategic planning – need for a) strategic vision for territorial development, which incorporate infrastructure, b) strategic plans for infrastructure and land use, c) strengthened role of regional governments in planning process, d) advanced human capital, e) capacity to implement, manage and monitor the regional plans, and f) capacity to evaluate social, economic and environmental impacts on territory.
- Financing – need for a) new financing mechanisms for infrastructure, b) mechanisms to facilitate sub-national investment, c) links to central-level budget and long-term facilitation for the regional plans, and d) strengthened role of sub-national governments in shaping their developing process.
- Regional plans need to address sustainable development by focusing on 1) new infrastructure financing mechanisms, 2) sustainable infrastructure development, and 3) infrastructure services with high quality standards.

Ethiopia – Bureau of Regional State of Oromiya | Mr. Teshome Negussie

Overview

- Ethiopia's base of natural resources is the foundation of any economic development, food security and other basic necessities of its people.
- Smallholder agriculture is the dominant sector that provides over 85 per cent of the total employment and foreign exchange earnings and approximately 44 per cent of GDP.
- Total population of the country is about 84.1 million and is the second-most populous nation in Africa after Nigeria.
- Ethiopia consists of 9 national regional states and 2 administrations.

- Regional states can establish zones, districts, special districts and villages.

Current policy and status

- In 1992 Government embarked upon a decentralized political, administrative and economic structures and powers instead of the past centralized systems.
- The government enacted proclamation (TGE, 1992a) which established the National Regional Self-Government.
- Integrated regional development planning exercised in the Region: The procedure of plan preparation involves two main processes: the planning and the budgeting processes.
- The planning process: The regional government (in the case of Oromiya) has institutionalized the planning system at each level of administration. The planning system closely follows the local government system (region, zone, district, village), The administration is responsible for different bureaus, departments, and offices at regional, zonal and district levels respectively, The administration at each level plays the central role in recommending the plan and budget.
- The budgeting process: The Ethiopian government budget is divided between the federal and the regional government: Federal Government budget finances development activities implemented by the Federal Government Ministries in the Regions. Budget is allocated between regions in accordance with the Federal criteria, which considers revenue generation capacity (induce more revenue generation) and expenditure needs (equity issue) of the regions. Regions in turn allocate its budget between regional bureaus.
- The role of local communities in regional development planning is increased
- The regional and sub-regional authorities have now more roles in public and private investment
- The regions have the power and responsibility to prepare, approve and implement their own plans, in accordance with the concrete situations of their regions and key national policy objectives

Needs and Challenges

- Regardless of success in decentralization of power, equity issue, community participation, political commitment, peace and security, there are still areas to be considered if we opt for better integrated regional development planning.
- Shortage of skilled man power in the areas of integrated regional development planning, shortage of budget, and lack of long-term planning are some of the challenges that needs due attention.

Ghana – National Development Planning Commission (NDPC) Mr. Kwaku Adjei-Fosu

Overview

- Ghana holds 10 administrative regions, 216 districts, with estimated population of 20 million (2010).
- Economy is dominated by agricultural sector, small capital intensive mining sector, and growing informal sector (e.g., traders, artisans, technicians, and business).
- Major trading exports include cocoa, gold, diamond, bauxite, iron ore and crude oil.

Current policy and status

- National development planning system consists of: 1) NDPC, 2) ministries, sector departments and agencies, 3) regional coordinating councils, and 4) district assemblies.
- Decentralized National Development Planning system and process (top-down & bottom-up)

with linkages and harmonization with sector and district mid-term development plans within the context of National Development Policy Framework with a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system.

- Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has been providing holistic understanding of the environmental, economic and social implications of the proposed policies, plans and programmes, and has been promoting participatory process.
- Success of the Integrated Regional Planning through the application of SEA include:
 - * Stimulating environmentally friendly patterns of growth.
 - * Protecting and enhancing the natural resources on which people depend for their livelihoods.
 - * Improving health and well being by eliminating pollution and disease.
 - * Reducing the risks to the vulnerable and excluded.
 - * Making the consequences of activities more sustainable.
 - * Creation of an evaluation framework for reviewing policies in order to: a) assess the extent to which environment has been incorporated in the policy framework, b) examine the environmental opportunities and risks associated with the implementation of policies, programmes, plans and projects, and c) identify win-win priorities for the benefit of the poor and environment
 - * Developing methods for assessing policies, plans and programmes such as matrices and check lists
 - * Assessing the links between policy goals, objectives, outputs and budget commitments
 - * Changing attitude in raising issues about effective governance with respect to environmental matters
 - * Encouraging MDAs to review their approach in development of policies
 - * Encouraging District Assemblies to conduct sustainability appraisals of their Med-Term Development Plans
 - * Individual sector studies leading to statements setting out opportunities for refining policies for each of the sectors at the national level
 - * Advisory notes on relevant SEA findings including sustainability considerations in sector budgets
 - * Critical review of the interactions between national policies and implementation procedures at district levels
 - * Drafting of Guidelines incorporated with SEA principles for the preparation of Sector Plans

Needs and Challenges

- Insufficient understanding and awareness of the concept of sustainable development, and integration between different Ministries, Departments and Agencies at the national level.
- Need for deepened knowledge and skills in IRDP.
- Funding to meet sectoral development priorities versus sustainable development.
- Inadequate capacity building for sustainable development, particularly in terms of integrating environment and natural resources management concerns.
- Inadequate resources to continuously strengthen the capacity of local government actors to plan and implement sustainable programme, projects and activities.
- Need for enhanced skills in engaging the public in consultative and participatory planning process at all levels.
- Need to develop capacity and skills of planning officers at the lower-level in negotiation, monitoring and evaluation, to enable them to train community leaders to negotiate for selection of priorities and allocation of resources and to monitor and evaluate development projects and

activities in the communities.

- IRDP holds the key for growth and development of development countries

Indonesia – Ministry of Public Works **Mr. Andreas Suhono**

Overview

- Indonesia is an archipelagic country with roughly 17,000 islands stretching in 5,000 km in length from Aceh to Papua.
- Indonesia consists of hundreds of distinct native ethnic groups.
- The total population of Indonesia is about 240 million of which about 60% of the population inhabits in Java Island, where its area is only about 7% of the total area of Indonesia.
- This creates three major regional problems; unbalanced economic production, income inequality and unequal opportunity among islands.

Current policy and status

- Development of an integrated development planning and program under the role of the central government together with regional and local government in democratic and decentralized systems (the Law No. 32/2004 of regional governance).
- The main approach adopted in the regional development planning in Indonesia experiences so far are: a) promoting approach of development areas through voluntarily transmigration program combined with development of infrastructure which is aimed to increase regional economy and reducing the population in Java Island; b) implementing a selective development approach in some strategic areas with abundant of natural resources in order to wisely optimized the economic potency without ignoring the risk of environmental and social conflicts for the creation of regional economic welfare; c) enhancing regional development approach by enacting the law of spatial planning to promote an integrated regional development at national, provincial, local level through combining the synergy of urban centers (service areas) with infrastructure network and strategic areas developments.
- The (National) Government Budget: more than 50% goes into regional and local and the rest goes to the sectors which are still the responsibility of Central Government such as education, foreign affairs, national security and religion.
- For regional development planning, civil society participation is not only implemented in local government but also at regional and national level.

Needs and Challenges

- In fact, Indonesia most likely has "Master Plans," but unfortunately they sometimes do not have "Master Controls." It is a challenge how to formulate master control rationally in democratic and decentralized environment.
- The governments in the future should become a trusted institution. When the people feel neglected by the governments, it will be difficult to create any program especially related with Integrated Regional Development. Indonesia also needs a leader who is honestly willing to serve the people, the city citizen.
- The integrated regional approach shows the lesson-learned that conflict should be managed transparently, so people will know what is happening. People do not like a corruption when many people live in poverty.
- Under Rio+20, Indonesia understands that integrated regional development planning (IRDP) is the key approach in balancing the development and achieving sustainable development towards

“the future we want.”

Lao PDR – Vientiane Provincial Government Ms. Singkham Khongsavanh

Overview

- Total Population: 6.5 million
- Land area: 236,800 Km²
- Main economic factors: Agriculture, industry, services
- GDP Per Capita: 1,281 USD (2011)
- Lao has been voted by European Union Council of trade and tourism as the World Best Tourist Destination for 2013

Current policy and status

- Ministries in central government are the main planning institutions. Among the ministries, the Ministry of Planning and Investment is playing the key role, which keeps the balance between the demand for development and the budgets supply
- In provincial level, Department of Planning and Investment is the key entity among many functional departments and districts
- Since 1986, opening the country for development, it applied Market economic model for national development, Since then, many development policies/strategies have been released for national development, especially the five year national social-economic development plan (NSEDP) which has come to the seventh plan
- The main targets of the 7th NSEDP include:
 - * continue economic growth with sustainable manner
 - * achieve the MDGs and poverty reduction goals
 - * establish a diversified economic foundation for graduation from Least Developed Country status in 2020
 - * progress towards integration within the ASEAN, regional and international communities
 - * Ensure political stability, equity and security
- The underlying core principle to achieve these targets is that of *sustainability* and integration of socio-cultural and environment protection in the development process
- Recent Achievements of NSEDP VII Implementation on Sustainable Development, Environmental Protection and Natural Resource Management:
 - 1) *Forestry*: completed classification plan for the conservation forest in 8 provinces, which drafted decree on conservation and protection forests; announced 2 new conservation forest areas.
 - 2) *Water resources*: completed draft policies, strategies and the National Work Plan on Water Resource Management; implemented a number of projects on river basin integrated management project in the lower basin of the Mekong.
 - 3) *Meteorology and hydrology*: monitor and report weather and water level on daily basis through radio, television, telephone and SMS; completed draft strategy on capacity building on early warning system; conducted assessment and prepared for improvement of the early warning system in risky areas; improved earthquake and weather station, and; improved the airline management for weather forecast to prepare for hosting “ASEM” in Vientiane at the end of 2012.

4) *Environment*: Completed draft Decree on the National Environmental Standard; improved the Law on Environmental Protection; conducted assessment on tax on loyalty; extract revenue from development projects into the sustainable natural resource management and environmental protection; completed draft National Work Plan on Environmental Protection 2011-2015; ratified the document on “Strengthening the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)”.

Needs and Challenges

- Inadequate supervisory inspection and systematic reporting in regulating and utilizing the government budget and other funds
- Laos has no Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMA) project at present
- Insufficient funds earmarked for activities to mitigate the impact of disasters, such as recovery, direct and indirect damages

Proposed draft for the next plan 8th NSEDP VIII

- Quit of LDCs status in 2020
- Post MDGs- sustainable development
- Inclusive growth
- Quality investment
- Maximize benefits and increase readiness of the country towards the regional and international economic integration, both bilaterally and multilaterally

Kenya – Ministry of Lands **Mr. Augustine K. Masinde**

Current policy and status

- The Department of Physical Planning is in charge of preparation of Regional Physical Development Plans (RPDP). Its focus is to identify and analyze priority regional issues and make them the focus for planning.
- RPDP goes beyond the traditional land use plan by bringing together and integrating policies for development and use of land with other policies.

Needs and Challenges

- Kenya lacks supportive legislation at national and regional level to support the implementation of the plans and policies.
- A protected and winding plan preparation process brought about limited capacity, skills and financial resources.
- Persistent shifts in policy direction led to abandonment of the initial strategies; b Because regional planning was almost abandoned, there was no single regional plan between 1978 and 1991.
- The plans and policies were advisory in nature but did not identify key actors and their roles.
- Integrated Regional Development planning can embrace two basic considerations; to provide a framework for achieving activities, and to acknowledge the important role of stakeholders and partners.
- Kenya needs to build capacity of both the national and country planning authorities; urgently needs support to new development plan to implement.

Session VII: Capacity-building for public officials on Integrated Regional Development Planning

The session was chaired by Ms. Chikako Takase, Director, UNCRD. She presented the overview of the past UNCRD capacity-building activities, dividing into four period of about 10 years each, which more or less corresponding to tenure of the past directors. Following her presentation, Mr. Kumssa, Coordinator of the Africa Office, and Ms. Hoshino, the Coordinator of the LAC Office, explained briefly the current capacity-building activities on IRDP in respective offices.

The pursuing discussion focused on what UNCRD should be concentrating in order to respond to the needs of developing countries with bigger impact, recognizing that integrated planning in essence has the objective to deliver sustainable development and assist countries with their pursuit of sustainable development priorities including linking the national and regional development processes. Several ideas were discussed and they could be classified into four areas of work, namely knowledge platform, training, technical assistance and networking. With regard to knowledge platform, the following ideas were highlighted. Firstly, it was noted that there is a new energy behind the idea of regional development, which sets firmly that regional development is the essence of national development. For this contemporary approach to the integrated regional development planning (IRDP), however, there has not been any good structured guidance material prepared. Therefore, it is urgently needed to compile a good reference material on IRDP, which could be termed as “Readers on Regional Development”. It should contain: theoretical formulation; case studies; statement of values; themes such as sustainability, social justice, participatory, democratic policy making, changing consumption and production patterns, etc. It was pointed out that the relevant materials already exist and it would be a matter of getting permission from the authors and compiling. Secondly, it was recognized that there are institutions working on research on regional development and relevant issues already exist. However, there is no roster of such institutions. It would be useful to build such a roster of institutions with relevant information for UNCRD as well as for the others to get information and assistance. It would be also useful to build roster of experts and UNCRD could assist developing countries by linking them to the right experts for specific needs when requested. Thirdly, it was also pointed out that UNCRD should provide a platform of information exchange and capacity building. It could be in the form of website, hosting good case studies. In person-forums on regional development can also offer a platform for exchange experiences, good practice, sharing among peers and discuss way forward. Such a forum can be termed as a forum for shared learning on sustainable regional development planning.

With regard to training, it was pointed out the both in-country training courses and international training course have advantages and drawbacks. In-country training courses can train many people at the same time and focus on country-specific issues. But it is not possible to organize in-country training courses for many countries. International or multi-country training courses can provide opportunity for sharing experiences among participating countries. However, only one or two persons can participate per country. It was suggested that as fund permit, pilot countries should be selected for in-country courses. In organizing training courses, both in-country and multi-country training courses, cost-sharing with participating countries should be explored. It was pointed out that some countries already send their officials for training courses at their own costs. In addition, resource persons could also be connected through internet. Training needs also varies according to the stage of implementation of the plans and the experience of the countries. Thematic training possibilities should also be kept.

As for technical assistance, it was pointed out that assistance in actual planning process as well as implementation was also important to generate concrete impact and that it would offer good training grounds.

With regard to networking, it was pointed out that there are several institutions which have been working on regional development for many years, such as AIT, UNU, DPU of University College London, ISS, SPRING Programme of University of Dortmund, National University of Singapore and Nagoya University, University of California at Berkeley, the Milan Polytechnic and other relevant universities and academic institutions. It is important for UNCRD to form a network with these key institutions for the activities of UNCRD in all respect, but in particular for the development of knowledge platform.

The following are the potential areas where UNCRD may focus its activities:

Knowledge platform:

- Publication of “Readers on Regional Development”: contains case studies and theoretical statements on key features.
- Development of roster of experts/institutions that are working on IRDP.
- Linking developing countries with experts/institutions as per areas of capacity sought.
- Organize forums to exchange information on range of issues related to IRDP, including policies, implementation mechanisms and best practices, for shared learning and improved decision making.

Training:

- In-country training courses – pilot cases
- Multi-country training courses: ITC, ATC
- Skill-building for conducting consultations
- Training of public officials in formulating IRDP
- Training of local communities in effective participation in IRDP process
- Training of facilitators for IRDP process
- Negotiation skill for non-governmental participants in multi-stakeholder consultations
- Monitoring and evaluation skills development and formulation of actual multistakeholder IRDP plans and projects.

Technical assistance:

- Assistance in plan / policy formulation, including participatory multi-stakeholder consultations, consensus building and prospective strategic planning processes.
- Assistance in implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Networking and Partnerships:

- Networking with collaborators: AIT, UNU, DPU of University College London, ISS, SPRING Programme of University of Dortmund, National University of Singapore, Nagoya University, UC Berkeley, the Milan Polytechnic, relevant academic, research and scientific institutions; non-governmental organizations (NGOs); community-based organizations (CBOs); international organizations; bi-lateral and multi-lateral donor agencies; private sector, etc.
- Keep the network of alumni and explore the possibility of recirculation of human resources, in such a way that people who had been trained at UNCRD or had been affiliated to UNCRD as researchers can lead collaborative efforts with UNCRD in their respective governments or institutions.
- UNCRD should try to explore networking with regional and local governments, private sector and development banks and other regional development financing organizations in the region of respective offices. UNCRD can explore building partnership in appropriate scale in the area of regional development. In this regard IPLA (International Partnerships for Expanding Waste

Management Services of Local Authorities), coordinated by UNCRD, serves as a model for fostering partnerships and international cooperation.

Looking towards the next decade, UNCRD could aim to be an institution which hosts continuously updated knowledge platform on integrated regional development planning and policy making. Given its comparative advantage and resource limitation, UNCRD will utilize networks of UN collaborative offices, academic institutions and other relevant partners as well as alumni of UNCRD training courses and affiliated persons to do so. UNCRD will actively use this platform for its own training courses and the training courses will also feed into the knowledge platform.

Towards this goal, it is very urgent to establish a network of collaborative institutions and involve them in building the knowledge platform. In the near term, UNCRD should focus its IRDP activities on building the knowledge base, in particular in Nagoya Office, while Africa and LAC Offices start the Development Account project. However, it is important that all offices share the same understanding that it is the knowledge platform for UNCRD as a whole and all offices should collaborate towards that end. In order to do so, UNCRD may need to make a promotional document, based on the executive summary, for fund raising purpose. It would also be useful to seek collaboration with UNOSD for possible “cost”-sharing and promotion of synergies, in relevant work areas, in particular the development of a knowledge portal.

In order to carry out the above, the following time line could be considered.

Quick progress opportunities (within one-year time span):

- Develop roster of experts/institutions that are working on IRDP
- Initiate networking with relevant institutions, including academic institutions, UN system organizations, local and central government institutions, non-governmental organizations
- Rebuild the alumni network and explore recirculation of human resource opportunity
- Convene at least one shared learning forum
- In-country courses offered to pilot countries – through Development Account project in Africa and Latin America

Mid-term targets (1-3 years time frame):

- Knowledge platform up and running, including “Readers on Regional Development” through collaborative efforts on relevant institutions
- Development of e-learning courses
- Revive multi-country training courses
- Continue with networking with relevant stakeholders to support and enrich the many aspects of UNCRD activities

Long-term targets (over 3 years):

- IRDP becomes established approach to promote sustainable development at regional level
- Shared learning forums become established annual event at global and regional levels
- IRDP training institutions established in several developing countries
- Continue with networking with relevant stakeholders to support and enrich the many aspects of UNCRD activities

Workshop: Designing Sustainable Low-Carbon Transport Systems Integrated with Regional Development in Asia

Delivering the presentation on sustainable urban transport planning in IRDP for Asian developing countries, Dr. K. Nakamura of the Nagoya University mentioned that it is important for transport planning in Asian developing countries to take long-term strategies to decouple economic growth with CO2 emission increase in a leap-frog manner, and IRDP is essential for it.

As transport demand and development demand are significantly interacted, transport studies have promoted integrated land-use transport planning as IRDP. Low-carbon transport development plays a key role in sustainable IRDP, particularly in developing countries, where rapid economic growth could cause drastic emission growth and the transport sector is one of the key responsible sectors. In sustainable transport planning, increasing attention has been paid to a backcasting approach, which focuses more on what should be done to realize a desirable system than on what can be done.

A backcasting approach to sustainable transport consists of 4 steps; capturing key causal mechanisms of transport-related emissions, visioning low-carbon transport systems, selecting effective policies to realize the vision, examining the feasibility of policy implementation. This approach is important for designing sustainable low-carbon transport systems in Asian developing countries. Their emission growth is characterized by serious road traffic congestion caused by rapid process of motorization and urban sprawl. As changes in land-use development and travel habits take long, the long-term vision of land-use transport systems is required to form a transport habit to depend less on cars in developing people's mobility under economic growth.

3 strategies are useful for the vision; AVOID unnecessary travel demand, SHIFT transport modes to low-carbon ones, and IMPROVE energy efficiencies in transport. The vision can be set by combining the strategies with land-use planning for self-contained compact cities connected to each other, transport planning for seamless and hierarchical transport systems, and transport technologies for low-carbon vehicles and operation systems. The vision needs to be tested by applying urban transport models to Asian developing cities to identify what policies are needed to realize the targeted CO2 mitigation. The approximate cost of policy implementation also needs to be estimated to examine the feasibility, considering the effectiveness of investment in low-carbon development for international climate-change funding schemes.

The details of the vision may vary depending on the contexts of cities and regions, but its general concept is applicable to many of developing countries. Traffic congestion is a common problem for the economy and the environment in developing countries, and sustainable transport in IRDP is necessary as the emission mitigation of technology advancement may not be sufficient. Modeling to estimate future demand in transport and land-use is not always reliable particularly in developing countries where limited data is available and their behavioral changes under economic growth are less predictable. Nevertheless, the accurate forecast of futures is not the aim of a backcasting approach, but the brief estimation of potential futures is more important to provide a message to decision makers in developing countries in terms of what kind of policy they needs to take and when they implement it. The results of model simulation suggest that immediate implementation of sustainable transport in IRDP is necessary to achieve the necessary CO2 mitigation for Asian developing countries. It may be too late if they wait for accurate forecasting models based on extensive database to be developed.

UNCRD
Expert Group Meeting (EGM) on Integrated Regional Development Planning
Nagoya International Center (3F), Nagoya, Japan, 28-30 May 2013

Programme

28 May 2013 (Tuesday)

09:30 - 09:40	<p>Opening Session Welcome Address: Ms. Chikako Takase, Director, UNCRD</p>
09:40 - 10:30	<p>Keynote Address: Professor John Friedmann, Honorary Professor, University of British Columbia, “Vision for Integrated Regional Development Planning for achieving sustainable development”</p>
10:30 - 10:50	<p>Coffee/tea break</p>
10:50 - 12:50	<p>Session I: Sketching out Integrated Regional Development Planning Chair: Prof. John Friedmann</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Key Presentation: Professor Michael Douglass, National University of Singapore “Integrated Regional Planning for Sustainable Development in Asia: Innovations in the Governance of Metropolitan, Rural-Urban, and Transborder Riparian Regions”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Presentation: Ms. Birgitte Alvarez-Rivero, DSD/DESA/UN, “Outcome of Rio+20 Conference as related to Integrated Regional Development Planning; Experience of National Sustainable Development Strategies”</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How IRDP contribute to promote sustainable development? What is the strength of IRDP as a tool for sustainable development? 2. How does IRDP (as an approach, an instrument and process) address the goals of integrating SD pillars, addressing equity, and facilitating integrated decision-making? What are the challenges of IRDP to promote SD? 3. Is IRDP a complement to Sustainable Development Planning / Strategy or could it be the alternative? 4. What are IRDP’s particular strengths and weaknesses?
12:50 - 14:30	<p>Lunch</p>
14:30 - 16:00	<p>Session II: Integrated Regional Development Planning: Nexus with Sustainable Development: Experiences of IRDP in Latin America and Africa Chair: Prof. Michael Douglass</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Presentation: Ms. Claudia Hoshino, UNCRD, “Experience from</p>

	<p>Latin America”</p> <p>Presentation: Mr. Asfaw Kumssa, UNCRD, “Experience from Africa”</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do IRDP responds to the countries challenges in Latin America and Africa? 2. What are the key differences between NSDS and IRDP? Any difficulties in presenting IRDP as a tool for sustainable development? What are the main obstacles of turning regional objectives into SD? 3. How are emerging issues and trends (including top-down and bottom up policy, and governance issues and trends) influencing IRDP as an approach, and instrument and a process?
16:00 – 16:20	Coffee Break
16:20 – 18:20	<p>Session III: Nexus of Urban-Rural Linkages in the Rapid Urbanization and the Role of Integrated Regional Development Planning as a Tool for Sustainable Cities and Regions.</p> <p>Chair: Professor Kozo Aoyama, Kyoto Prefectural University</p> <p>Key Presentation: Professor Masao Takano, Nagoya University, “Integrated Regional Development Planning as a tool for sustainable cities and regions”</p> <p>Presentation: Ms. Carolina Chica, Planning Secretariat of the City of Bogotá “Experience of the Regional Integration of Bogota”</p> <p>Presentation: Mr. Katsuaki Takai, UNCRD “Endogenous Regional Development”</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How does IRDP address the urban-rural linkages in building sustainable cities and regions? 2. What are the lessons learned from specific practices in LA and Africa? 3. Are there any differential approaches in the Africa and LA regions?
19:00 – 21:00	Welcome Reception at Hotel Castle Plaza (<i>Kikuno-ma</i> , 4F)

29 May 2013 (Wednesday)

09:00 - 10:50	Session IV: Emerging Environmental Issues and the Implications for Integrated Regional Development Planning
---------------	--

	<p>Chair: H. E. Mr. Ryutaro Yatsu, Vice-Minister, Ministry of the Environment</p> <p>Key Presentation: Professor Yoshitsugu Hayashi, Nagoya University, “Consideration of Climate Dynamics in Integrated Regional Development Planning”</p> <p>Presentation: Mr. C. R. C. Mohanty, UNCRD, “Environment in the Context of Integrated Regional Development Planning: Role of EST and 3Rs”</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How are emerging development issues and thematic areas addressed by IRDP? 2. What are the prospects of IRDP addressing emerging issues and thematic areas?
10:50 - 11:10	Coffee/tea break
11:10 - 13:00	<p>Session V: Integrated Regional Development Planning towards Increased Resilience</p> <p>Facilitator: Mr. Jean D’Aragon, UNCRD</p> <p>Key Presentation: Mr. Markus Gottsbacher, Senior Program Officer, International Research Development Centre (IRDC) “Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience Building in the context of Integrated Regional Development Planning, Video Presentation“</p> <p>Presentation: Mr. Jean D’Aragon, UNCRD, “ Experiences from Latin America and Africa”</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How should risk management incorporated into IRDP? 2. How to increase resilience of urban regions
13:00 – 14:30	Lunch
14:30 – 16:00	<p>Session VI: Needs of countries for Integrated Regional Development Planning</p> <p>Co-Facilitators: Mr. Asfaw Kumssa, UNCRD; Ms. Claudia Hoshino, UNCRD</p> <p>Presentations from country experts: Country Experiences and Challenges</p> <p>Ms. Vivien Villagran Acuña, Chile Mr. Teshome Negussie, Ethiopia Mr. Kwaku Adjei-Fosu, Ghana Mr. Andreas Suhono, Indonesia</p>

	<p>Ms. Singkham Khongsavanh, Lao PDR Mr. Augustine K. Masinde, Kenya</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is UNCRD adequately addressing the countries' needs? 2. What could be done to better address the countries' needs?
16:00 – 16:20	Coffee/tea break
16:20 – 18: 20	<p>Session VII: Capacity-building for public officials on Integrated Regional Development Planning Chair: Chikako Takase, Director, UNCRD</p> <p>Presentation: Overview of current and planned activities of UNCRD in the area of IRDP</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do we have the up-to-date approaches, methodologies or materials for training on IRDP for sustainable development? 2. How do we achieve practical oriented training (skills for regional analyses, definition of vision and objectives, strategies and priorities, action programme and projects)? 3. Are in-person trainings, in-country or regional, the best way to build capacities of the target personnel? 4. Are we reaching sufficient target groups? What could be done to reach more? 5. What else could we do to increase the capacity of target groups? 6. How to take advantage of information technology for capacity building?

30 May 2013 (Thursday)

10:00 - 10:30	<p>Distribution of summary of key discussion points Participants to study the document</p>
10:30 - 12:00	<p>Session VIII: Integrated Regional Development Planning as a Tool for Sustainable Development Chair: Chikako Takase, Director, UNCRD</p> <p>Wrap-up of the Sessions: Key points highlighted in the discussion at each session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IRDP in the current context – its relevance and importance - IRDP as a tool for sustainable development – a tool for integrating sectors as well as decision-making - How to build capacity of target groups - Challenges in promoting IRDP <p>Comments and Discussion:</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the concept of IRDP clear enough? Is the linkage to sustainable development sufficiently made? 2. Are the deliverables clear? 3. Are the needs of countries sufficiently addressed?
12:00 – 12:50	<p>The Way forward Discussion on what to be done by UNCRD as well as interested partners</p>
12:50 –	<p>Closing session Closing remarks: Chikako Takase, Director, UNCRD</p>
13:00 - 14:30	Lunch
14:30 - 16:30	<p>Pubic Symposium: Designing Sustainable Low-Carbon Transport Systems integrated with Regional Development in Asia Chairs: Professor Yoshitsugu Hayashi and Dr. Kazuki Nakamura, Graduate School of Environmental Studies, Nagoya University</p> <p>In Asian developing countries, regional development under rapid economic growth may drastically increases CO2 emissions for coming decades, particularly from transport. To decouple the emission increase from the economic growth, it is increasingly required to develop sustainable low-carbon transport systems integrated with regional development in a leap-frog manner. This workshop aims at discussing how to realize a sustainable low-carbon transport system in integrated regional development in Asia. Challenges, visions, measures and feasibility of the development will be discussed.</p>

Annex 2. List of Participants

UNCRD
Expert Group Meeting (EGM) on Integrated Regional Development Planning
Nagoya International Center (3F), Nagoya, Japan , 28-30 May 2013

List of participants

Government:

Name	Country	Organization
Mr. Matt Fraser	Canada	Consul and Senior Trade Commissioner Consulate of Canada
Ms. Vivien Villagran Acuña	Chile	National Director of Planning Ministry of Public Works
Ms. Carolina Chica	Colombia	Director of Regional National and International Integration Planning Secretariat of the City of Bogotá
Mr. Teshome Negussie	Ethiopia	Deputy Bureau Head Finance & Economics Development, Bureau of the Regional State of Oromiya
Mr. Kwaku Adjei-Fosu	Ghana	Deputy Director Plan Coordination Division, National Development Planning Commission
Mr. Andreas Suhono	Indonesia	Director of Center for Strategic Studies Ministry of Public Works
Mr. Ryutaro Yatsu	Japan	Vice-Minister for Global Environmental Affairs Ministry of the Environment
Mr. Augustine K. Masinde	Kenya	Director Department of Physical Planning, Ministry of Lands
Ms. Singkham Khongsavanh	Lao PDR	Deputy Governor Vientiane Provincial Government
Mr. Stephen S. Wheeler	USA	Director and Consul Nagoya American Center US Consulate Nagoya

Academia:

Name	Organization
Mr. John Friedmann	Honourary Professor School of Community and Regional Planning, Faculty of Applied Science, the University of British Columbia
Mr. Clyde Michael Douglass	Professor Asia Research Institute and Department of Sociology Head, Asian Urbanisms Cluster, National University of Singapore
Mr. Yoshitsugu Hayashi	Professor, Graduate School of Environmental Studies and Director, International Research Center for Sustainable Transport and Cities, Nagoya University
Mr. Kozo Aoyama	Professor Faculty of Public Policy, Kyoto Prefectural University

Mr. Masao Takano	Associate Professor Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Graduate School of Environmental Studies, Nagoya University
Mr. Kazuki Nakamura	Graduate School of Environmental Studies, International Research Center for Sustainable Transport and Cities, Nagoya University
Mr. Markus Gottsbacher (Video Presentation)	Senior Program Officer Governance, Security and Justice International Research Development Centre (IRDC)

UNDESA

Ms. Birgitte Bryld Alvarez-Rivero	Senior Sustainable Development Officer Division of Sustainable Development, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations
-----------------------------------	--

UNCRD

Ms. Chikako Takase	Director
Mr. Asfaw Kumssa	Coordinator, UNCRD Africa Office
Ms. Claudia Hoshino	Coordinator, UNCRD Latin America and the Caribbean Office
Mr. C. R. C. Mohanty	Coordinator, Environment Unit
Mr. Jean D'Aragnon	Coordinator, Disaster Management and Planning Unit
Mr. Katsuaki Takai	Senior Researcher, Social and Economic Development