

V FACILITATING URBAN DEVELOPMENT

This concluding section brings the various strands of the foregoing discussion together to show how the policies and approaches introduced above could be facilitated by a holistic approach to urban management. It will outline the processes developed by the UMP in the form of a nested set of national, city and local level consultations. It suggests that though each of the sectors and sections above can be successfully dealt with in isolation, where it can be introduced, an integrated and co-ordinated approach would be preferable.

The section also describes the institutional requirements for the management of a successful urban management programme. It indicates the capacity building that is likely to be required and how to go about it. It also provides a "map" of the UMP "receptacles of knowledge", the regional networks of experts, the anchor institutions, centres of excellence and other individual and institutional support that are available to anyone wishing to avail themselves of the UMP experience and expertise.

Va FORMULATING URBAN MANAGEMENT POLICIES

Experience gained from UMP-supported interventions (assessments, country- and city consultations) suggests that these interventions should be designed as a consultative process with support from existing representative structures at various levels. The outcomes of consultations held indicate that the development of this process must acknowledge local needs and decision making culture, must be organised in a participative way and followed-up with the support of a critical mass of actors involved.

The experience gained from the UMP-supported interventions has also helped to firm up the specific steps to be taken in this consultative process. These are described below. As the experience with this approach matures, more detailed guidance documents may be developed.

The Need For A Local Issue Paper

The situation obviously varies from place to place, but the development and review of a local issues overview and assessment study as generally prepared for the above consultations has proven to be a decisive condition for a successful approach.

This is so, firstly, because many aspects of urban management are usually not well understood, and often these gaps are ignored. Even where an urban management action programme is ongoing, not all potential action elements are equally well covered and in some cases political instinct and charisma has supported or replaced - often successfully - pertinent knowledge of the situation. The issues paper helps to fill such gaps and to highlight the main issues and their relative importance.

The issues paper, as it has been commonly utilised in UMP consultations, comprises both the collection and analysis of existing data on selected urban management issues (depending on the agreed scope of the envisaged consultation), as well as an overview of policies and programmes (if any) addressing the issue. It furthermore includes an identification of the main gaps/deficiencies regarding municipal or state policies, as well as of the attempts made by different stakeholders to overcome this situation, and their institutional roles and responsibilities.

A perception of the demand and potential of quite heterogeneous groups of people is essential. The demand for urban services, for instance, varies from city to city according to people's demographic characteristics, habits, inputs, market, distances, quality of services, labour market, climate or topography. Likewise, the position of the informal sector in the city depends on very specific local factors: local credit access, specific local market, number of micro-entrepreneurs, the level of organisation, and (type of) linkages with the local formal sector.

Another important reason for preparing an issues paper is that, if sensitively done, it could be the first phase in the process of reaching consensus among the main stakeholders on a programme of action. This implies that the main findings of the paper need to be cross-checked with representatives of the most active local organisations.

The preparation of an issues paper is not necessarily a one-off exercise. Specific issues identified during the ensuing consultative workshop could be further analysed in depth, particularly if they relate to practical

solutions. However several important aspects should be carefully considered:

- the paper should not pre-judge the selection of priorities during the subsequent consultative meeting(s) and the paper, therefore, should at most present alternative action options.
- such an options paper should unambiguously assess the political willingness and the institutional capacity of the stakeholders to implement an action programme. A request to UMP or another agency to assist in developing such a programme does not necessarily mean that the local government has the capacity to carry this out. For instance, if a UMP intervention would have the impact to significantly expand the scope of on-going activities supported by the municipality, this carries a significant risk of non-performance. Similarly, a successful ongoing project addressing environmental issues, infrastructure development or other problems does not mean that the municipality is automatically prepared to also face, for instance, poverty issues.

Consultative Workshops

Preparation of an issues paper should be followed by a carefully prepared consultative workshop. Participants to the workshop should represent the broad spectrum of stakeholders: city authorities, local private organisations, political leaders, CBOs, NGOs and representatives of other government agencies involved in urban services delivery, employment generation and/or in poverty reduction. UMP consultations suggest that the workshop agenda is most usefully divided in four parts:

- issues paper presentation
- one or two panels discussing main topics
- working groups
- conclusion

A team of facilitators is particularly needed in the working groups that comprise participants from different cultural backgrounds and social levels. Reaching a consensus in the working groups is essential and saves time in the implementation of follow-up activities. The workshop is meant to provide a mandate to the municipality to develop and coordinate with the other local stakeholders a number of priority actions on which an agreement has been reached. The workshop should establish working groups for the follow-up period with clear responsibilities.

From the UMP consultations held, it appears that low-cost or no-cost actions clearly are the high priorities for immediate actions. These normally involve actors who are prepared to quickly initiate actions, creating dynamism and generating confidence among beneficiaries.

Additional workshops provide an opportunity for evaluation, and if needed, for a reorientation when follow-up activities are implemented. This also enables local authorities to disseminate their experience. These workshops are likely to deal with more specific subjects than the initial one and would be meetings of stakeholders and experts in the selected priority activities. The frequency of such evaluative workshops is usually established before activities are implemented.

Issues Regarding Consultations

Although consultations can be used for a variety of purposes, the following issues should be considered:

- When to hold a consultation – the objective of a consultation is for all the actors concerned (the stakeholders) to be consulted and for them to identify priorities and how to resolve them. Therefore, the consultation needs to take place at the earliest possible time, and certainly before areas for priority have been defined. Otherwise, some actors will feel that their participation is a formality, or has been marginalised. On the other hand, obviously some discussion of the issues and problem areas need to have taken place for the need for a consultation to emerge.

- *Who should participate*

– the participation of all the actors concerned is an integral aspect of the process. However, it is clear that too large a group will become unmanageable. There is also a need to keep the consultation amongst actors from the same or similar levels in order to avoid dominance and to facilitate dialogue. Therefore, rather than hold one large consultation, it might be better to hold a series of back-to-back consultations, each focusing on a particular level of the issue. Thus for example, policy-makers might be called to a consultation that followed on from a consultation amongst managers or implementers.

- How often should consultations be held – given that the purpose of a consultation is to give direction rather than being involved in the day-to-day operations or the implementation of policy, it is unlikely that a consultation on the same subject will be needed on a frequent or even on a regular basis.

- What should be the agenda for a consultation – since a consultation is likely to bring a large number of people, the pure logistical problems suggest that the consultation be short (not more than two or three days). To ensure that there is a successful conclusion, the agenda should be limited to one or a very few policy issues.

- *How should the consultation be designed*

-because of the nature of the event and the participants the process needs to be well organised. In particular, there will probably have to be background or briefing documents made available in advance so that participants can get straight to the issue under discussion. The actual details of the event will depend on the particular circumstances, but if possible, it is helpful to have the consultation take place away from the participants' work environment in order to minimise interruptions and absences caused by other work.

Follow-up Activities

The UMP experience suggests that the initial consultative workshop normally leads to three types of priorities: the first comprising the improvement of on-going activities or the implementation of projects self-financed by the municipality or local actors.

The second category comprises new projects for which additional funding is required. In such case UMP may assist in defining a strategy of fund raising with the local partners. Fundraising, which could take between six months to one year, is also part of the process of capacity building for the city authorities and for the team which backstops the activities.

The third category of priorities typically relates to a situation in which some funds are already committed for the proposed actions. This allows for an immediate follow-up and gives time to find complementary funds (if needed) for developing broader-based activities. All three types of activities contribute to capacity building at local government level.

BOX Va) 1

EXAMPLE OF A CITY CONSULTATION: THE ELOY ALFARO METROPOLITAN AREA, ECUADOR

Introduction

The process of the creation of the Eloy Alfaro Metropolitan Area began nearly 15 years ago, and is essentially the story of the cooperative association of five municipalities located in the center of Manabi Province, sharing the banks of the Portoviejo River, to promote development in this region of the country. Nevertheless, the process has moved slowly and has faced some obstacles. Within this framework, and due to the importance of promoting a new regional pole of urban development in Ecuador, a City Consultation was begun whose principal objective is to support the crystallization of the project and to deal with identified problems through an Action Plan with the participation of diverse local actors.

The principal challenge is to bring five autonomous municipalities together to pursue common objectives, in such a way to optimize resources, realize the potential productive capacity, improve the infrastructure network and establish an innovative management system which integrates urban and rural dimensions.

Participants

The base of the City Consultation is the participation of the Executive Committee of the Metropolitan Area (made up of the mayors of the five cities or their delegates), its President (selected from the Committee on a yearly rotating basis) and Executive Coordinator, and CIUDAD (the implementing NGO).

In the workshops and meetings, diverse members of the community have participated: members of the business community (chambers of commerce, industry, banks), the media, educational institutions (the Technical University of Manabi, the Eloy Alfaro University of Manabi), neighborhood federations of Manta and Portoviejo, women's organizations, elected politicians, and others.

Results obtained in the process

The most significant outcome of the UMP-supported process has been its influence in the political process through the approval of a national law which establishes the cooperative municipal entity through the Congress and the national government. The law has been published in the Official Registry. Other results include:

- A proposal for a participatory strategic planning process which includes actors from all political, social, and economic spectra.
- A proposal for administrative organization which aims at overcoming the existing barriers, and which is being considered by the parties involved.
- A proposed technical structure of the Area for the coordination and execution of identified projects is under discussion. A list of priority projects for the Area has been drawn up, which will be the prime material for the Technical Office.

Lessons learned so far

- UMP-LAC's intervention in the Eloy Alfaro Metropolitan Area has broadened discussion of the theme on the regional as well as the national level.
- A key to the replication of CC processes is ensuring that they are known about (and respected) by people and organizations outside the locality. The project's validity has been recognized, to the extent that its replication has been recommended in other regions of the province. This validity has included recognition on the national level (i.e. National Deputies from the area), as well as the international (as in the strong support of UNDP).
- The media can help to assure acceptance and participation of the local community. This particular City Consultation and the presence of UMP-LAC have benefited from wide media coverage (radio, newspaper, television). There has been a coordination with UNDP initiatives such as the discussion of Local Agenda 21 and the Self-Managed Communities Program of Habitat which have been undertaking efforts linked to the City Consultation. This synergy with other UN agencies and projects is often underexploited in other City Consultations.

UMP- LAC

The Need for a Local Support Team

Irrespective of the financial resources available, the support of a local team is needed to ensure the continuity of the initiative. Considering the limited UMP resources, it may only rarely be possible to create a UMP team specifically for the initiative; in most cases it will be more practical to draw on the support of an existing project.

If no project with synergy with the consultative UMP approach exists and funds are not immediately available, the local government could provide some support or an agreement with an NGO needs to be pursued. Without potentially permanent local support there is little rationale for UMP interventions.

Progress Monitoring

UMP interventions have highlighted the need for a monitoring system for urban management actions. Tentatively, a monitoring system could include yardsticks related to the beneficiaries of the intervention, to the city authorities and to the city residents at large. Some initial suggestions are as under:

Regarding the beneficiaries:

- sectoral indicators related to the selected area(s) of intervention (income, health, infrastructure coverage, housing etc.);
- qualitative indicators of the change in their overall poverty situation (how is their overall poverty situation affected by reducing one aspect of poverty?);
- assessment of the perception of improvement by the beneficiaries.

Regarding the city authorities:

- evaluation of their state of knowledge of urban management issues and of their ability to design instruments to assess the situation;
- assessment of their capacity to mobilise funds within the city for issues related interventions;
- assessment of their capacity to facilitate the local private sector, NGOs or government initiatives;
- assessment of their capacity to mobilise the urban poor in poverty reduction activities.

Regarding the city

- qualitative assessment of the integration of the beneficiaries within the city;
- assessment of the capacity to generate a social consensus in the city among stakeholders with differing interests;
- assessment of the existing organisations to build their own persuasive capacity to influence public action;
- change in the perception and behaviour towards the urban poor among local residents.

Clearly, this is an area in which much further conceptual work needs to be done, tailored to specific needs as articulated by city- and country consultations. This is a demanding area for follow up, both in terms of resource requirements, but also in terms of intellectual challenge to the UMP and its local partners in urban management.

Further Information

UMP Annual Report 1996-1997

Vb BUILDING INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES

The preceding sections have given an indication of the issues and challenges facing urban management and outlined some of the steps that can be taken to confront and resolve them. By definition, many of the actions and interventions being suggested there are not part of the current portfolio of most urban local governments. More importantly, it is not just what urban management is being required to do that has changed and is different from their present functions, it is also the way that these functions are executed and implemented that is radically different from the way that urban local governments do business.

A number of new approaches are now being suggested for incorporation into every aspect of urban management. These include taking a gender perspective, addressing the needs of the poor, and having an environmental concern, as well as taking a more inclusive, participatory approach, develop-

ing public-private partnerships and having a more responsive, accountable and transparent operation.

Quite clearly this will require a change in the institutional make-up and operations of urban local government. As part of the new urban management strategies, there will also have to be the development of new urban management capacity to respond to and develop policies and practices that meet the new urban agenda. The building and development of capacity is going to have to be crucial to this effort, as has been recognised by the Habitat Agenda (see box).

Building Institutional Capacity

The status, organisation, staffing and capability of each urban local government institution is likely to be different. Even where it originated from an inherited or initial structure that was based on a common or commonly accepted set-up, over time, the realities of the particular situation are likely to have led to its evolution into a relatively distinct if not unique organisation. Therefore the reform and restructuring that may be required, as part of a capacity-building process, are likely to need individual specification. What are presented here are some general guidelines that are likely to be generally applicable.

For the successful management of an urban management programme, there are two distinct considerations. The first is the external environment in which the institution operates and the second is the internal environment. Both are crucial in determining institutional effectiveness, and to a large extent, each has a bearing on and affects the other. Thus changes in the one are likely to bring

Box Vb) 1

Human Settlements Management

(from The Habitat Agenda)

Local authorities and others involved in human settlements management need to draw on the skills and resources of a diversity of people and institutions at many levels. The scarcity of suitably qualified personnel and the weakness of institutional systems and technical capacity are amongst the main obstacles to the improvement of human settlements in many countries, particularly in developing countries. Capacity-building and institutional development strategies must form an integral part of human settlements development policies at the national and local levels. In addition, the use of new skills, know-how and technology in all aspects of human settlements planning and management will be necessary. In countries where changes in human settlements patterns are rapid, resulting in socio-economic and environmental challenges, there is a need for Governments and the international community to ensure effective and efficient development and transfer of leadership skills, planning and management expertise, know-how and technology.

about similar changes in the other. Therefore, even though it may appear that the external environment is beyond the control of the institution, in practice, though it may face greater difficulty in operating, a positive internal environment is likely to be able to help bring about a positive change in the external environment. Once the initial inertia is overcome, the changes are likely to become self-reinforcing.

The **external factors** that affect the operations of an institution are to do with

- *Customer Demand,*

which is a reflection of the extent and degree to which there is an interest and a need for the services and functions that the institution is supposed to deliver. For most urban management institutions the customer demand is likely to be there, particularly if it takes on board and responds to the new urban agenda.

- *Political Will,*

which includes support from the higher authorities that control or regulate its operations. Increasingly, national or provincial governments responsible for urban local authorities are supportive of actions that reduce financial dependence and are therefore likely to be supportive of the new urban agenda.

- *Policy Framework,*

under which the urban local authority has to operate, including the legislative and regulatory frameworks that apply to it as well as those that it has at its disposal to carry out its operations. By and large, such frameworks as currently exist are adequate for and supportive of the actions and interventions being suggested under the new urban agenda.

- *Support Structures,*

including the links to other organisations and institutions for training, information, technical, financial and other inputs that may be required. These are part of the supports established by the Urban Management Programme and which can be mobilised by any urban local authority. These are further elaborated upon below.

The **internal environment** that has a bearing on the capacity and capability of an urban management organisation are to do with

- *Management Commitment*

to improve, develop and direct the institution and its operations, and to have a sense of "ownership". This is probably the most important, and may be difficult where the top management has been "posted, deputed or assigned" to run the organisation and has no particular affinity or preference for the job.

- *Staff Morale,*

like management commitment is important to the successful management of an organisation and includes both a sense of motivation and a clear link of rewards to performance. This is most likely to be problematic where there is no clear identification of responsibilities and duties or of performance to reward and promotion.

With favourable internal and external environments (or their expectation), the urban management institution can further improve its performance, capability and performance if it has

- a clearly set out objectives that defines its functions and operations, has

- an organisational and staffing structure that facilitates its objectives and functions,
- the staff, equipment and other resources with which to do so.

No organisation is likely to have all the resources it might feel it requires, but a well organised and efficiently run organisation is more likely to attract the right calibre of staff and generate the resources it requires than one that is inadequately motivated, poorly defined and inefficiently managed.

Actions to Facilitate Capacity-Building

Other action that can be taken to facilitate capacity-building and institutional development for the improvement of human settlements planning and management comes from the Habitat Agenda. This suggests that, Governments at the appropriate levels, including local authorities and their associations, should:

- Support training programmes for administrators and civic officials at all levels, and for all other key actors, as appropriate, to enhance leadership qualities and promote the inclusion of women and young people in staff structures and decision-making;
- Consider establishing private-public, community sector, business and economic forums to exchange management know-how and experience;
- Promote comprehensive training, education and human resources development policies and programmes that are gender-sensitive and involve local authorities and their associations/networks, as well as academic, research, training and educational

institutions, community-based organisations and the private sector, focusing on:

- The development of a multisectoral approach to human settlements development that includes the unique contributions and institutions of indigenous and immigrant people;
 - The training of trainers to develop a core capacity for institution-strengthening and capacity-building that includes gender awareness and the needs of children, youth and the elderly as integral components;
 - The development of local capacity to define needs and undertake or commission applied research, particularly with regard to age and gender-sensitive analysis, social and environmental impact assessments, shelter strategy formulation, local economic growth and job creation, and to incorporate the findings in management systems;
 - Develop information systems for networking, for accessing resources in a timely manner and for the exchange, transfer and sharing of experience, expertise, know-how and technology in human settlements development;
 - When appropriate, encourage, within the context of transparency and accountability, as appropriate, the involvement of private-sector authorities, including non-governmental organisations, in improving public-sector management and administration and the formation of entities that are public in their function, private in their management and public-privately funded;
 - Consider developing mediation programmes to resolve conflicts, including those between competing actors over
-

access to and distribution and use of resources in human settlements and train civil society in their use;

- Be encouraged to increase their knowledge about eco-cycles involving their cities so as to prevent environmental damage;
- Integrate gender sensitive policies and standards in each of the categories above, if not already specifically, indicated.

Support for Institutional Capacity-Building

The Urban Management Programme has developed and instituted an extensive system of support for urban management that is available to urban management institutions around the world. This support includes a number of networks made up of anchor institutions and centres of excellence, regional experts and various publications and forums for the exchange of information, advice and expertise. These can be accessed via the local, regional or global office of the Urban Management Programme (see Appendix 1 for a map and list of addresses and contacts).

Receptacles of Knowledge

The Urban Management Programme makes use of the knowledge, information, expertise and experience accumulated with the many practitioners, professionals and institutions around the world. It sees these as "receptacles of knowledge" that can be called upon in response to local demand to offer help and advice.

Regional Network of Panel of Experts

The UMP has established regional networks of experts anchored in developing countries' institutions in order to assist with the country consultations, and to ensure more effective programmes of technical cooperation, interchange of experiences and ideas between cities and countries, exchange of information between the country, regional and global levels, and the development of region-specific programmes of research and production of tools.

Developing countries are able to draw upon this regional urban management expertise on a continuing basis for technical advice and cooperation. In establishing these networks, UMP regional staff identified institutions and individuals with the requisite background in each topic area and region and brought them together in a series of workshops. These workshops focused on lessons learned from Programme activities to date and the experiences of network members with regard to specific issues.

A major effort is under way to build a permanent urban management capacity within each region. The networks will develop region-specific approaches to the three component areas and, where appropriate, to sub-elements of the major components. Members of the networks will be retained by the Programme and be made available to countries and cities, which request UMP services. This involvement will take place as early as possible in the defining stage of the consultation activities, and they will be backstopped in these activities by the UMP Regional Office and (less frequently) by members of the UMP core team.

Anchor Institutions

For more effective development, transfer and exchange of the substantive knowledge on various aspects of urban management, the UMP has been "anchored" to appropriate institutions within the region, which can help in responding to requests for UMP support. These "centres of excellence" are UMP's partners in adapting generic policy options and examples of best practices to region-specific circumstances based upon the institutions' own work and experience. They bring into the partnerships their substantive expertise as well as institutional capacities. There are two types of "anchors" in each region. Most significantly from the capacity building perspective, there are anchoring institution for the regional network of experts set up for each programme component. Moreover, to ensure the optimum support UMP can provide, the UMP Regional Coordinator's office and other UMP offices are also housed in one such institution.

UMP Publications

From its inception, the Urban Management Programme has been concerned with generating and collating information and advice on best practices and approaches to improving urban management. Many of these have been especially commissioned by experts in their field, and cover the whole range of activities and areas of concern of urban management. Other papers assess and address particular issues and activities in each of the UMP regions. All of these have been published in the form of Working Papers and discussion papers (see Appendix 2 for a complete list), and are available from the UMP offices.

Vc THE URBAN MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME: EVOLUTION AND APPROACH

Overview

The UMP is a global technical assistance programme designed to strengthen the contribution that cities and towns in developing countries can make toward development of their own human resources, including the alleviation of poverty, the improvement of environmental conditions and the management of economic growth. The Programme represents an innovative strategy to focus national, regional and international expertise and resources onto the objective of building the capacity of local governments in developing countries to manage their own development more effectively.

Origins

The UMP originated in the mid 1980s as an effort by UNDP, the World Bank and UNCHS (Habitat) to document, synthesise and disseminate the lessons learned globally in urban management and in international urban management assistance efforts, not only by these three agencies, but also by other External Support Agencies (ESAs).

This stemmed from a level of frustration that, while a significant extent of experience existed at that time at city- and country level with the various elements of urban management (such as urban infrastructure management, urban land management, and municipal finance and administration), this experience had not been brought together in a synthesised form to enable the development of generic policies, approaches, tools and programmes. It was expected that such generic

"recipes" could form a well-researched and well-respected global basis for the development of local strategies to be adopted in any one country or city.

It was also felt that the development of such a global, synthesised set of policy and tool documents could best be taken in hand through a partnership of UN agencies which together form the receptacle of a rich array of urban management support experiences in developing countries across the globe. Seeking communalities in these was seen to provide a relatively robust database for the development of the above "generic" policy recipes. Considering the comparative advantage of each agency, it was decided that the executing agency for the programme at that time should be the World Bank, with UNCHS as the associated agency, and UNDP providing financial as well as substantive support.

Inception and intentions

The programme thus set out in 1986 with a nuclear research team split across the two agencies and began to collect and document experiences in three main areas of urban management, then perceived to be the most crucial ones:

- urban infrastructure management,
- urban land management, and
- municipal finance and administration.

The two teams were set up with substantive capabilities in these three main thematic areas. A fourth thematic area, urban environmental management, was added in the course of the programme's first phase.

Implementation and the nature of programme phases

Phase 1

Thus, Phase 1 of the UMP (1986-91) focused on these four issues which the programme felt most constrained the capacity of governments to manage their urban resources adequately. A fifth component, the alleviation of urban poverty, was added to these substantive components at the onset of Phase 2 in 1992. As noted above, the initial perspective was a global one, concentrating on the development of urban management policy frameworks and tools.

Research undertaken during this phase of the UMP indicated that a more comprehensive strategy for confronting urban problems was needed; one that broadened the view of developing countries and the international community beyond housing and residential infra-structure to encompass the political dimension of effective problem-solving, as well as the efficiency of the urban economy and the need to focus on the alleviation of poverty. The task of the UMP, therefore, was re-gearred to identify strategies and modalities for implementing this new agenda. Experience gained during the first phase indicated that this would involve placing greater emphasis on national and city-wide policies and institutional development, as well as on continued research and dissemination of lessons learned in the individual topic areas of the UMP.

The Programme also recognised the abundance of human and institutional expertise, as well as the experiences that exist in countries throughout the developing world. The experience gained from local programmes and projects, whether they be successes or

fail-ures, constitute a wealth of knowledge and experience that can be shared within regions and provide the basis for cross-country fertilisation regarding innovative approaches.

Governments, however, will only reform their policies and institutional arrangements in keeping with their circumstances and priorities and reflecting their culture, history, and political structures. It follows therefore that technical solutions will be shaped and adapted to particular situations as they are interpreted in the countries themselves. This requires an in-country perspective around which a consensus may be developed. Countries are likely to benefit from the experiences and perspectives of neighbours with similar histories and conditions that have also been engaged in addressing similar problems. Further, addressing the issues of policy and institutional development in the context of urban management will not be a one-time activity but an ongoing adaptation to changing circumstances.

The combination of these factors in the closing stages of Phase 1 therefore pointed to the need to:

- a) engage the expertise existing within countries and their neighbours in the design of solutions for those countries and regions;
- b) work with existing national and regional institutions in the design and adaptation of solutions;
- c) facilitate timely and responsive exchange of information and new understandings that arise in the course of investigating and applying solutions; and
- d) respond to issues as they are defined by the people who must live with the consequences.

At the same time there was also a noticeable growing interest among bilateral development agencies for a more coordinated approach to technical cooperation in the field of urban management.

Phase 2

Phase 2 of the UMP (1992-1996) was therefore aimed at using the Phase 1 frameworks and tools to build capacity at the regional level and extend it to country and city levels. Phase 2 of the Urban Management Programme was further influenced by a number of other global circumstances that were prevalent at the time it was designed:

- a) it was initiated at a time when there was just beginning to be wide-spread recognition and acknowledgement of the international and regional dimensions of urbanisation. One aspect of this broader awareness of urban management concerns was the recognition that there was a need to develop a more comprehensive strategy to confront urban development issues.
- b) Phase 2 was developed on the heels of three very significant statements by the three major partners and in the international environment of planning for a major event which had direct relevance to the Programme. The World Bank published *Urban Policy and Economic Development: An Agenda for the 1990s* in April 1991. That policy paper developed four themes that were later reflected in the design of Phase 2. The following month, the UN Commission on Human Settlements passed Resolution 13/18 supporting an expanded UMP effort and specifically recognised the Urban Management Programme as an outstanding example of multilateral technical cooperation. In July of the same year

UNDP's strategy paper *Cities, People and Poverty: Urban Development Cooperation* in the 1990s was released. This paper specifically addressed the need to develop and strengthen national and local capacities in urban management; a theme that underlies the strategy adopted in Phase 2 of the Programme. The strategy paper also identified five challenges to the international community: poverty alleviation, improving the urban environment and providing infrastructure, shelter and services for the urban poor, strengthening local government and administration, and promoting the private sector and NGOs.

During this same period, the urban environment was being addressed within the context of the Earth Summit, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) held in Brazil in June 1992. UMP contributed to UNCED and to having a Human Settlements chapter included in Agenda 21.

Equally important in this global context in 1991 was the fact that UMP, although it could no longer lay claim to being the only inter-regional urban initiative, was still the most visible because of its unique association among the UNDP, UNCHS and World Bank. The Programme had a high degree of credibility and international recognition. This global convergence of policy focus on urban management issues was very important at the time. There was consensus about need and objectives, if not about strategies.

Against that background UMP Phase 2 (1992-1996) started to translate the results of the Phase 1 synthesis of experiences into operational support for policy action planning and programming at national, provin-

cial and city levels. This phase of the program was characterised by three key operational principles: it was demand driven; it was operationally decentralised, and it brought together the creative efforts and experience of the international assistance community in urban management.

Phase 2 started with the establishment of regional program offices in each of the four developing regions in the world, through which the UMP promoted coherent urban policies, strengthened urban management and enhanced the provision of municipal services by harnessing the skills and strategies of regional networks of experts, communities and private sector organisations.

In Phase 2 the programme relied on two mutually supportive processes to facilitate capacity building in the programme's theme areas (both described in more detail in the below section on process and progress):

- a) City and Country Consultations, which bring together national and local authorities, the private sector, community representatives, and other stakeholders within a country to discuss specific problems within the above UMP theme areas and to propose reasoned solutions.
- b) The development of Regional Networks of Experts in each of the five UMP theme areas for the purpose of providing technical advice and co-operation to ensure a sustained capability to support consultations and follow-up thereafter.

In view of this operational orientation, Phase 2 saw a role reversal of the implementing agencies, with UNCHS (Habitat) taking the overall executing agency role, and the World Bank becoming the associat-

ed agency. UNDP continued to provide substantive and financial support (along with several bilateral ESAs, most importantly Germany, The Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland). In fact, in Phase 2 the UMP saw participation in the programme of a total of 15 multi- and bi-lateral external support agencies (ESAs), and as such it became the largest global multi-agency technical assistance programme in urban development in the world. ESA support varied from support to individual activities to broad cost-sharing in the UNDP-managed core budget of the programme.

Through its core teams in Nairobi (UNCHS) and Washington (World Bank) the programme continued to support the regional programmes and networks by synthesising lessons learned; identifying best practices; conducting ongoing state-of-the-art research; and disseminating programme-related materials in all the five UMP themes noted above.

Phase 3

UMP Phase 3 (1996 – 2001) was similarly initiated at a critical juncture in the evolution of international development assistance in the field of urban management. In June 1996 the United Nations held the last of a series of international conferences which address important sustainable development issues: the second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) is held in Istanbul. Having considered the experience since the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements held in Vancouver in 1976, Habitat II has taken up the messages from relevant recent world conferences and developed them into an agenda for human settlements, the Habitat Agenda. One of the two major themes of the

Istanbul Conference is "Sustainable Human Settlements Development in an Urbanising World." Major principles guiding future UN activities with respect to this theme are (1) equality, (2) eradication of poverty, (3) environmentally sustainable and healthy human settlements, (4) liveability, (5) family, (6) civic engagement and government responsibility, (7) partnerships (8) solidarity, and (9) international co-operation and co-ordination. Most of these principles are embodied in the strategic approach of Phase 3 of the UMP.

The third phase of the Urban Management Programme therefore has three overarching themes (and sub-themes) as follows:

Urban Poverty Alleviation

- Access to Urban Employment
- Access to Urban Services
- Urban Social Integration

Urban Environmental Management

- Urban Environment Planning and Management
- Urban Infrastructure

Participatory Urban Governance

- Decentralisation
- Municipal Finance
- Urban Land Management

These themes have been distilled from the experience of the first two phases and reflect the continuing convergence of thinking about urban management issues in the international community.

Phase 3 of the UMP continues to build capacity at the city, country and regional levels, but has shifted relative emphasis from country-level to city-level activities,

and places more emphasis on the follow-up to the city/country action plans developed in the consultations. As programme resources are still limited, this implies more geographical selectivity and continued commitment to work with a particular group of clients during a significant period of time.

In Phase 3 there is also more explicit concern with the sustainability of programme interventions at the country and city levels. Therefore, the programme's support for regional networks of urban management experts is taken a step further in Phase 3 with their anchoring in regional institutions as Urban Management Centres of Excellence. For more effective development, transfer and exchange of the substantive knowledge on various aspects of urban management, the UMP is being "anchored" into appropriate institutions within the region, which assist in responding to requests for UMP support.

These "centres of excellence" are UMP's institutional partners in adapting generic policy options and examples of best practices to region-specific circumstances based upon the institutions' own work and experience. They bring into the partnerships their substantive expertise as well as institutional capacities. There are two types of "anchors" in each region. Most significantly from the capacity building perspective, the programme works with several anchoring institutions for the regional network of experts set up for each programme component. Moreover, to ensure the optimum support UMP can provide, the UMP regional coordinators moved their offices into a regional institution in each region at the onset of Phase 3.

Programme Outputs

The UMP output has changed significantly over the years; it can be broadly characterised as follows:

During Phase 1, the programme output was some 14 to 15 research and policy framework papers on various elements of urban management produced by the World Bank and UNCHS core teams, which synthesised the then state of the art of the element considered.

During Phase 2, this continued, partly as overflow from Phase 1, partly as new synthetic work, laid down in an additional 6 such framework papers (UMP 16 – 22) and more than ten UMP working papers (see Appendix 2 for details). More importantly, as noted above, in Phase 2 the programme started decentralising its operations to UMP regional offices in each of the four developing regions in the world, focusing on country- and city consultations in locally applying the global knowledge generated. The regional UMP offices have taken the lead in organising these consultative processes. Some 100 consultations were carried out during this period in the four regions. These were supported by a wide array of local studies, regional studies and regional workshops.

In parallel, some of these programme outputs were also used as inputs in the development of urban sector policy papers by some of the bi-lateral ESAs. It is fair to say that the UMP work has significantly impacted on policy documents prepared by the above bi-lateral ESAs (Germany, The Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland) and the United Kingdom.

As noted above, in Phase 3 the programme is continuing in a more selective way with the above consultations (with a definite shift to city, as opposed to country, consultations), paying more attention to the need for sustaining UMP support over a longer period of time in any one location, which by implication sharply limited the total number of consultations supported by the programme during this phase. Phase 3, more importantly, is the phase in which the UMP approach is being anchored in (sub-) regional institutions. By and large the institutional anchors have been agreed on in all regions at present, but there is as yet little implementation experience with running the programme's operation largely through these institutions.

By the year 2001, it is expected that at the city level practical examples of innovative and effective policies, programmes and projects of urban management benefiting the urban poor will have been developed in all four regions. Specifically, depending on the length of consultations, it is expected that between 40 and 80 agreed action plans will have been developed, in one or more of the three Phase 3 themes or upon a broader urban management strategy. Many more consultations will be in progress.

Perhaps more important than the components of the plans themselves, from the perspective of the objectives of the UMP, these plans signal an increased ability to support the preparation of such plans, to support their implementation, and also imply an increased ability to extend the consultation/action-plan-preparation process to other substantive areas. These action plans may include changes in the legal and regulatory frameworks and the adoption of

coherent long-term policies for improving urban conditions.

Over the long term, therefore, partly as a result of UMP, a large number of low-income settlements will have been provided with adequate water, sanitation and waste management services; hundreds of thousands of families, women, men and children in informal settlements with adequate income, livelihoods and education, living healthier lives; and hundreds of cities and towns with vibrant, participatory structures and processes of governance with the full involvement of all the citizens, especially the urban poor. In the UMP cities there will be a large number of national and local organisations and institutions (NGOs, academic, public and private) with increased and sustainable capacities of urban management.

At the regional level, through regional documentation and interchange, successful policies and practices are disseminated, transferred and replicated, through South-South co-operation, in a number of other countries. In each of the four programme regions, regional organisations and institutions are increasing their urban management support capacities, as they are regularly involved in consultations in several countries and cities within the region. After the programme's conclusion these institutions are expected to routinely support city- and country consultations on their own initiative, without the involvement of UMP staff. They will be well-known throughout the region for their ability to manage the consultative process and for their special expertise in urban environmental management, urban poverty alleviation, urban governance or a combination of these UMP themes.

Process and Progress

UMP phase 1 focused on the development of "generic" policy framework papers, discussion papers, and tools with global validity and applicability. The most important lesson learned during Phase 1 was the essential cross-cutting nature of urban management and of the five component areas of the Programme. The addition of urban poverty alleviation and urban environmental management as Programme themes in, respectively, 1991 and 1992, highlighted this fact by focusing attention on the inter-relatedness of the other components and the importance of ensuring that they are worked on as linked facets of the same complex of issues.

UMP Phase 2 has been directed towards translating the results of this synthesis of experiences into operational programs and policy action plans at national, provincial, and city levels. As noted above, three operating principles have characterised this phase of the Program:

- it is demand driven;
- it is operationally decentralised, relying upon regional networks of expertise;
- it brings together the creative efforts and experience of the international assistance community in urban management.

The most important programme processes at the city and country levels consisted of the city and country consultations that brought together national and local authorities, the private sector, community representatives, and other stakeholders within a country to discuss specific issues and solutions to key urban problems. In doing so, thematic policy framework papers, discussion papers, and tools developed during both phases of the Programme were used as starting points

for discussion. Consistent with the Programme's commitment to "articulated demand," consultations were held at the request of a country or city and were intended to provide a forum for discussion of a cross-section of issues. This generally resulted in a concrete action plan for policy programme change

The principal process to facilitate capacity building at the regional level in Phase 2 was the development of regional networks of urban management experts. These networks — comprised of experts with background in the five UMP theme areas — provided technical advice and co-operation to assist in facilitating the development and implementation of action plans and the mobilisation of resources as a follow-up to consultations. Typically, these regional experts became a major part of the human resource base in the Programme after having participated in several country or city consultations in their specific area of competence.

At the global level, the UMP has worked with multilateral and bilateral external support agencies, international professional organisations, global networks of local authorities, governmental agencies and NGOs, and international training/research institutions in organising interregional and global workshops to synthesise lessons learned and disseminate research outputs and to design technical cooperation programmes supportive of national and regional capacity building activities.

In Phase 3 this approach at the above three levels is being institutionalised through the focus of involving in the programme activities in each region a limited number of carefully selected (sub-) regional centres of

excellence (and/or having the potential to become one) in the main areas of programme concern, with the intention that these centres will ultimately be able to independently fulfil the support role currently provided by the UMP.

Entry Points

While the focus of UMP activity has shifted from the global/regional levels in Phase 1 to the regional/country/local levels in Phases 2 and 3, there were already some country and city level activities during the first years of the programme. At the city-level, the UMP worked with city officials and technical staff, community organisations and NGOs, and local enterprises (including the informal private sector). It also participated in preparing city profiles and developing and strengthening capacity for planning, implementing, and managing development programmes at the city level.

UMP work at the country level has involved officials and technical staff of central government agencies; individual professionals and their organisations in both the government and private sectors; associations of local authorities; research and training institutions; financial institutions; and trade, development, and voluntary organisations. These partnerships involved activities leading toward developing and adapting appropriate urban policies, standards, systems and procedures, training programmes, and training materials.

Also at the regional level, in each of the regions the UMP-supported network of experts in each of the substantive themes of the Urban Management Programme is being institutionally anchored. Each of these networks is developing formal mechanisms to

maintain interaction among the participants and a regular programme of activities is developed to improve and maintain their professional skills. The experts in the network are regularly involved in city and country consultations.

At the global level, through interregional documentation and interchange, successful policies and practices are disseminated, transferred and replicated, through South-South co-operation, world-wide. Global organisations and institutions, including UN agencies, NGO networks, cities' associations, are being strengthened to retain their urban management capacities. The programme continues to influence the investment policies and strategies of a number of the ESAs and intends to generate an increase in bilateral and multi-lateral support for urban management activities. The multilateral partner agencies – UNDP and UNCHS (and the World Bank, as it re-joined the partnership in the middle of Phase 3) pick up lessons from their participation in the UMP affecting their policies and programmes, and permitting them to make more effective interventions.

Paradigm Shifts

As illustrated by the above developmental patterns, throughout the process of programme implementation during 1986 – 2000, several shifts in programme paradigms took place over time. These can be summarised as follows:

- a) a shift from a research orientation towards an action planning orientation;
- b) a change from a centrally managed, two-nodal programme to a programme that is increasingly decentralised in its operation;
- c) a gradually evolving, growing concern

with policy development and action planning processes, as opposed to substantive findings and outputs;

- d) an emerging concern with institutionalisation of these processes and its support mechanisms in the regions through the focus on involvement of and support to the "anchoring" institutions in Phase 3, which will ultimately become the receptacles of the UMP substantive and process knowledge.
-