



GLOBAL TASKFORCE
OF LOCAL AND REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS
FOR POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA
TOWARDS HABITAT III

Analysis of the Habitat III Framework Document

Policy Unit 9 -Urban Services and Technology

(Urban infrastructure, basic services (energy included) and Transport and Mobility)

1) A brief analysis of the Framework Paper

- Main challenges:

- Huge Financial and material needs, including enormous investments to ensure the decarbonisation of urban economies;
- Necessity of better resilience, controls, transparency, planning, coordination, synergies and multi-actors cooperation, optimization of the inter-linkage between systems and sectors to achieve the SDGs, holistic vision and the “introduction of life-cycle-cost estimates prior to investment decisions”;
- The transfer of responsibility to the local level should go hand in hand with the simultaneous transfer of political mandates and “the establishment of legal, economic and technical framework conditions”;
- The traditional benefits of agglomerations are damaged by traffic congestion and pollution;
- “The lack of access to urban opportunities is worsening the effect of social inequalities”;
- The prevalence of the model of private motorized modes of transports in developed economies is not sustainable;

- Key measures proposed to become a part of the New Urban Agenda:

- Promote a higher participation of local authorities in the allocation of finances as they can best advise on local needs and demands (subsidiarity);
- Launch large scale investment programs to bridge the investment gap and establish cost recovery schemes on the basis of existing and functioning basic infrastructure systems;
- Renew existing infrastructure and incorporate a more resource efficient design and operation management and reduce the demand of building energy consumption by traditional and new technologies including resource efficiency.

2) Identify messages or proposals that are problematic for us: a brief comment or propose an alternative wording.

There are not problematic messages or proposals, but parts of the text should be more detailed or clarified in order to avoid future interpretations that could be problematic for us.

On infrastructure: They are not enough clear about the dilapidation of old infrastructure (and the need for replacement) in developed countries.

On Mobility: They should clearly state that the model of private motorized modes of transports can no longer continue and that there is a risk of collapse.

For local government: they should speak about Bottom-up approach when they refer to coordination and cooperation, or when they refer to subsidiarity.

The key actions for implementation of the basic services should be declined by level of government, in a general approach –after the presentation by sector- as they did for mobility.

On « stakeholders »: they should precise who they are, and how governments (local and national, but also international cooperation), should deal with them.

O the point “Sustainable urbanization is the sole paradigm to achieve a better habitat and use of resources for all users of urban areas as sustainability links social and economic development with environmental improvements (the triangle of sustainability) based on a set of inherent values, identity with quarters, cities and regions and the contribution and participation of people.” We could rephrase it to have the last part on “values” and “identity” clearly stated as the “cultural” part of sustainability, speaking about the square of sustainability and no the “triangle” (in order to have clearly mentioned the four pillars of sustainability, accordingly with the UCLG vision).

3) *Are there critical points or questions that are absent in the Framework Paper? Which ones?*

“Regional level” (in the continental-scale meaning) is missing. This level can be key on basic services (example: the EU).

The paper should mention that local governments should have the full capacity to decide what kind of management they want to choose for infrastructure and basic services in their jurisdictions.

The paper could highlight that the set-up of ombudsmen to trouble-shoot and mediate between citizens, service operators and local governments would be an important way of resolving conflict as well as ensuring monitoring and evaluation.

The paper could also notify that service provider should recognize their corporate social responsibility to the local community where they operate (social, cultural and environment issues, as well as health, education and local development).

Comments from UCLG Committee on culture

- Interesting understanding of the role of culture (heritage, creativity, diversity) as a key dimension of sustainable cities. Needs more development.
- Perhaps these two ideas could be included:
 - o Local governments to be aware of the potential impact of new urban infrastructures on the preservation of cultural heritage, practices and

symbols: ex ante analysis of potential negative impacts should be carried out, applying a precautionary principle when necessary.

- Cultural services should be included among the examples of urban basic services whose universal access should be guaranteed with adequate policies and institutional frameworks. A wording like “Ensure accessible decentralized and well-resourced cultural infrastructures that include museums and monuments, but also art-schools, libraries or theatres” would be welcomed under “Priorities”