Session-IV
Devising and Tracing Institutional Changes – Toronto, Tokyo, Seoul and Jakarta

In keeping with the extremely well structured and educative presentations by our experts from London, we now have a power packed session comprising four presentations from four megacity regions, Toronto, Jakarta, Tokyo and Seoul. Professor Robert Young from the University of Western Ontario will present the Toronto story. He will be followed by Marco from the Rujak centre of urban studies, Jakarta. Professor Andy Thornley from LSE will share his knowledge about the Tokyo experience and Professor Mike Douglass from the National University of Singapore will make a presentation on Seoul. This session is chaired by Miss Sheila Patel, who is the director of SPARC, an advocacy group for pavement dwellers of Mumbai. We also have an extremely knowledgeable panel to comment on these four presentations. We have Ms Vandana Chauhan, who is a Rajya Sabha MP from the nationalist congress party of India, Mr V. K. Pathak who is a former chief planner MMRDA, Mr Sanjay Ubale MD and CEO of TATA Reality and infrastructure and Mr A. Srivatsan who is the deputy editor of the Hindu. Given the fact that these four city presentations will be highly interesting and yet exhaustive we will first have the presenters from Toronto and Jakarta. This will be followed by the comments of our panellists and a floor discussion. This will then be followed by the presentations for Seoul and Tokyo.

Presentation by Mr Robert Young: Honourable elected politicians and colleagues, I am very happy to be here. I would like to thank the organisers, the Centre for Policy Research, especially its chairman KC Sivaramakrishnan. I am always pleased to be in his company not only because of his keen intellect but also his very fine sense of humour. I would also like to thank the staff for various logistical help. So I am here to give an account of the Toronto experience, the Toronto city region. I won't take too long because Toronto is a relatively small city region. Of course as we will see much depends on how one defines a region. So I will try to be succinct and I will try as ever to follow the two rules of my presentations which are laid down by my wife, one, say something that someone at least might find useful or at least thought provoking, and two, don't make an ass of yourself.

So what I am going to do first is to give a basic context for Toronto very briefly, to talk about the creation of Metro Toronto which probably is the only time that the Government of Ontario, the province in which Toronto was located and the representatives for Toronto actually thought outside the box as we have been encouraged to do here. Then I want to talk about the amalgamation of Metro Toronto into a single tier city or an entity that as its opponents called it the megacity. This led to pressure of the kind that we have seen in many other big cities for more powers and then I want to talk briefly about the current way of thinking about the Toronto city region which is very expansive vision of the greater Golden Horseshoe and then I will try to reach some conclusions.

So the context, in Canada, unlike even the situation in the United States where there is home rule, municipalities are constitutionally creatures of the province. They are established and created by the provincial level of government. Each province has a Municipal Act which lays out the powers and functions of the municipalities in the province and in the case of Canada the involvement of the federal level of government in the municipal sector is relatively small and sporadic at best. There is very little federal involvement with municipalities. The context

with the city of Toronto within the Ontario context is, very simply, it always has been to be run in a business-like manner, to be competitive, to keep tax rates low, to provide services efficiently and to build up if possible the human capital taking care of the inhabitants of the city. So here is the Canadian situation, it's the large country. It is as someone said one of the land rich countries. Ontario sits right in the middle. It's often thought of as the heartland of the country. Toronto is at the Southern extremity of Ontario, fortunately, otherwise it would be even colder. The great innovation in North American terms are around Toronto was the creation of metropolitan Toronto, a two tiered system, a true metropolitan government, one of the very few that have been created in North America.

The city of Toronto itself, in 1950, was a piddling little place, really negligible in any large scheme of things. However, in Census Metropolitan Area, Toronto, and infact the entire region, has witnessed a fairly explosive growth over the past sixty years with the population increasing normally by about 50% or 30% in every ten year period and this is persistent. Major cause, of course, is immigration, originally from rural areas and now from other countries. So the CMA itself is around its 6 million at the moment. In the early 50's the suburbs which were the burgeoning areas of growth around Toronto were simply not in an economic position or fiscal position to pay for the services that were required by a burgeoning population. The city itself requested to amalgamate the suburbs but for political reasons the provincial government and one of its agencies refused and instead created Metro Toronto where the city is the small block in the middle of the diagram here and there were 12 other municipalities that became part of Metropolitan Toronto. So the metropolitan government, the upper tier government provided trunk water services, trunk sewer, arterial growth, all the big heavy duty infrastructure that the individual municipalities could not manage. It provided public transit, it had joint authority over housing and planning and very importantly it was able to borrow money, it was the only authority that could borrow money. So basic structure and we haven't heard too much about taxation here today but the basic structure was an unusual one in which the city had 50% of the Councillors on Metro, it had 57% of the population and yet it provided 62% of the money. So Metropolitan Toronto was seen by its detractors, many of whom were in that central city as a device to suck money out of the centre and use it to pay for infrastructure in the suburbs. It was the, to put it politely, the financial anchor of Metro.

Metro Toronto's creation was also accompanied by the institution of a large number of special purpose bodies to run schools, housing, engage in planning, conservation authority and the transit commission that was meant to provide public transport for the whole metropolitan region. This shows the planning committee, planning commissions area of purview although metro Toronto was the area enclosed in the heavy line, the planning commission was actually active outside the boundaries of the city and this is always the case, it has always been the case in the whole evolution of Toronto. There was only one reform that was significant over the course of the metro's history. The 12 municipalities were combined into a total of 6 and direct election was made for Metro Toronto counsellors who previously have been indirectly appointed to the Council of Metro.

Now as time went by other metropolitan authorities were created across the province of Ontario, 11 in total. So this federated structure was reproduced widely within the province of Ontario despite its political unpopularity. This effort eventually stopped but it acquired ahead of steam and in the late 60's and into the mid 70's these metropolitan authorities were created in many parts of the province. So, in 1997 the Metro municipalities were amalgamated into a single city. So the city of Toronto was reborn with much larger boundaries. The reasons were

continuing increasing in immigration, increasing disparities, the city residence were paying disproportionate share of the cost of Metro Toronto. There was severe disagreement over transit planning. The suburban areas wanted roads built and they still do and people in the central city wanted mass transit in the form of subways and trams. So metro as a structure became decreasingly popular and the provincial government, so called progressive conservative government took a bold decision to simply amalgamate all of Metro Toronto into one city. This was part of a neo-liberal economic platform that this government was elected on, so called common sense revolution. It was a very odd government by Ontario standards, it's odd to cut social welfare and education spending, deregulate just about everything that the provincial government had authority over and it wanted to cut transfers to municipalities and the amalgamation of Toronto was a way of doing this.

It was a very quirky decision to proceed to the amalgamation; part of this had to do with the globalisation imperative. It was said that the Premier of the province had been to conferences and was told that the only thing people knew about Ontario was Toronto and so he decided to follow through and create a Toronto that could be "globally competitive". Many citizens of Toronto were very upset about this development but the government pushed through. It was a strong government. It also went through amalgamations in many, many, many other municipalities in the country so that the total number of municipalities was reduced from over 800 to about 450. So sweeping consolidations throughout the province.

Now in reaction there was a movement that the city of Toronto itself should gain more power than it currently had and this was around 2000-2003 and it was part of a really general movement certainly in Canada but also well beyond the rise of the consciousness of global city regions, the sense that cities were the engines of the economic growth and that they had to be free to some extent from the shackles of senior governments. So, more powers for Toronto were demanded. There were pressures from foundations, quite big foundations, from think tanks, from the financial sector which is based in Toronto arguing that not only that city but other cities needed more power and financial resources. The Conference Board of Canada, a very large representative organisation of business, jumped on board and in Toronto itself there was a movement to form a large alliance between community groups, the financial sector, other business organisations, the voluntary associations like the United Way to demand a better deal for the city. The response of the provincial government was to pass a new City of Toronto Act which took Toronto out from under the general structures of the Municipal Act, gave it further taxation powers. Nothing significant, no income tax, no sales tax but there were land transfer taxes that could be implemented, hotel taxes, a variety of smaller taxes to try to increase its fiscal resources. But still there was a persistent shortage of cash and there is a persistent shortage of cash for transit.

Now, over this time, starting about 10 years ago, thinking in the provincial government changed in the way it viewed the prospects of Southern Ontario and what came to be called the Toronto centred region. There had been talk about the Greater Toronto Area but the definition of the GTA expanded in the minds of provincial politicians and officials to focus on the greater Golden Horseshoe. So here is the Greater Toronto Area and that shows the unicity of Toronto in yellow, and it is hemmed in by these other regional governments which are still two-tiered governments. But the whole region of the greater golden horseshoe stretches well east of Toronto and well West of it all round the end of lake Ontario, an area of over 200 kilometres whose major problem and this is a big concern of business is congestion and the costs of congestion which are estimated to run into billions just for the city of Toronto itself every year.

The other defining characteristic of the Greater Golden Horseshoe is very rapid development. The darkest areas here show growth rates of 20% in a 5 year period. The next is 10% and almost every part of the Greater Golden Horseshoe is growing at 10% every 5 years. So there was a smart growth panel established to start to think about the whole Greater Golden Horseshoe. There was a major provincial policy statement issued that called for densification and intensification of land use. There was an Act that started to implement that thinking of the provincial policy statement and a growth plan for the whole Greater Golden Horseshoe area. So part of this was to set up a green belt so that growth would be concentrated inside of the green belt and also beyond it in growth nodes including cities like Hamilton and Waterloo and Berry to the North and specific growth areas were designated in that plan. This was accompanied by a multiplication of structures within the Ontario Government to plan for the region especially to plan infrastructure and that's where we stand now.

So, conclusions, in terms of the brief which was handed to us what is causing this change, it's undoubtedly the rapid expansion of population. Canada takes in every year about 1% of its population in the form of immigration. This is really quite unique in the world. The state of the economy both when it's good and when it's poor has stimulated Ontario government action and there is always the sense of the need to be competitive in the North American and world contacts. The political process is complicated. There are always defenders of local autonomy but this local autonomy leads to sometimes very wasteful inter municipal competition because of the extent to which are municipalities are dependent on the property tax. They need to compete to get new investment. Provincial control is a constant and there is a sort of ambivalent provincial concern on the one hand about cities becoming a financial drain but in the case of Toronto the need to maintain the engine of growth for the provincial economies. So politically there is never a consensus and what happens is the provincial government takes decisions and some people lose, they feel, and other people win and the province decides what will occur. The institutional design is characterised by very low level of federal government involvement as I said by many special purpose agencies and in so far as those system as a whole has legitimacy it's conveyed by provincial elections which is fairly thin read on the legitimacy front.

The outcomes there are still inadequate transportation infrastructure; there are still conflicts about transit. The new scheme has some promise environmentally but that's yet to be realised and the inclusiveness is due to provincial spending which is rapidly increased on education and especially health. So much depends on the provincial government. It's clear that determined well organised municipal action can be effective but the final decision maker is the province. That is what I have to say, thank you. I welcome any comments and questions.

Ms Sheela Patel: I think you followed your wife's instructions. (I hope so), Marco, do you?

Presentation by Mr Marco Kusumawijaya: I have to disappoint you because I am not going to talk comprehensively about Jakarta and its metropolitan region, I will speak only about a particular aspect which is the role of civil society and communities especially within the perspective of ecological transition. I think it is useful at this moment because I am concerned that the talk about metropolitan governance might think that this role of civil society and transition throughout ecological age could be discussed later after we have the structure for the governance. I would like actually to urge that this should be talked about

now before or when we are designing the metropolitan governance structure. I think that might be useful based on my experience somehow on Jakarta.

As you know Jakarta was flooded on February 16 and 17 and actually until less than two weeks ago I was not sure whether I will come or not because my house was flooded and only two weeks ago I found that my passport was saved so I did come here. I would like to begin with this flood story because in the last flood there are two interesting new features. The one is the long inundation of the coastal area and the secondly the gushes that overwhelmed Central Jakarta which was not before flooded. The cause for both is infrastructural failure. Pumps in the coastal area failed to work and a leafy collapse near by the central area. One can always say that there should be more infrastructure to channel excess water but this statement for me is faulty for seeing only one-third of the equation of the flood. You know it's very simple half which is flood equals the balance between surface run off and the capacity of natural and man-made drains. It follows very easily that to reduce flood we need to reduce surface run off and to increase the capacity of man-made and natural drains. But the thing is for more than 100 years, Jakarta, and I would suspect that it happens also in many other cities, the works done are mostly on increasing the capacity of man-made and natural drains which is not sustainable because when you increase all the time the capacity of the drains without reducing the surface run off which is increasing because of human habitation and because of deforestation in the upstream areas, whatever infrastructures you build to drain more water will be always over-filled again and again and that's what I think has happened in Jakarta for 100 years or more and some studies confirm this, for example a book written specifically about the history of flood control in Jakarta.

Now the last flood in Jakarta for me is a wakeup call. So we actually immediately convened a number of civil society organisations and experts to think about writing up a programme which is an alternative to infrastructural approach. This approach that we want to promote we call conservationist ecological approach which is basically to reduce surface run off by reforestation in the upstream areas and by reducing surface run off in Jakarta itself. You immediately see this has to do with metropolitan scale because the upstream area of Jakarta is outside the jurisdiction of Jakarta. This leads me to the suggestion that when we talk about delineation of metropolitan area I think it should not be just about economy, it should be also about ecology. I think it is actually fortunate that with the problems of water our realisation about Jakarta and its metropolitan areas is closer to not to the whole bioregion delineation of the area but at least to the watershed area. Jakarta with a population of 9.6 million, with its surrounding districts, it's around 28 million and now we are also thinking about adding up a further Southern area which is Bandung and surroundings, altogether that will make up more than 34 million population which would become second largest after Tokyo. Now we are third largest after Seoul and Incheon area.

So the idea of bioregion or at least watershed area is an important way of delineating a metropolitan region because water is one whole entity that works in one watershed area. But why I want to emphasise on the role of civil society because it is obvious that actually a more conservationist ecological approach requires participation by civil society and communities and cross border cooperation. We need to reforest the upstream areas of Jakarta. We need to cooperate with two other provincial governments and to decrease the surface run off we need to recharge as much water as possible into the ground. So changing from what we call horizontal drainage to vertical drainage which is to recharge water into the ground and at the same time actually to solve the problem of subsidence in Jakarta. Subsidence in Jakarta now has been confirmed in the past three years, although the phenomenon has been observed since

70's. Recent studies show that subsidence in Jakarta happens at the rate of 18, eighteen centimetres not millimetres per year, 18 centimetres per year at some point. The recent study shows at least there are three points that have that rate of subsidence. So to recharge water would help stop it but our temporary calculation shows that we need to have about 4 million recharging wells to do this in the next 20 years and recharging wells need to be done in every plot perhaps one plot or some plots would have more and some would have less but still it requires participation of individual citizens, of civil society, of communities. It would be actually cheaper and I think that's the reason why politicians do not like this approach because it is cheaper, it is decentralised and it is empowering citizens to own our recovery capacity of the earth to help us and free us from flood and other matters.

So, my other argument about the role of civil society has to do with our recent relative success in asking the new Governor of Jakarta to reject the 6 elevated toll roads proposed by national government. Actually last week the Governor convened a number of civil society leaders and he told us he has listened to us all in the previous two months and he decided to reject all 6 segments of the elevated toll roads but he said the private sector negotiated and requested for two segments at least. So he asked us whether we have additional arguments to reject this other two segments. This is a project worth 42 trillion rupiahs which is something like 5 billion US dollars. In a way for us this is quite encouraging, we feel a certain degree of success that the new Governor known for his innovativeness and for his humility and for his willingness to listen to people that he would dare to take such risk under the pressure of the national government no to more elevated toll roads. But somehow I think civil society roles should be more than just rejecting things. Most environmentalist, more conservationists I think most Leftist people have been criticized by philosopher like Slavoj Zizek who said that we are champions at criticizing others but we are very slow in proposing our alternatives and that's why now we want really to work on this so called conservationist approach to water management in Jakarta by really, really working to write a programme that could go into budget, that could go into programme of mobilising civil society to do it.

But also at this moment I think there are many other civil society organisations that somehow help people with their initiatives. There are cyclists association covering the whole region of Jakarta metropolitan area. There are carpooling activities initiated by people. We just also organised a workshop that we call smart cities; smart city equals smart people and smart process not smart buildings. That will be exhibited in Berlin in next summer in the Aedes architecture gallery. In the workshop interestingly two proposals that we will immediately work on, one proposal is to create a website that would record people converting their yards into open spaces and improve it to be recharging wells. With this kind of website where people can voluntarily report that he converted his yard into green spaces, then there will a calculator that automatically calculates that because of Jakarta we have certain percentage more of green spaces etc. It can also encourage people to help. So I can for example I want to change my yards into public space, open spaces but due to lack of money or perhaps I could do it myself but I need more trees, can someone for example contribute trees? So this is an example where civil society are using the advantage of social media, the IT technology which actually decentralise our access to knowledge. By that I mean not only access to information but also it frees us to coproduce knowledge about ourselves, about our cities and to define knowledge about our cities ourselves.

Besides this emerging social media and IT, I think the civil society in Indonesia particularly in Jakarta, Jakarta by the way is among the largest producer of threat in internet whether it's Facebook or Twitter. We are also taking advantage of the new law on freedom, freedom for

public information. So basically we can request any public information from the government and if within two weeks they did not comply we can sue them which is very interesting opportunity for us. But of course there are problems. As you know 1998 for us means also reform, decentralisation, more autonomy for second tier or third tier regions or municipality cities in Indonesia and it created as much fragmentation that we have heard from many other cities and part of the world. But we think that this also creates an opportunity for us, for civil society to intervene and I think we have not done formatting the proper mechanism for the procedures of for civil society intervention into public policies. I hope this is a no-return avenue for us – the new technology, the decentralisation, new ways of civil society to organise itself to intervene into public policy debate. I am sure things must be done at very structural level, at governance structure etc. but I think as someone mentioned this morning that it is about change in mind set and I think it will start from also communities and civil societies. We actually last year had this bigger ambition to set up metropolitan citizens association which I think is failing. It's too big for us for a civil society organisation but then this flood problem gave us an opportunity to start an association which focuses on water management and we are starting to do that.

So there are opportunities and challenges faced in Jakarta with the new decentralisation and other developments in the past 10 years. I am sure in many other cities there are also civil society associations. In Jakarta I have mentioned carpooling society, river society, voter society, pedestrian society, cyclists society, and even also train commuters association and of course business associations. I think if we can find a way to mobilise this free association of civil societies and to relate that to a bigger structure of metropolitan governance, I think that would be perfect and I think we need to think about it when we are designing the structure not after we designed the structure. Thank you.

Ms Sheela Patel: Thank you very much for bringing in a whole new spectrum of thinking in this discussion. What I would like to do is to ask all of you to give any comments or ways by which this these two presentations have triggered thoughts for you and then open up for one or two questions.

A. Srivatsan: Two presentations have take away points and I will just pick three which I can connect with the cities in India and particularly the city I come from which is Chennai. In Robert's presentation on Toronto, it's a very interesting thing that he mentioned that the suburbs wanted amalgamation so that it could use the city's wealth in order to invest in the suburb which I think is an interesting and a healthy relationship because what I see happening here is the reverse that the city needs the suburbs for its rich resources particularly the land and hence there are certain kind of a parasitical relationship develops between the core city and the suburb. In fact there is a deep suspicion in the megacity project that the core city wants the land and resources and hence this huge megacity project. So in that sense it's a healthy thing to look at that how you use the city in order to develop the region in a more equitable way but I don't know really what happened in Toronto whether it realised that or ended up in being a parasitical kind of a contract.

The second thing that you mentioned in Toronto which I connect with Marco's presentation is the thing when you mentioned of horseshoe, the other horseshoe that came to my mind was the Randstad model of the Netherlands which is another interesting regional approach where it's a three centre, it's a kind of a polycentric model arranged in a horseshoe. So there is an alternative to a megacity which doesn't have to be centred around one city but basically you are looking at a polycentric model in which case no city has to within the major megacity

doesn't have to lose its own identity. It could flourish and it could mutually support. But that connects with what Marco said, is there another way to delineate a region which is let's say using ecology. So another parallel thought that entered my mind was the Richard Forman's idea of region where we use corridors and patches and suddenly look at cities wherein we have a very complex geometry that comes out not this contiguous mega humungous city centred on one point but once you deploy ecology and other ways of looking at region then there is a complex form, a complex geometry which compels us to think not privileging only one centre, so be it Hyderabad or be it Chennai or be it Bangalore it looks there is 8000 or 7000 sq.km was mobilised to see how well to serve one single city. So, one could approach it not only from this kind of a contractual parasitical criticism but also from ecology and the different kinds of geometries that it could throw.

Ms. Vandana Chavan: May be I would like to put in a few points. First of all I would like to congratulate CII, CPR and all the other partner organisations who have taken up this very important subject for today because our cities and basically all over the world urbanisation is happening so fast that every presentation that I see be it London or Jakarta or Toronto we can feel that they are all evolving a system where probably they can administer better and bring the best for their citizens. It's the same scenario in India. Being a Corporator of 15 years at the Pune Municipal Corporation I myself have realised that every city, Pune has been growing so fast that the administration has not been able to cope up with the kind of growth and these kind of platforms, these kind of interactions give us lessons to learn as to what are the success stories and what are the failures.

I would like to on a broader canvas may be even ask a few questions here through my interaction that every city is asking this question that how big is the city supposed to be. What is the largest limit that we can restrict ourselves to and if there is any answer for that from any part of the world I think that is something that we need to deliberate on. Every time there is a different kind of concept that gets floated. When urbanisation is happening some say the city needs to spread, some say it has to be a compact city where you need to go vertical. So what is the exact pattern that every city should have? Have we thought of these kind of questions because these are the guidelines probably which would serve as guidelines for Indian cities to grow and specially when I read from several data that urbanisation is happening so fast, 50% of the population world over stays now in cities and in India almost 40% and the largest percentage of urbanisation is in India. So when this kind of urbanisation is happening it would really be the right time to introspect and to find out what are the patterns which are being adopted as best practices all over the world.

Marco has thrown light on a very important aspect that is ecology. We are sitting in a premise which is very vulnerable to climate change. I remember 2 years back the cover page of India Today showing the Gateway of India, the foot of Gateway of India under water and is this going to be the picture by 200 that was the caption. Climate change India is very vulnerable to climate change and therefore these are new aspects which city governance has to look into. If there is no rain what do we do. Do we tap the underground water? What are the kind of systems which we need to put in place to make sure that our groundwater doesn't get depleted and not only it doesn't get depleted but make sure that we have a recharge of this water. Rain water harvesting, if there is more rains then how exactly are we going to cater to this because then we...Marco just said that he fortunately found his passport and therefore could come here. Now this is a scenario in several other cities in our country also and more so in the countries where they were no rains. So this is another aspect I feel which needs to be looked into and probably this would be the right forum to actually address these problems

and give cities of India guidelines as to what are the best practices. In London things have been done, if it has been done then how exactly the people got together to make these changes happen.

There have been several systems which we are working in especially in Maharashtra we have a typical law where the administration, the Commissioner is given more powers than the Mayors. As somebody rightly said, the Mayor only goes to cut the red ribbons but not really, if a Mayor decides he wants to or she wants to be proactive I think he or she can make a world of a difference. I mean I have experienced it myself so I know it can happen but of course you don't have powers and therefore you are limited in that sense. There was an experiment made in India especially in Maharashtra with two municipal corporations where we had the Mayor in Council and I think that ran only for one year. Now why did it fail? I think that was the ideal system to work in because at the moment in municipal corporations we are only fire fighting. Whatever problem, you fight it and there is no time for planning. We see a city engineer of a municipal corporation. He looks into the daily course of passing building permissions. He also does the development plan and he is also expected to bring in innovative ideas to develop the city. Now how can one man look at all these three things? So I think we need a entire revamp of our governing system at the local self government and the local self government undoubtedly is the most important part of governance because it rules the grassroots and if we really don't make visible changes in that our cities are not going to really be...So I really look forward that this platform thinks and deliberates and brings out the solutions and a thinking where we have to revamp the whole system probably where we could get in better governance. Thank you.

Mr. Sanjay Ubale: I just wanted to make a couple of comments. In the first place I don't know whom we are talking to. So I think we are probably talking to those who are converted, who believe that governance need to improve and we need to do something drastically different. I know that there are lot of luminaries out here who have in their lifetime have tried to improve governance in the cities. Mr Sivaramakrishnan is here and we have been listening to him for a long time about what needs to be done to improve the conditions in the cities. Unfortunately it hasn't happened and you know why because today if you see those whom we are supposed to address these are also not here, so you know why it's not happening. It's generally said that we neglect cities to our peril and it is a fact that cities are the drivers of the economic growths, cities are drivers of innovation, cities are drivers of well-being, culture everything actually happens in the cities. Unfortunately we have neglected cities for a long time and something drastically needs to be done. I entirely agree with Mrs Chavan when she says there is an urgent need to revamp the entire system of governance that we currently have. The way I see it is I think there are two aspects; one is how the cities are governed. Typically say like the municipal corporation of Pune, city of Pune and how the region which is beyond that city how those regions are governed and we need to basically have two things in place. One is that we need to have a mechanism by which the voice of the citizen is heard and they have a stake in the future of the city and two is that, that system of governance should be able to deliver the services to those people which it attempts to serve. On both these accounts to my mind I think the system that we have currently, not only in Maharashtra but in India, generally fails very miserably.

Now if at all we are saying that if the citizens voice is to be heard, the citizen's voice in the cities is actually heard through the municipalities. However the decisions are not taken in the municipalities as Mrs Chvhan also mentioned that in the city the decisions are not taken in the municipalities. There either the State governments in the case of Maharashtra to which I

have a fairly intimate knowledge, I know that the decisions the important decisions are not taken even by the Municipal Commissioner let's say, forget about even the Mayor ads the Mayor in the equation really doesn't have as many powers as even the municipal commissioner having. So the state government essentially takes those decisions and the state government is not accountable to the citizens of that city. So there is a huge structural problem that you see. Those who are accountable for it are not really empowered to do what they are supposed to do.

One of the key things I think which we have in driving and I think various forums including Bombay First I have been driving is that we need to have something like a not even a Mayor in Council system something like a directly elected Mayor who has ultimately to show to the people what he or she has been able to do for the improvement in the city. The structure that we currently have doesn't provide the kind of accountability to the people, to the citizens as it stands today. That's an important point and I don't know how these structural issues are addressed. I could not hear that in both the cities have Ontario and Jakarta. So how is the accountability established in this governance framework?

Too very often it is generally believed that the moment you gave authority automatically the services also should follow and the services should also fall within the ambit of the municipalities and I feel that again there is sometimes we tend to make a mistake. I personally feel that the municipal structures, the municipal councillors or the municipal general body essentially is more like a regulatory structure. They set up a vision for the city and they will expect that vision to be translated into action. There entire job is to get the resources and see that the vision actually gets translated into reality but very often as Mrs Chavan also just now said that the same junior engineer is doing the development plan, the same junior engineer is supposed to address complaints, also execute projects on the ground. What all is he supposed to do. Personally I feel he is not supposed to do everything. The job of the municipality is that of a regulation supposed to ensure that those agencies which are supposed to deliver those services deliver it to the specifications that were given and ensure nothing less in that. Unfortunately what happens is the execution and the regulation had got fused into the same body. The body which is supposed to see the quality of roads that are supposed to be delivered in your cities, the quality itself is something that it's supposed to regulate and supposed to execute. So you have two authority fused into one. That's a reason why you having extremely poor quality infrastructure, extremely poor quality of execution of say water supply schemes because those who are supposed to keep a watch have a much larger stake in ensuring that there are certain leakages happen in the delivery mechanism. I am quite sure Mrs Chavan also must have seen this happening that whenever you actually try to see that you try to control the expenditure, you try to control say the unauthorised water connections, the same people will come back, the corporators probably will come back and say that no, no regularise those connections. Of you catch hold of a Junior Engineer who has been corrupt some of the corporators will come back and say that please let them go they are actually helping us in our political system. So you have a situation wherein there is a nexus between completely two opposing kind of objectives and unless we are able to separate that out I think will not be able to ensure good governance to the people.

So I feel that the two critical things there has to be direct accountability to the citizens through to my mind a directly elected Mayor who is chosen by the people and two that we need to have a separation of the municipal services, it could be water supply, could be sewage systems, could be roads from the regulatory services where the municipal counsellors actually are dissociated from the execution part of it. Their job should be to see that all those

who are delivering those services are held accountable for the quality and the standards that they are set for themselves. I think these are two fundamental things and I don't think unless we are able to achieve it we should be in a position to deliver a good quality infrastructure for the cities.

Ms Sheela Patel: Thank you. I am now in a bit of a dilemma because we have two more presentations and there is a desperate need for also making sure that we also have questions from the audience. So if I could ask two or three people who want to ask questions which are related to clarifications of the two presentations I will invite them. Please be short and succinct. I see two hands there. Please introduce yourselves and then I will ask both of you to make some points and then invite the next questions.

Ms Darshini Mahadevia: I teach in a planning school. I have a question for Professor Young. In Canada you talked about this amalgamation of municipalities around the metro cities and I understand that process was through referendums at the smaller municipality levels but I also have heard at least in case of Montreal that then there was demerger process as well and it has created a very complicated governance systems. If you could throw further light onto what has happened in Toronto metropolitan region.

Mr Darryl D'Monte, Journalist: This is more in concurrence of what Marco said because you are in very good company here in a city which in July 26th 2005 got about 94 centimetres of rain in about 12 hours and the city came to a halt. I was on a concerned citizens commission which published a report which showed that the railway which is the life line of Mumbai the water in what we thought was a drain, actually a river, the water was just a foot below the railway tracks, had the water risen in another foot, South and North Mumbai would be in sewer but may be Mrs Chavan from her party should be asking her party which is in charge of the Maharashtra state road development corporation, why it and the congress party concern only in building roads, sea links, road schemes for 8% of the commuting public which travels by car and we are spending roughly what Jakarta is spending 20000 or 30,000 crores, 4 or 5 billion US on road schemes in a city which used to have the highest percentage of the population commuting using public transport 87% it is now reducing because of the crush of cars and I am afraid that the political class and specially the coalition in this state both the Congress and the NCP have an edifice complex and a road complex and a motor car complex. All of which they should share immediately.

Mr Marco Kusumawijaya: Actually I would like to respond to the previous comment about the possibility of imagining metropolitan region as not only focus or centres around one city with very high urban primacy. I think that's what we have been talking about another term to make it complicated. I would like to suggest the term multipolitan because megacity megapolitan tends to say that there is one big city dominating others but multipolitan is about many cities in one region which can be defined either according to ecological consideration or others. On the water problem Sir I don't know things and situation about Mumbai but and also on road situation here but in Jakarta we have establish some facts that actually the more you build roads especially toll roads the more you induce traffics and the more you create traffic jams. Actually we just have a new case. A new elevated non toll roads, highway in Jakarta opened last week and immediately it was flooded by cars and the thing is it encourages sub-urbanisation, given the context of Indonesia where fuel is heavily subsidised. There is argument about road ratio and this is an argument often raised by many engineers. Jakarta has very low road ratio as compared to Tokyo etc. but again the 20% road ratio in Tokyo does not make Tokyo free from traffic jam. Tokyo has traffic jam especially when

you talk about elevated highways etc. inside the city but it has much more public transport but for Jakarta's specific situation the cause of traffic jam is actually the wrong or unsustainable land use spat patter where Jakarta proper its population growth is at the rates of above 1% which is lower than the national average but the surrounding suburbs are growing at the rate of 4 to 5% which is of course much lower than what you have here in Mumbai, in Hyderabad and other metropolitan region but still this explains the cause of the traffic jam which is the induced traffics or tripped by car. So I think you might have different situation here that I think we should talk about it at length later during dinner. Thank you.

Mr Robert Young: Well thank you both to the floor and the panel for these remarks. I will be brief if I can. First I am not going to talk about Montreal. Montreal is a complete mess and I said that I would be succinct. On the question of the justice of having the suburbs developing at the expense of the central city one could go along with this except that of course development didn't stop and development spread well beyond Metro Toronto and in some ways the citizens of Toronto were paying for that but the original suburbs then became relatively poor because people with money moved farther out and so those original suburbs which developed on the back of the city of Toronto especially Etobicoke and Scarborough are now distressed places.

Second unusual of how big a city can be. Well I suppose the city can be almost infinite but despite being a land rich country Canada and Ontario in particular cannot afford to continue to sprawl at the rate we are sprawling, North Americans have a penchant for single family detached houses on plots of land, the bigger the better and we are just devouring farm land really high quality farm land at too higher rate and that's why the provinces stepped in with its smart compact growth strategy which hasn't really bitten yet but we will see whether it will. Finally Mr Ubala's comment about accountability and what is needed. I completely agree that accountability and an elected Mayor with some powers are very very important but the problem of cities is that they do not define their own boundaries and growth keeps spilling beyond the boundaries beyond the boundaries beyond the boundaries and no matter how powerful a Mayor, no matter how directly elected the Mayor is that kind of growth cannot be controlled by the city administration and so there is a need for senior levels of governments which are not as directly accountable to play a role there. It's the same thing in the United Kingdom. London is huge but the entire South East England can only be planned for now short of incredible and very costly inter municipal cooperative agreements, it can only be planned for now by the central government of the United Kingdom and the same is true in the case of Ontario, it's the provincial government can and must try to integrate the interests of the city of Toronto with the burgeoning sprawl around it. Thank you

Mrs Vandana Chawan: First of all because Mr Demonte refer to my name that is why, first of all I think this forum is much above political bickering – number one. Secondly I have not come here as a mouthpiece of my party to say why my party has taken a particular stand which I don't know off and if you can take some time off and search on Google as to what I have done in the past in my city as far as environment conservation is concerned, I am a bit of a rebel in the political circles.

Presentation by Mike Douglas:
Its very nice to be back in Mumbai after many years and I am totally charmed by the graciousness with which you been hosting us and the also the level of the exchange is very rewarding. So I am going to talk about Seoul for a little while. We talk about other experiences in a way that is not a model of course but more or less thought provoking and

even cautionary and I think we can find both in the case of Korea. This photo air photo basically shows you the metropolitan regions of South Korea. We can start with the national land population, the purpose of this basically is to tell you that it's a very mountainous country and so there is actually not a lot of land where cities could develop.

Furthermore even in the 1970's if you look at the darker spots you see that the population was widely distributed. It's only over the last 30 or 40 years when the concentration of population in Seoul has really taken off and you can see this that it's been unrelenting if regional planning or city region planning is the question, seoul or South Korea has tried everything. It is the classic textbook of every single policy you could ever imagine has been tried in Korea and they have even invented new ones and yet none of them stopped the growth of Seoul. Today Seoul equals half of the population of South Korea, the Greater Seoul capital city region. In addition unlike many other Asian countries but soon to come to your country too I would imagine pervasive depopulation of rural areas. Korea is now at the point of depopulation itself. Japan has already started that and Korea is close behind. So that by the year 2005 we only had about three or four city regions that were actually growing, the rest of the country is depopulating.

Democratisation if we talk about governance of the region or the country, democratisation comes late and hard fought and what might surprise you these photos of people in different modes of protest are actually very recent. This is after democracy not fighting for it. So this very strong State in contest with citizens over all kinds of things continues on today but it is a full democracy that comes into play only from the late 1980's. Devolution is even later. During the 60's, 70's upto the mid 80's you had Marshall Law and the local autonomy abolished. So it's only in 1995 that Mayors are actually elected for the first time in modern history and its only 1990's onward the citizens have the right to petition government and only in 1998 and after when fiscal decentralisation actually began. So it's very much like Indonesia actually in terms of timing that decentralisation is really only about 10 years old. So we don't have a lot of experience.

One of the problems is that if you have half of the population of the country in one single city region that region is going to have a lot of advantage even in the process of decentralisation. So this chart shows you that the level of autonomy in other words self-financing, what is showing you is Seoul and Kingie its surrounding province are fairly self-sufficient in funding but the other cities and regions are not and they still very dependent on central government financing. So even if you have massive decentralisation in the case of South Korea it's still favourite Seoul and Seoul also as a capital city gets all kinds of expenditures that never are registered in terms of local budgets. So the per capita expenditures on a city like Seoul are immensely greater than those expenditures on any other city in the country. In addition, 98% of all of the corporations are headquartered in Seoul and they are powerful. Samsung is just one name that I am sure you all recognise, there are larger corporate profits larger than many countries. So together Seoul becomes a very powerful vortex of the green economy and politics as well.

The 1998 crisis which Koreans don't call the finance crisis, they call the IMF crisis and then they play with IMF, F means I am fired. There is another word that starts with F that it's too used too that I do not say but they blame the IMF for the whole show and there is some truth to that. But it anyway this dramatically changes Korea from a society that were more or less had even distribution of income to the beginning of a next era of what I call neo developmentalism which is a combination of a very strong State with neo liberal policies. So

the state is operating hand and hand with these very large corporations to in some ways dismantle the state or as some people were saying this morning privatise much of what's going on and or corporatize but still stays strongly involved.

Ok, so let's talk about Seoul directly for a minute. All of this is very compressed in time. If you looked at this one photo 1900 Seoul says or people in Korea say that Seoul has a 2000 year old history and yet it was very small until the middle of the 20th century. We have around the turn of the century 1900 it was basically a city of palaces and hamlets. By 2010 when the housing juggernaut was put in place it became what people have called apartment city which the vernacular city which more or less eliminated by corporate production of housing which functionally speaking housed everyone. But in terms of we talk about place making other things we could ask other questions. But to look at these graphs you see that around 1990 or so Seoul city starts to taper off and now starts to decline in population whereas the metropolitan region continues to grow. So you have the classic case of the core in terms of night time population, the core starts to decrease and the suburban areas start to not only increase in residential population but also in some of the high tech and other kinds of industries as well.

So we have a situation in which we have a very powerful central government and you also have a very powerful Seoul government but you have no mechanism to coordinate among the local governments. So in Seoul itself you have a Mayor who is elected for 4 years and also in a parallel with Indonesia the new Mayor is actually from an NGO and very progressive guys so we are not quite sure what's going to happen. But until two years ago there was a Mayor who was part of the neo liberal party of Lee Myung Bak who was instituting a number of policies that I will try to talk about. It also has a city council, a city council that is elected and can be from the different party than the Mayors so there is often that oppositional element which could be good. It has 25 wards with populations ranging from 140000 to 700000. Now the whole population of Korea itself is around 40+ million which is probably less than some states in India. So it's a very compact nation in that regard. You could see from this night light picture though the kinds of blueish area in the middle, that is Seoul city and the rest its surrounding regions. So you can see how it expanded way beyond the boundaries.

In terms of finance 2002 really starts to devolve or decentralised financing but still remains highly centralised, estimates are about 35% of budget are locally produced and the rest comes from central governments. There are many other mechanisms that the central government can use to try to push local budgets to spend on things that the national government wants. So in other words local autonomy is very very modest in Korea and you have a mix of decentralisation or devolution but also deconcentration which is simply putting offices in another location but keeping control under national government. So if we look at the question how is the national capital region the larger region which is composed of Seoul, Gangido and Incheon, how was that managed. Well in a very very short statement it's not managed at all. There are number of coordination bodies and councils that have been established but none of them have really been put in force and they have no legal powers. So there is actually no coordination over this region as such. Therefore the main players in terms of managing the growth of the capital city region are really the national government and individual city or provincial governments. Seoul itself has the status of a province.

So here is what some of the many policies that the Korean government tried over the years that will sound familiar to you. One was the institution of a green belt. So, Korea has a

classic development State. In fact it is the one that is often talked about as the model and by that I mean when the state says it's going to do something it does it. In the case of Korea's green belt it was absolutely enforced, nothing new was added to that green belt during its life. The net result was though that the commuting population had to go out further. So kind of leaped over the green belt and extended the metropolitan region even further. Another policy that the government put was direct control over population 1960's and 70's the government actually burnt down slums. They stopped the growth of universities because of this very strong cultural power of Seoul that you can learn more by sleeping in Seoul than by studying in the countryside, that kind of feeling, you have to be in Seoul. Seoul is the only place you can go upward in society. So the government tried to actually start population through education policies. They did not had number of zones, no industrial location, no this or that and then selective growth and so on. The net result of that turns out in the 1990's that Seoul city is face with growing suburbs but it can't grow itself because it had all of these provisions to stop itself from growing and this is part of the politics that we will see in a minute.

But anyway from the 1980's onward neo-liberalism starts to come in and you find dismantling of the green belts and the new policy is to create new towns to redistribute the population. This is down to a national land agency and a national housing agency that basically assembles clears the land and then large development corporations come in and build housing. More recently it has a plan to remove the capital city functions from Seoul to somewhere near datum which is only about an hour and half from Seoul itself.

On the plus side it has a magnificent, actually quite extensive and quite well working transportation system in terms of both rail and bus. It's adopted the Korecheba bus system with articulated buses, dedicated lanes and buses of different colours depending on where it's going, how far it's going. It works quite well. However not enough to displace the automobile which is one of the biggest problems in Seoul is the massive traffic congestion. Ok, So the Mayor Seoul faced with the problem that the deteriorating economy within Seoul that's been extravatedthrough all these policies. Seoul engages on as something call as second miracle on the Han which included a proposal for a 152 story building. All kinds of mega projects the one by Hadid in the middle there is actually been built as a design park. All of this for world city branding, for intercity competition and the whole neo-liberal kind of competitiveness. There are all stopped by the new Mayor. So we will see what happens but in the process as I said the vernacular city more or less disappears and you have mega projects covering very large swathes of the city as a way to regenerate its growth but not in hand and hand with any surrounding provinces. Incheon as some of you may know is busy doing Songdo or 30 billion dollar land fill project off the coast.

So to conclude, there are number of issues that have not, I am not coming to the rest of Asia but they are in fact very important in Korea now. One is after 1998 there was a disengagement or a breaking of the contract of workers life time working and now about half of the work force of Seoul is temporary and low income or I should say insecure income. So you have a problem of housing supply, housing gluts now because the housing industry is producing endless housing but not at the price affordable to lower income people. So you have housing gluts but also housing needs. The government has intervened into social housing which is very innovative and interesting itself but you also have a demographic turn which means that the labour force is shrinking and an ageing society along with that you have a rise of foreign population particularly foreign workers who will never be citizens going now over million people now in Seoul and other cities.

The biggest fear that I hear when I am in Korea is the rise of China, absorbing industry from particularly provincial towns in Korea itself and how can Seoul reinvent itself because China is doing everything and as I said traffic congestion. Air pollution is also unique in the sense that it is not necessarily coming from Korea but it's also blowing over from China from the sandstorms that go through Beijing and photo over here is actually of Seoul itself, rising inequalities and a multiculturalism

Finally, reunification. Seoul is only 41 kilometres from the border with North Korea and that equation is never far from anyone's mind. There are many refugees coming down from North Korea one way or another and they end up often on street corners trying to get day jobs because there is a difficulty in the social integration of those people. So some cities may wish they had these problems because the problems that the cities have are much greater than there is. There is no water problem, there is not a problem with drainage or any of that kind of thing. It's a problem of a quite different order that as I said here deals more with social inequalities and what other people have talked about, sense of place.

So according to the OECD Korea by the way is the only Asian country that is a member of OECD except for Japan. So the OECD talked about metropolitan governments and had these three recommendations. More incentives from central government for horizontal coordination in other words how to make Seoul, Gyeonggi-do and Incheon somehow have some kind of cooperation. That's really missing. Activating the lowest level of government the wards this is much like Marco was talking about how to get citizens involved in the planning process is very weak still in Korea even with democracy and the suggestion was to create some kind of metropolitan regional council. This council of governments that are in San Diego or Los Angeles and other places. Those recommendations are bieng put forward and so in lieu of those recommendations to conclude what is really managing the growth of Seoul is Seoul city itself where the respective local governments and a very strong national government with very strong corporations hand in hand doing a lot of massive land development. Thank you

Prof. Andy Thornley:
I have been asked to make some observations on Tokyo. I don't have a presentation and my knowledge of Tokyo is not as great as it is of London. So what I am going to do is make these observations as an outsider, as somebody from outside looking at what's been happening in Tokyo in the debates they have been having over the last 20 years what I have found of interest. I am not sure they're going to be so startlingly interesting to keep you all awake at this stage of the day but I will do my best.

Tokyo, the levels of government in Japan, in Tokyo region are two-fold, there is the prefectural level of which Tokyo Metropolitan Government is deemed to be a prefecture and then below that there are municipalities carrying out the lower level services and that's been a structure that's been there for a long time. In Tokyo region the prefecture, the Tokyo metropolitan government, the central core of the metro TMG as is called contains 8 million people extending a bit more because they have taken this strange western extension upto 13 million but the Tokyo metropolitan region is more like 35 million and so it's a huge area beyond the TMG, beyond the metropolitan government of population and its only central government that has an involvement in the planning and organisation of that broader region. And That brings me on to another point about talking about Japan and that is the strength of central government. The developmental State that was developed in the post-war period to promote economic growth is still there and still very a strong element in the whole

hierarchichal structures of government in the country. But what is interesting in terms of the debates the last 20 years has been the way in which the development state is been challenged. Its under discussion how it is going to adapt to certain pressures of more recent times. Some of the significant issues has been how to deal with financial austerity. Second one has been what to do with lack of government at the regional level and the discussions about the actions taken regard to these actions taken regarding these increasing tensions, increasing power debates between city level and the national level, so thats been the feature of whats been happening in the last 20 years. The other thing that I meant to say was one of the differences about the Tokyo situation is this one about lack of growth and now lot of the debates there about what to do about the decline in population. The projections for Tokyo over the forthcoming decades is one of decline and how you deal with an aging society in that context. Now, two of the trends thats been challenging the developmental state which I will talk about, one has been decentralization and the other about globalization. In terms of decentralization this is particularly revolved around the issue of financial control and the way in which this financial control of the developmental state is being reduced. This arose in the context of the financial crisis of the country in the 1990's, the lost decade and led to all sort of revision of national government approaches with the familiar patterns of privatization and streamlining the beureaucracy and the old political system is seen to be a part of the problem and this led to an act in 2000, the omnibus decentralization act and based on the odea of subsidiarity and trying to create stronger municipal governments by decentralizing some of the powers and this decentralization of power also led to merger between municipalities to actually take on this new responsibilities. However, these new responsibilities came with lessability to do anything because with new responsibilities also came less money from central government. They were in the situation of having increased powers but reduced finance. However this is a national policy, this particular situation did not affect like other areas because Tokyo had because of its economic situation on par. There has been less reliance on finance from central government anyway and so this change had less impact on Tokyo itself which also led to certain political grumblings from the rest of the country about Tokyo benefitting more than those who are away from these changes. Second trend that I want to mention is globalization and competition between cities, which we heard about in Seoul amd London this also had an impact in Tokyo to Tokyo rose to the situation of being one of the top three world cities in the literature in the 1980's by far and after that the financial crisis in the 1990's meant that it lost lot of its glory and its position and started feeling more and more threatened by other asian cities Singapore or Hongkong, Seoul maybe and so there was a lot of concern that the city was actually losing in this competition. This fed in to the debate about regional government because it was felt that the city region was the economic powerhouse on which to build any competitive situation for Tokyo and the regional level was weak. So, the debate has risen in the last 10 years about trying to do something more about regional government, for the government like the capital region of Tokyo. This is the reason because of which, as I say, the city region has a better basis for competing in this process of competition and also because decentralization going down to the municipal level and weak in the prefecture level. So, the prefecture level, the upper level has less responsibility and become a weaker body which will also, therefore weakening the broader kind of approach and it was accepted for certain kind of issues such as environment and transport and needed some kind of regional organization. But as a result of all this the national level introduced an act, the national level land sustainability act in 2005 with the idea of preparing wide area regional plans and one of these was prepared for the Tokyo capital region in 2009. However, it is a rather vague and general document built upon consensus on trying to get everybody to agree and as most consensus documents It does'nt say anything big and bold and of course the other issue is the same one as I mentioned similar to London that

any regional body for the 35 million in region in Tokyo is going to be a very dominant player in the national arena and that itself is a political problem for other areas and that again is a political problem for other areas and that again is a big problem in trying to create any new regional based approach to the governance of the Tokyo area. So, that debate in national level is going on but then there is also development and issues coming up from the city level and there has been increasing challenges from governor of Tokyo (i.e) equivalent of elected mayor and challenging the national government, the national government there is traditionally is an hierarchichal system of national policies coming down from national government, for example the regional airports strategy comes down as part to the national plan and the ishihara, the governor of Tokyo has for the first time really has started developing or independent and autonomous ideas to put against the national picture and in 2001 he produced the capital region megalopolis concept which was the first time that the governor of Tokyo has produced a plan beyond the boundaries of his responsibilities so he was making a play for producing regionally oriented plan and this was all part of a game between Tokyo city and central government. It did actually originate from the idea of the national government had of moving the capital out of Tokyo and putting it somewhere else. This is part of his strategy to say that if we plan this properly at the regional level then there is no need to move the capital out because the idea was to move it out to ease congestion and make it more possible to manage the city and the idea of having a regional plan was to demonstrate that that wasn't necessary, you didn't need to move the capital out of Tokyo and so this regional plan had ring roads in it and an alternative airport strategy upgrading one of the airports nearer to Tokyo and as I said that these ideas were to part of the power game versus national governments. So you have this as I said top down move towards more regional approach but also the bottom up city level moving up.

Another example of the way in which the city is exerting its authority a bit more is by the way it was using the bid for the Olympic games. This seems to be something everybody uses these Commonwealth games and these Olympic games but it's not all about sport, it's all about governmental power and one of the ideas is that by bidding for 2016 Olympic games the Governor of Tokyo could get a whole lot of his pet projects and the development of certain parts of the city integrated into the Olympic bid that would therefore force national government to pursue his agenda and also get money out of national government to do that. So this is another way of the Governor using his position to pit against the national level. They failed to get the 2016 games but they haven't given up. They are now bidding for the next one and apparently one of the reasons they didn't get the first round was that nobody, less than 50% of people in Tokyo wanted any Olympic games. However one of the contributions that London has made to Tokyo and to help the Governor of Tokyo is that the London games were so successful and popular. Now there are 70% of people in Tokyo now want the games and so it has shifted the whole popularity and emphasis of the bid.

So finally to sum up I think some of the major trends that are happening, the decentralisation is given opportunities for more power, though as I say less resources, to the local level. Globalisation is tending to upgrade the power and importance of cities. So both those forces are increasing the power of the metropolitan level but national government is still a player in this situation. One thought I had about the national government in Japan is that which links to some of the environmental and climate change things we were heard about minutes ago from Marco and that is that these big issues like climate change and in Japan the earthquake, these are big issues that require some kind of strong national state involvement. Well you could say they require them, but may be some people could say they can be dealt with in other ways but I think risk management of these issues does require that if you compare to what

happened in Japan to what happened in hurricane Katrina in New Orleans on a market oriented decentralised kind of approach, there is vast differences in the way that that was dealt with. So I think in some ways this sort of climate ecological risk aspects are going to maintain a certain level of national, centralised state involvement. So what I think you have got is a reduction in the top down bureaucratic developmental state but not a total decline, it's still a player and you have an increasing degree of power and influence from the city level and what the result of all that is that you have less of a bureaucratic approach and more of the political approach. More debate, more inter play between the levels, interplay between the strong political players like the Governor and other actors in the region. Finally, I will just say in the Japanese case there is a lot of discussion about the low level of public participation and civic society in this situation and although there is concern about that I think there is still a long way to go in developing that aspect in the Japanese situation. Those are my observations.

Mr V K Pathak: Most of the international experiences we have heard are of metropolitan cities which are also national capitals. The five Indian cities that have been chosen for the study are not national capitals and whether it makes a difference in managing a metropolitan city which is a national capital versus a city which is not a national capital. One could imagine that access to resources could be quite different whether you are a national capital or whether you are a State capital and in the Indian situation it is also added by the political complexity. You have three levels, the national government, the state government and the local government. The three can be from three different political parties and they have different equations which also come into managing the multiplicity of agencies which operate within a metropolitan area. I think Mumbai has experience that the municipal corporation is governed by an opposition party, the State government is with another party and the state government has used metropolitan government to try and tell the citizens that we are doing better than the municipality which is with the opposition party and these kind of complexities do have a role apart from multiplicity of agencies which has been emphasised all along.

The other thing particularly the civil society role which was emphasised in case of Jakarta, I think the problem is how does one create a forum for different kinds of civil societies to come together because civil societies also have lot of fights among themselves and they need a forum to sort those out otherwise the debate continues and there are many examples which one has seen in case of Mumbai. In international examples I didn't care much about the way the finances were raised for the metropolitan governance perhaps because they are national capital cities. Mumbai has many innovations on that, one of that is FSI. So FSI is seen as controlling densities and managing city's infrastructure demands or managing carrying capacities. In Mumbai it has been turned into very good fiscal instruments. Through FSI Mumbai has promised free houses to 80% of its population, through FSI it wants to conserve its heritage, through FSI it wants to build its roads and metros and through FSI it also contributes to state exchequer. So that's a great innovation perhaps other cities would also like to consider.

The question really is that whether we want a metropolitan governance that attempts to do everything or whether we want to define its functions. I think what is important in case of London is that four functions are very clearly defined. If you read the Acts of most metropolitan development authorities they can almost do everything under the sun and that is why they end up in many kinds of problems. So perhaps what is necessary is that what the local government cannot do only that the metropolitan government should try to do or

metropolitan authority should try to do and once that domain is clearly defined then we might be able to get more effective metropolitan governance. Thank you.

A Srivatsan: Couple of things of mine which would probably sober the Minister's enthusiasm for high density. One, Seoul's density is about 44,000 persons per sq. km.(residential) and also you connected that to per capita expenditure when you compare to that. It correlates, though he didn't say it in so many words and I extend that correlation to de-population. I am raising this because the question in my mind is this, this de-population does it lead to a sub optimal use of land in the agriculture area. So what we are talking about GDP's contribution through cities, mobilising certain kind of resources or producing certain kind of resources, on the other hand we are sub optimally using land from a food production point of view. I am asking this again because I have just taught 15 villages in the Cauvery delta region and where I am increasingly seeing low production and the kind of conversion of agriculture land. So though at one level certain kinds of resources are important, equally other resources are important which cannot be compared using monetisation as a basis of comparison. And for long I was always thinking that it was Dubai and Shanghai which is the aspiration model of Indian cities but hearing from andy I think probably Tokyo is the secret ambition because with 35 million population Mumbai can still grow further another 18 more million and probably the minister would say yes we could but then that raises a question in my mind not only in the case of Mumbai but also the state I come from, given the dense distribution of settlements almost every 50 kilometres I could hit a decent town in Tamilnadu for sure. Why would I want a larger super region when within 60 kilometres I am going to get a fairly well developed town or a city. So it would probably make sense again I am coming back to the polycentric idea of the multiple centres because all the experiences that has been presented here are primarily super-sized single cities. So I don't know whether that model particularly would work for States with good distribution of urban settlements.

Q&A Session

Mr KK Pandey, IIPA: I think this session gave very useful feedback for the governance of megacity regions from the angle of role of civil society and further decentralisation from town hall up to grassroot level, whatever we have seen from London, Tokyo, Pune and Seoul. I would like to recall that in India we have certain systems top-down but are not implemented. For example, Ministry of Environment, three years back issued end of use disposal norms for hazardous waste. These cannot be implemented unless local government, city government and civil society is activated to take up this task. Similarly National Disaster Management Authority has issued guidelines for urban flooding. I think most of us may not even know that those guidelines have been issued by NDMA because there is NDMA, there is State Disaster Management Authority, there is District Disaster Management Authority but there link with city government is almost nil. Similarly, there is model municipal law which asks for environmental audit and energy audit. These type of things we have failed to activate. There is a need to activate the system of involving, engaging civic society in the governance of city regions.

Neelima Rizbud: I just wanted one more stakeholder which is very important in metropolitan management. We have talked about central, state and local in the metropolitan level and also the NGO's or civil society organisations but the one which is actually doing a lot of decisions is the real estate market. The land market which has been buying land actively on the periphery of these large metropolitan areas; in fact they are deciding where the development will go. There is a huge buying of land and consolidation of land which decides development

and directions of development and then development decisions follow those. So I think this is one very important stakeholder specially in case of India because I think the population will continue to grow and people have known the advantages of this huge conurbations and the economic wind falls out of a land decisions. So I just wanted to add this.

Dr Rabindra: I think as Mr Pathak said I think not much has been spoken about the resources. How resources are raised in the city government and metropolitan governments etc. One comment or one suggestion or whatever came from I think Seoul, Seoul citizen tax attracted my attention. I think if you can kindly expand a little more on Seoul citizen tax. Who leveis the tax, is it the local metropolitan government or the central government, you said centralised, there is lot of centralisation in South Korea as a whole and how much and what is the share of the citizen tax in the whole taxation system of Seoul government.

Ramani Iyer, CII: Mrs Vandana Chawan made observations about Pune city. I live in Pune and I 100% conquer with why a city like this is not actually governing or doing what's right for the people. So we have a huge problem in all cities of deficit of governance simply because the elected people they have no feel for the pulse of the people nor they have departments which could do planning and detailed work about how to improve the city. So it's a huge problem but I also go by what Mrs Bale said a little while ago about elected Mayors, elected Mayors being accountable for the cities. Tamilnadu has 6 cities where the Mayors are elected including Chennai. I personally went and met the Mayor of Chennai in his chamber and to my surprise he has nothing to do with Chennai water, he has nothing to do with Chennai water and I am told that by a bureaucrat, oh the Mayor has nothing to do with this. What is his function? It is ornamental. Now this is something which is disturbing me because on the one hand you have elected representatives who are supposed to govern in other states who elect Mayors from amongst a group. On the other hand you have Mayors who have been directly elected who still have no powers, who still have no functions to deliver what they need to do. Now this is where I think we need to make a break but if you look at towns like Chicago, New York City, I have observed what's been run in Chicago. The Mayor there was been elected year after year for about 20 years. Mr Daley he has done tremendous amount of work in terms of how to improve Chicago city. When they think of a plan they do it within 6 months. When we think of a plan we forget it after 2 months. We need to bring about a change in that, that's what I want to say.

Mr K C Sivaramakrishnan : I was struck by what Marco had said. Now while doing our study we were wrestling with this problem of delineation. How does really delineation take place? You find in the case of Kolkata and also to some extent Chennai initially, the delineation of the metropolitan area really proceeded on the basis of what was existing already. In the case of Bangalore, they just followed the administrative district. So Bangalore district and therefore they followed it. It's also interesting that in the case of Mumbai the delineation of the Mumbai metropolitan area is notified, but changes are not possible unless they are supported by a resolution of the two chambers of the legislature. One of the things that we have been noticing is that the delineation of metropolitan boundaries are quite often treated as a matter of executive discretion. So right now in the case of Chennai there is a debate going on whether Chennai metropolitan region should be 4000 sq.km or something different. I am mentioning this because Marco mentioned ecological considerations, whether ecological considerations should be an organising principle for a metropolitan delineation and if so how does it work. Suggestion was made that in the case of Jakarta, this has been the case for about 20 years or so, Jakarta has experienced flooding from time to time and the surrounding areas have been going on. It was

not very clear whether in the case of Seoul and Tokyo, whether that particular dimension was thought about.

Water can be an extremely important envelope as our study showed both in the case of Bangalore and Hyderabad and even to some extent in the case of Chennai water has not been used as a defining envelope at all and as Neelima Rizbud just now observed, in the past 15 years or 20 years it is making land available for development that has somehow emerged if not as an organising principle at least as a driving force. So I think that is something which the set of international presentations brings forth. So you cannot deal with a metropolitan area merely because somebody has declared it to be so. So there I think a more serious attention is called for. I think that's a lesson that one would like to take.

Sheela Patel (Chair): I have to stop here because we have past the time. You are going to meet everybody for dinner but I want to give them a chance to speak because I am seeing people leaving.

Mr Andy Thornley : I will just respond to some of those points very quickly. One was about the importance of being the capital in terms of what happens to the governance of the city. In my mind it's not so much the role of the administrative capital. You have examples like New York and Washington and Ottawa and Toronto where the separation occurs. What I think is important is the degree to which the city is the economic driver of the whole nation. So if it's the economic driver for the nation that gives it a very particular and special role and is likely to lead to special treatments and circumstances. So the situation of Tokyo and London for example, that is the case and that is perhaps more important from whether or not it's the actual administrative capital. The idea that these many countries now in this globalisation period talk about picking winners and economically in most dynamic city is your global winner, so they say and so resources start getting sucked from the nation as a whole into those particular cities.

A second point was the about the way in which different political parties at different levels of government can create a complexity between the levels and that is definitely the case but what I think you can also see as cities get more strong and the importance of being the leader of a particular city gains, you can see that the elected Mayors have become more independent figures. They are not so closely tied to the traditional political parties and I think in Tokyo the governor used to be very much figure head from the dominant political party but in more recent times they have been come more independent figures who well known for other reasons for literature or acting, and Boris Johnson we got in London is a popular figure that appeared on TV that's how people know him. So they are not political party machinery people and so I think that's a trend that is quite interesting.

On the idea of poly polycentric cities being preferable to dominant cities I think one of the problems here is the strength of history. The cities have built up their position over a long time and is very difficult to do to actually counter that historic position that gives them a lot of advantages over other cities. It's interesting to see in the European Union the strategic plan for the European Union is based up on the idea of polycentric cities and actually encouraging that as a strategy but of course that is built upon on the history of the of many European cities being smaller or you can look at the German cities Frankfurt and Berlin and Stuttgart and Munich, they are all quite bigger and important cities and the basis of that are poly-nuclear kind of approach could be a imagined. But there are two cities who are particularly in Europe and particularly against this poly nuclear approach and strategy. I am

surprised that it is London and Paris who actually prefer the strong large city approach. So that's the one on the poly nuclear.

May be just one pick up one last one on the delineation, I think as I said earlier that the delineation of London was very clearly going back to an easy boundary and that easy boundary Richmond in the GOC that boundary was the green belt. So the green belt had created a physical boundary around the city and that physical boundary became an easy one then to use back in 1965 to create the GOC and I said in 2000 we actually went back to that because of the ease of legislative arrangements. In the Tokyo case I am not quite sure how they delineate the boundaries there, i.e. Tokyo metropolitan government is a fairly tightly drawn boundary, it's not the functional urban region but there are historical reasons why it's come to that position and in fact it has this very strange as I said before a strange Western extension that goes out from the core city right out into the hills which does not make any rational sense as a boundary and then the capital city region as a whole is bigger than the functional urban region. So again that has not been utilised directly as a means of delineating either of those two levels of government.

Mike Douglas: Thank you for the question about secondary cities, it's very important one. Japan and Korea actually have a lot in common. Japan being large archipelago has much more distributed settlement system but both countries if you look at their recent census in Japan only Tokyo and Nagoya are growing, the rest of Japan is de-populating and Nagoya is growing because that's where Toyota Motors is. Even the suburbs, the greater Tokyo area are now depopulating and the government of Japan is now trying to consolidate towns bringing people out from places that are just collapsing. Rural Japan and rural Korea it's not so much a matter of economy. The farmers are quite doing quite well in Japan but the towns gone, the last school closed. There is no children. It's a decimation of rural society but the farmers can always increase in scale, can get more tools, so while they may not be rich in Japan because they are able to organise, in fact they are not poor most probably. So that's not a question of productivity, its lifestyle and life itself.

Secondary cities interestingly enough, there is a very interesting case coming from Japan and Korea. They realised that the capital city is no longer there friend. Capital just puts branch plans and then moves them to China later. So Tagu, Pusan are really in trouble but particularly Tagu. Pusan, here is very interesting. Pusan is now linking up with Fukoka to create a core living sphere between Japan and Korea by two city regions. This is a new form of a metropolitan governance and it's amazing historically given the animosity between the two cultures not co-economic, co-living based on culture founded on the idea of aging society with culturaltalents, exchanges of education, all kinds of things, trying to invent a new economy across the national border, we should watch that.

Density, population, I will about explain that, the citizen tax and all of those earlier policies, we have to remember that it's only in 1995 that there is an elected Mayor. So anything that happened before 1995 was a puppet Mayor appointed by the national government to institute its policy, so all of this things about green belts and all that were actually national policies implemented locally. Both Japan and Korea have a national land agency that does comprehensive national land use planning, whether that's implemented or not is another story. About the environment, in fact Seoul is doing quite well in that record. With democracy one of the biggest kind of a bubbling up with civil society was environmental movements and they put very strong pressure on government. So Seoul has now got more parks and more sensitivity to areas that will catch the rain and so forth. It's quite interesting.

Even Chang-e-Chang which is that river is now become emblematic even though it's controversial because it's environmentally not so great but the greening of the city is one of the contributions.

So let me conclude by flipping what I said the other way around. I think places like Singapore and Korea provide us with a little conundrum because you have a very strong State and a very weak civil society but the streets are paved, the water works, everyone has electricity and there is a national health system and there is some social housing to boot and you can't dismiss that automatically. You just can't but of course it brings along with it a lot of deficits but it's a different kind of deficit, people talk about poverty and all that, it's a different kind of deficit, it's a deficit of an accurate city, of an engaged society, of a creative society and that would take us to a different discourse.

Sheela Patel(Chair): Thank you very much. I want to apologise to those whose questions I didn't take but I hope you will get a chance to speak to the speakers during dinner. Thank you very much for your comments. Mrs Chawan apologised because she had to rush off to Pune. So with that we come to the close of the first day.

End of Session IV
End of Day 1