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Abstract

Over the last two decades the concerns of Intergovernmental Organizations (IGO), States and policy actors have been oriented towards the definition and implementation of programmes to improve the sustainability of human society. Within the many sectors addressed in international agreements and national policies, cities emerge as a specific field for measures to reduce environmental footprints, enhance social inclusion, and promote green economic development.

The period between 2015 and 2016, the “Year of Sustainability”, represents a crucial point in time because a set of global agreements concerning the development goals, the climate and human settlements, are negotiated and endorsed by the international community. This new round of documents include like ever before a specific attention to cities and their management tools.

This study aims at reviewing the momentum by taking two different perspectives, the one of the discipline and planning theory and practice, and the other of IGO, in the making and preparatory process, of the global agreements (the Sustainable Development Goals, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction and the New Urban Agenda).

The study has followed three research questions and in particular: a) to identify which is the interest of IGOs in urban development and planning; b) in reverse, which is the consideration within planning debate of IGO agendas; c) how planning and sustainable urban development is addressed by the new round of global agreements.

The study also reviews a set of disciplinary journals and identifies a certain but rather specific distance between the planning domain and international institutions. Aside, the same analysis is proposed for a number of IGOs; a substantial interest on the matter of urban development is disclosed.

Towards the end this study proposes a synthesis and identifies two simultaneous trends: the first from the Organizations perspective that surfaces a consolidating, and increasingly institutionalizing, interest in urban intergovernmentalism: the second, from a city, and to a much limited disciplinary extent, to show the rise of city diplomacy, whereas cities become both stakeholder and actors of negotiation (marking an evolution with respect to the past round of global agreements) and get recognised and assisted in the development and monitoring of local policies to implement locally the international policy directives.

The study has been built merging four typologies of bibliographical resources, the ones related to planning, urban studies and its international authors; the second related to climate change and sustainability; the third related to the international polity and IGOs in their functioning, regimes and the principles of policy coordination; the fourth related IGOs, this category is further composed of two sub-types, the first of reports and studies on human settlements produced by the Agencies; the second to the actual and rather procedural work of IGOs that considered decisions and negotiations outcome for the process analysis of decision making and its content related to human settlements.
Estratto in Italiano

Nel corso degli ultimi due decenni, ed in particolare in seguito al rapporto della Commissione mondiale per l’Ambiente e lo Sviluppo del 1987, gli stati e le loro politiche sono state interessate dalla definizione e dall’implementazione di programmi per migliorare la sostenibilità della società e delle risposte nazionali a problemi emergenti. Nell’ambito di molti settori oggetto di accordi internazionali, le città emergono come un campo specifico di misure per ridurre gli impatti ambientali, migliorare l'inclusione sociale e promuovere lo sviluppo economico sostenibile.

Il periodo tra il 2015 e il 2016, "l'anno della sostenibilità" rappresenta una svolta cruciale quando una serie di documenti riguardanti i temi dello sviluppo, il clima e gli insediamenti umani saranno negoziati in contemporanea ed approvati dalla comunità internazionale tra settembre 2015 e l’autunno 2016. Questo nuovo round di documenti prestano come non mai una specifica attenzione alle città e agli strumenti per la loro gestione.

Questo studio ha lo scopo di ricostruire il contesto dell’anno della sostenibilità proponendo due diverse prospettive: quella della disciplina, nella teoria e pratica della pianificazione; e quella delle Organizzazioni Internazionali (IGO) nel processo di preparazione e negoziazione dei documenti (I goal per lo sviluppo sostenibile, la Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sul Clima, l’Agenda Post-2015 per la riduzione dei rischi e la nuova Agenda Urbana).

Lo studio ha seguito tre domande di ricerca e, in particolare: a) ha analizzato qual è l'interesse di IGO nello sviluppo urbano –sostenibile, e pianificazione urbana; b) in parallelo qual è la considerazione all'interno del dibattito dell'agenda dell'IGO; c) come si rivolge la pianificazione e lo sviluppo della sostenibilità urbana nel nuovo scenario di accordi globali.

Questo studio analizza inoltre una serie di giornali della disciplina della pianificazione e degli studi urbani e identifica una discreta -ma abbastanza specifica, distanza tra la disciplina e le istituzioni internazionali. Inoltre vengono anche analizzate le attività di alcune Organizzazioni nel campo degli insediamenti umani dal quale emerge un concreto interesse di queste nel settore dello sviluppo urbano, sostenibile.

Verso la fine lo studio propone una sintesi, ed identifica due orientamenti paralleli: il primo dalle prospettive delle Organizzazioni che intravvedono un consolidamento, dell’istituzionalizzazione e di un interesse nell'intergovernalismo urbano; il secondo, dal punto di vista delle città, e in un senso molto più limitato al campo disciplinare, mostra la cresita del fenomeno della diplomazia nella città, dove le città diventano sia protagonisti (tematici) che attori della negoziazione (evidenziando una evoluzione con rispetto alla passata stagione di accordi globali) ed essere riconosciuti e assistiti
nello sviluppo e nel monitoraggio delle politiche locali per l’implementazione locale delle direttive internazionali.

Lo studio è nato durante il periodo di servizio presso la Commissione Economica Europea delle Nazioni Unite a Ginevra, nell’unità di Edilizia e Gestione del Territorio ed costruito unendo quattro tipologie di fonti bibliografiche; le prime relative alla pianificazione con contributi provenienti dalla disciplina ed i suoi autori principali nel contesto internazionale; la seconda, tematica, riferita alla letteratura della sostenibilità e dei cambiamenti climatici; la terza relativa al campo delle relazioni internazionali, alla pubblica amministrazione ed ai regimi istituzionali internazionali; la quarta, relativa alle Organizzazioni Internazionali, è ulteriormente suddivisa in due categorie: la prima relativa ai rapporti e studi degli organismi, la seconda relativa all’analisi del processo e delle procedure di negoziazione con l’analisi delle decisioni e note di conferenze di queste Organizzazioni.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Preparatory Committee</td>
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<tr>
<td>WB</td>
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<tr>
<td>WCDRR</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Introduction

The international community over the past 50 years has engaged in the challenging domain of sustainable development. The United Nations system, together with most international organizations has been strongly concerned in the definition of a common framework for discussion and action.

The economical, ecological, cultural and social sectors mutually and jointly contribute to sustainable development. The mutual relation of the latter sectors triggers trade-offs when one domain overpowers others.

According to this holistic interpretation most human environments and practices produce environmental externalities or support sustainable development. Therefore human needs and activities such as energy generation, transport demand, industrial production and urbanization are responsible for the principles of environmental degradation and climate change (i.e. natural resources consumption or global warming), but also input factors for the promotion of green economy (pillar from which sustainable development shall be developed).

As the majority of global population lives in cities and urbanization and urban life become dominant phenomena worldwide, the challenges related to cities have gained the fore of international debate.

More specifically intergovernmental agencies, funds and programmes or the UN GA itself affirmed the relevance of urban policy and planning to address sustainable development and its goals. From an IGO perspective it seems to emerge a great attention to cities and their management systems (thus including the urban planning discipline) to turn human settlements and their capital (buildings, citizens, infrastructures etc..) into active input for sustainable development.

This crossroad is also accompanied by an evolution of planning theory itself that opened to emerging themes (i.e. those related to sustainability) and become more responsive to new forms of public management, decision making processes, communicative rationality and the various forms of participation, collaboration and co-ordination (Campbell S. , 1996) (Jessop, 2004); (Harvey, 1989); (Habermas, 2001); (Davidoff, 1965); (Susskind, 1999); (Healey P. , 1997)). While some core of the planning practice stays at municipal level and it is bound to comply with obligations required by statutes (i.e. land-use, development, behavioural and systemic norms, and eventually building rights), new dimensions, tools and approaches to urban development are introduced to comply with the alignment to international policy co-ordination.
Given this framework it is possible consider, from the two perspectives of planning discourse and IGOs debate, the evolution of discussion and the eventual mutual adjustment, reinforcement or asymmetric support of the two spheres.

This thesis, prepared for the master degree in urban planning and policy design at Politecnico di Milano, investigates the relations among Intergovernmental Organizations and urban planning; especially, the research question structuring the study are:

* Should IGOs deal with planning, if so what do they care about?
* Which is the consideration of IGOs in planning discourses?
* How planning is regarded in IGO activities in this crucial momentum in Intergovernmental agreements and agenda?

It is recognized that the primary engagement of IGOs and their members mostly focuses on agenda setting to provide strategic input to national and regional policy formulation. In the last decades the attention of IGOs on cities has been considerably growing. One of the very first attempts to provide a shared framework and principles of sustainable development has been provided by the Stockholm declaration, outcome document of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (1972). The declaration contains 26 principles among which specific attention to human settlement is paid, especially with respect to the management and reduction of environmental externalities.

The last two decades are marked with milestones in international agreements such as the Kyoto protocol (and the UNFCCC), and the Millennium Development Goals. Environmental responsiveness of states’ policies emerged as widespread concern in several countries; cities emerged as structural component.

At this point in time, between mid 2015 and December 2016, several of the international agreements that have inspired governments’ policies will be re-negotiated.

The international community is currently engaged in a very extensive and inclusive consultation phase towards the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (September 2015), the new United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change at COP21 (December 2015), the new Urban Agenda at H III Conference (October 2016), and the Post-2015 Development Agenda (UN inter-agency agenda). These last are also known as global process. In addition to the ones above, the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction has recently been adopted during the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, held in Sendai Japan in March 2015.

The global process’ outcomes will considerably be reflected in the principles of next future governments’ policies to achieve for example “Inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable cities and human settlements” (proposal for SDG 11).
On the planning side, the same period of time (last two decades) has been marked by a “reinvigoration of theoretical discussion within the discipline” (Fainstein, 2000, p.451) in which a number of contributions (i.e. Fainstein, 2000; Marcuse, 2011; (Campbell H., 2012); (Friedmann, 2008)) were suggesting theoretical references to reframe planning discourse and proposing key directions of contemporary planning. The relations between planning and institution are very strict (Kim, 2011; Neuman, 2012), while probably the linkages between cities and diplomacy –when considered from an urban planning discipline perspective- seem to be less natural and show a certain difficulty to enter into the debate (LeFèvre, 2012).

Growing urban inequalities, asymmetric welfare delivery, a notable ineffectiveness of the planning practices to address urban development and to manage the implementation of its provisions have triggered the evolution of planning practices. More recently the discipline seems to build capacity in the orientation of decision-making process, to adopt a governance approach and most of all it recognizes itself within a policy tools approach. On one side in fact, planning can be seen as one of the governments’ tool to implement or design states’ public policies (especially those with territorial impact and focus), on the other it provides a wide array of tools to implement and support these programmes.

This step might be considered a deal to clear the doubts that may identify and confine the planning practices to the city plan.

Along with this understanding it is somehow easier to reconcile the gap between planning and IGOs, also by underlining the relevance of planning for IGOs as tool to implement and design their programmes.

**Box 1 IOs and IGOs**

International Organizations –IO¹, and Intergovernmental Organizations –IGO², are one of the most important heritages of the XIX century world wars. Since the 1940s there has been a proliferation of International Institutions, treaties and arrangements among states accompanied by a deepening of regional integration as formal representation of the institutionalization of world polity and politics (Simmons and Martins, 2001).

While the fields of this international politics arena were traditionally related to security, economics and monetary domains, trade, justice and human rights, it is of great interest to note that the evolution of IOs efforts on development become increasingly relevant also for the urban studies and planning domain. This aspect is necessarily linked to the importance that urbanization play in societal development.

---

¹ A wider term referring to organization with membership from multiple states, or with international scope, generally created by an international agreement

² Refers to IO whose members are sovereign states and other IOs (by regime more than three nations should be involved), which by the formal instrument of agreement (normally a treaty) commit to engage in cooperation to address peace rights and well being at international level; the capacity of IGOs include international norms setting and convention negotiation
Next to this partially disciplinary entry point to IOs it should be acknowledged that the studies of international regimes and organization stays in the field of institutional analysis and political sciences. International Organizations have recently become a fruitful field of study not just for social sciences and economics but also for other domains given the emergence of sectorial specialization of some of the agencies (WMO, UNISDR, UNEP and so on).

IOs over the decades have often evolved into autonomous actors in the world politics, and their role of mediator and facilitator of states’ cooperation have faded into a more process, and often content, oriented work (including studies, policy frameworks and development assistance projects, agreements and negotiated documents).

Two major disciplines, the economic and the social, have traditionally studied IOs. The economistic one has mainly focused on the principles of efficiency to improve welfare, in response to incomplete information and transaction costs (specifically relevant factors for monetary and trade policy/integration). The social one, instead, mostly looked at the legitimacy and power balance of international regimes and has particularly flourished on organizational studies and in particular on institutionalization, the functioning mechanisms and processes of IOs (especially for what concerns the political sciences scholarships, Jessop, 2001).

The relevance of studying IOs and international regimes was proposed by Simmons and Martins (2001) and it is based on two main components: first IOs have agency and agenda setting influence; second, because of their socialization capacity. In particular both elements are important to structure a third main pillar of international regimes and its polity, that is the salience of international debate to states policies and the degrees of transfer of policy inputs, agenda and debates that move in a two way format from the national to international level and vice versa.

Additional studies in the field of political sciences have faced the underlying factors of the opportunity of states to act trough IOs (Abbott and Snidal, 1998). One of the arguments stays in the capacity of IOs to increase the systemic efficiency because of their centralization (concrete and stable organizational structure and supportive administrative apparatus managing collective activities) and independence (the authority to act with a degree of autonomy and neutrality according to the mandate). Given these and the previously mentioned features (agenda setting and socialization capacity) the role of IOs as platforms for dialogue, exchange and policy formulation can be fully validated; from a network analysis perspective it also emerges that much of these IOs capacities derives from the high degree of centrality and resources mobilization that these institutions are able deploy.

Having understood the opportunity to act through IOs, it is meaningful to understand which are the core attributes of these action. However within this study the main field of concern limits to sustainable urban development and therefore the core attributes of traditional international regimes (peace and rights) are not addressed. The benefits of international regimes are concerned to the bundle of benefits related to international norms and agenda setting and to institutional and policy coordination.

The first set, of norms and agenda setting, are more rooted in the legitimacy of internationally socialized processes rather to the authority of the international regimes. The UNFCCC can be taken as example: in fact the salience and legitimacy of a norm built by nearly two hundred parties under the auspices of an IGO does not entail any evidence that this architecture is the most effective and efficient to tackle climate change (content related), but rather because multilateralism has attained a degree of legitimacy to govern a common such as the environment it is (process related).

The second set of benefits refers to the effective capacity of IOs to engage (at different degrees, ranging from non-opposition to actual commitment) the parties in cooperative behaviours and convergence of national policies to internationally agreed goals (usually endorsed with the unanimity principle). This core attribute has again process and content related implications. On the side of the process, it is of interest the degree to which IOs are able to establish forms horizontal (intra-state) and vertical (inter-state) forms of institutional coordination. Concerning the content of states engagement, the matter is reflected in the
capacity of IOs to mobilize MSs to a common strategy for development –i.e. the SDGs, providing fundamentals principles of convergence to national policies. It is however true that, as pointed out in political and organizational studies (i.e. Barnett and Finnemore, 1999), IOs do have dysfunction and actual pathologies. First it is recognised that there is a certain difficulty to investigate IOs apparatus both in their procedures and debate that it is even harder to study the dysfunctional behaviours of these bodies. One of the main origins of these pathologies originates in bureaucracy. Barnett and Finnemore (1999) identify three streams related to this origin: first, the irrationality of rationalization, whereas the rules and procedures that enabled bureaucracies to do their job became ends in themselves (instead of innovating rules of procedures by reviewing failures) or become so powerful to self determine the organizations’ goals; second, the bureaucratic universalism, which presumes to manage multiple contexts at once by “flattering diversity” (i.e. development assistance is first conceived in the global north, second it often occurs very little context adaptation of strategies); third, the normalization of evidence, in which a repeated deviation from rules over time becomes a “routinized and normal part of procedures” and the tendency to apply predictable responses substantially reduces the capacity to introduce innovation; an additional dysfunction refers back to the difficulty to enter into consultation or cooperative status with some international regimes, this is somehow related to a perceived and actual insulation of the intergovernmental polity that on one side it opens processes and studies review to society (either institutions, professional associations, social groups and so on) but on the other remains unable to engage some of the necessary stakeholders in its processes, either to have a say or to shape documents clearly or indirectly related to their constituencies. Within this framework of strength and weaknesses of IOs it is honest to recognize the role these institutions pay to overcome some of the collective problems of society by establishing long-term cooperation, assistance and coordination. This field of international polity applied to cities –as it has been noted in section I.III, may seem rather far from the concerns of some disciplinary practices strongly rooted and bound to the city plan; but actually there is much emphasis paid by IOs to cities and by IGOs to urban intergovernmentalism. This evolution, from the traditionally diplomatic fields to the attention to human settlement is due to at least two factors: first there is an increasing specialization of international agencies (from the one on spaces, to the ones on the meteorology or on technological development); second much of the activities of IGOS over the last three decades has focused more and more on development –sustainable development. From the combination of these two phenomena it steams the attention to human settlements, rooted in the sectorial diversification of agencies and a clear urbanization pattern of development.
I. II  Methodology  

I.II. I  Introduction  
This thesis has been conceived during the period I served the UNECE3 Committee on Housing and Land Management having opportunity to do my study plan internship. The study moves from the recognition that several IGOs are engaged in debates, negotiations and studies strongly related to human settlements. The urban planning background I have been building at Politecnico di Milano promoted a multidisciplinary learning which allowed to understand and recognize the emergence of these urban development and planning related themes, but also to appreciate the institutional, decision-making/negotiation processes, and policy related aspects of the IGOs in which I got in close relation with.

The study explores the linkages that sustainable urban development builds with urban planning discipline and practice, as it is debated and as it is referred to in the guidelines that are conceived by IGOs. It is understood that urban planning is a considerably wide field, and over the last century it has evolved in numerous ways. This also includes the introduction of a wide range of topics, from procedural norms setting, to urban design to strategic visioning and so on. It is also understood that international polity shall not be a suitable field of exchange on sectorial urban planning matters. Instead, the opportunity that is introduced by the discussion at international level resides in the great attention, and to a certain extent also confidence, that these key intergovernmental players attribute to our discipline.

Given the intergovernmental momentum we are living in, the two dimensions of interest to this work -the Intergovernmental and the planning one- are particularly interesting to track. More specifically the interest is to investigate the extent in which IGO and planning debate mutually reinforce their efforts for sustainable urban development.

---

3 The United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, is one of the 5 Regional Commissions of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). UNECE was established in 1947, at the end of Second World War, with a specific unit on housing and land management. The unit was established with the auspices of supporting reconstruction in Europe. On the basis of the latter Committee in the 1970s the UN Programme UN-Habitat was created. World War, with a specific unit on housing and land management. The unit was established with the auspices of supporting reconstruction in Europe. On the basis of the latter Committee in the 1970s the UN Programme UN-Habitat was created.
The research work for the preparation of the developed as it follows:
- Understanding and identification of urban development and planning related debate currently on-going in Intergovernmental Organizations;
- Reconstruction of intergovernmental momentum, including competences, and upcoming milestones;
- Planning literature and journals review;
- Analysis of planning tendencies
- Review of current intergovernmental agreement with a potential focus on urban planning tools.

This study also proposes a compilation of relevant references to the activities (decisions and reports) of the work of IGOs to orient other researchers in the reconstruction of the intergovernmental momentum and the path towards the preparation of the global processes that have been reviewed. For this purpose the bibliography (p. 116) and the set of references to support the study have been built to bridge between planning domain literature and IGO studies, report and decisions on human settlements. Therefore the bibliography include references of the disciplinary debate on sustainable urban development, IGO work on sustainable cities, including the decisions taken, and a set of –so called, international literature that analyses the functioning and procedures of the international arenas.

I.II. II Research Methodology and Sources

The study opens with the description of the present context; the section is meant to provide a classification of the global processes that are coming to conclusion between 2015 and 2016. There is currently a complex and overlapping phase of negotiations and meetings to prepare draft texts to submit for adoption to the final conference for each of the five processes (see fig.1).

The thesis sets three research questions to investigate the relations, mutual interests and adjustment that occur between planning practice and intergovernmental organization dealing with urban development and planning.

The questions are the following:

- Should IGOs deal with urban planning, if so what do they care about?
- Which is the consideration of IGOs in planning discourses?
- How planning is regarded in IGO activities in this crucial momentum in Intergovernmental agreements and agenda?
The research path follows four main steps, which in principles overlap the research questions. It is first understood and identified how urban development and planning is addressed by the current debate in Intergovernmental Organizations. It is then considered how planning literature considers the role of IGOs and which evolutionary trends can be identified in the planning theory. After portraying the intergovernmental momentum it is analysed the content of intergovernmental agreements currently under negotiation, by investigating urban planning implications and checking the consistency of these IGOs decisions with previous care to planning practices.

The portrait has been built on the basis of the experience acquired during the latter mentioned preparatory meetings, and also on learning objectives of ad Hoc UN trainings that were designed for staff and delegates in charge to follow the process. An example is the UNITAR SDGs Briefing Programme, held in Geneva between May and June 2014.

A second research step has dealt with the consultation and review of 10 years of planning journal issues. On the basis of urban planning journal ranking and impact factor, six journals have been considered: Journal of the American Planning Association, Planning Theory and Practice, Journal of Urban Economics, International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, Journal of Planning Education and Research, Environment and Urbanization. The analysis focused on the frequency with which international organizations, institutional co-operation, cross-country policy co-ordination and the themes debated by IGOs were analysed by planning debate. At some point of the literature review, since the care of planning journals about intergovernmental organization was not more than marginal, it was questioned that public administration review literature was more responsive to the topic, while not focusing on the stake of planning discipline.

The third step of the study consists of a review of the activities on the matter of urban development and planning addressed by five IGO. The review is particularly interesting as it emerges that each of the Organizations frame the debate in rather specific ways, moving from the own specific mandate of the Organization. The section also analyse specific contributions (in the forms of policy framework) that the Organizations have prepared over the past years. The work has been mostly based on the reports of the Organizations, and when available, also on impact assessment reviews or academic contributions that supported the preparation of the studies. In this section the convergence between planning debate on journals and IGO initiatives get at its closest.
The fourth part reviews the content and when possible also the negotiation path, its uncertainties and deadlocks, towards two intergovernmental agreements and a thematic policy framework. Also in this case the analysis of literature on the content and process of the documents has been only partially rewarding, but useful for the preparation of MDGs and Hyogo Framework for Action boxes. It is also true that most of these processes are happening quasi live, that means that the dynamic consultation environment limits the possibilities of scientific debate of individuals not fully involved in the processes. The main sources of analysis have been Organizations’ notes and again two briefing and training programmes organized by UNFCCC and UNITAR. The case of World Conference of Disaster Risk Reduction has also been followed as UNECE HLM delegate to PrepComs.

A final part presents the conclusions of the findings rooted in documental resources, and my individual point of view built during the year in the Intergovernmental environment.

**Figure 1 Research Components and Sources Matrix**

| Urban development in IGOs | • disciplinary literature  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>• IGO reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| International momentum   | • IGO reports  
|                          | • IGO decisions |
| Content of planning debate on IGOs | • disciplinary literature  
|                          | • sustainability & climate change literature |
| Intergovernmental debate on sustainable urban development | • IGO reports  
|                          | • International polity literature  
|                          | • sustainability & climate change literature |
| IGO agreements on sustainable urban development | • IGO decisions  
|                          | • IGO reports  
|                          | • International polity literature  
|                          | • institutional news and press releases |
I.II. III Limits of the Research

The study puts into relation two fields that may appear considerably far one another, thanking it to the extremes: diplomacy and city planning.

It is however true that not all international relations and intergovernmental debate deal with macro economic and monetary policies (Currie, Holtham, & Hallett, 1989) or human rights and military treaties. Equally, planning culture and its tendencies are wide enough to overcome the operational dimension at city level.

The room of this study emerges from the opportunity and benefits of co-ordination of states, especially in those fields where subsidiarity is fundamental to deliver full and fair payoffs to individual countries committing to sustainable development practices.

On the contrary the extensiveness of intergovernmental debate on agenda setting and policy priority agreement is hard to be assessed from an urban planning perspective. Indeed, planning as one of the tools of public policy, strong of its capacity to address spatial and physical characteristics, can play a role in all this debate. Another fruitful approach could have dealt with the national programmes and focus on the domestic impacts of international agreements.
I. III The Context

The following section aims at providing a synthetic portrait about the global processes that are currently on-going also proposing a classification.


The articulation of these processes is quite complex, but it is meaningful to provide some of its elements to better understand the potential impacts and relevance of the documents that will result from them.

I. III. I Global processes clusters

In the present juncture there is a rather complex and overlapping phase of preparation to several international agreements. It is however possible to try to provide a classification in clusters (figure 2). First the set of processes related to the Post-Rio+20, which is entrusted to adopt the new set of Sustainable Development Goals coming to a synthesis in September 2015; second, a set of “thematic events”, part of the UN Post-2015 Development Agenda; the third track is the one of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change; the last (not reviewed in this study) related to non-UN processes.

Post-Rio+20 Intergovernmental process

Rio+20 conference recommended to establish an inclusive and transparent intergovernmental process on sustainable development goals under the auspices of the UN GA. The resulting Open Working Group (OWG) on Sustainable Development Goals was established in 2013 and includes over 70 MS with representation of regional groups. The group works at drafting a set of sustainable development goals, SDGs, to guide sustainable development strategies and frameworks of policy and actions in the next decades. SDGs are meant to revamp the experience of Millennium Development Goals that lacked on monitoring system, and thus on results. A High Level Political Forum on sustainable development was also established to supports the OWG with actions including guidance and recommendations for sustainable development and follow-up and review progress in the implementation of commitments. The
first meeting of the OWG held in spring 2013 considered 8 cluster themes to be included in SDGs; cluster 5 focused on “sustainable cities and human settlements, promoting sustainable consumption and production, climate”. The OWG had (as of May 2015) eleven sessions (two additional summer sessions are planned). The current proposal includes Goal 11: "Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable". SDGs will be adopted during the “year of sustainability” by the 79th UN GA in 2015. In parallel a set of indicators, currently developed by UNSDSN are being prepared to support the monitoring of the achievement of the goals.

Climate change
The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change is the parent treaty of Kyoto protocol. Since its adoption in 1992 signatories have met annually in Conference of the Parties (COP). In September 2014 UN Secretary General put forward a comprehensive proposal for the new negotiation of UNFCCC to take place during COP21 in Paris in December 2015. The proposal was structured in three key areas: convergence towards a common long term vision (new UNFCCC at COP21), emissions cut including carbon pricing, and stakeholders inclusion and PPP to for low carbon and climate resilient development.

Thematic events
Under thematic events the outcome documents of UN Programmes are grouped.

C1) Third world conference on Human Settlements, under the leadership of UN-HABITAT, to take place in Quito, Ecuador, in mid 2016.
The conference is called to deliver the New Urban Agenda (MS and IOs contribution) and the City We Need support document (contribution of partners and stakeholders, including NGOs and major groups). H III will be the major global event on human settlements and the 5 UN Regional Commissions (ECOSOC, Europe, Latin America and Caribbean, Western Asia, and Asia Pacific) are in the process of preparing Regional Reports to provide delegates with a snapshot of challenges and priorities faced by human settlements in the regions. Regional Reports represent a good occasion for debate and research on the status of global human settlements.

C2) Third world conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, under the leadership of UNISDR, that took place in Sendai, Japan, in March 2015.
The conference has adopted the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030.

Figure 2 Overview of Global Processes
I. III. II Negotiation and preparatory process description

Within the framework of the global processes mentioned above, Governments, IOs, NGOs and stakeholders are currently involved in a very wide and rather complex consultation process. The complexity is due to the intersection of multiple working groups and secretariats working on more than five different outcome documents, part of the three clusters outlined above. This consultation period however represents the opportunity for an inclusive dialogue and reflection in which government representatives, major groups and civil society, and international organization discuss together to shape the principles of future cooperation on sustainable development.

The programmes of work for the preparation of the conferences have been formalized for each of the global processes with UN General Assembly resolutions. Each of the processes has specific features and timeline; but in general terms secretariats have been entrusted to prepare the conference and related documents with the support of working groups and international/regional expert groups.

The context is now further explained with examples of the preparatory work towards the WCDRR and H III. The first has been a successful example, even encountering some difficulties; the second, looks less on tracks to adopt its final document in October 2016. For the preparation of these two conferences the GA adopted the formal structure of Preparatory Committees (PrepCom) to agree on the procedures and draft the output document to be adopted by the conference. The preparatory work is implemented by secretariats under the supervision of the elected Bureau. The Bureau is composed by high-level representatives of member States, and it is entrusted to monitor and ensure implementation of the programme of work in preparation of the conference.

I. III. II. I Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction; Towards Post-2015 Framework for DRR

The third UN Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction comes at the conclusion of the 10 years cycle of the Hyogo Framework for Action (also known as HFA II), the UN guiding document DRR. The HFA II was adopted at the second world Conference on DRR in 2005, held in Hyogo, Japan.
The case of the WCDRR preparatory process (2012-2015) has showed the effectiveness of a very large global partnership, but has also surfaced some of the inefficiencies of such large process, especially when carried out at intergovernmental level. PrepCom I (July 2014) has been rather successful (A/CONF.224/PC(I)/L.1, 2014) having adopted the draft Rules of Procedures of the conference ( (A/CONF.224/PC(I)/3, 2014)) and the draft Agenda for the conference.

In addition, concerning content related matters, a preliminary draft of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction was circulated by Bureau co-Chairs few weeks after PrepCom (co-Chairs’ Non paper). Furthermore it was decided to organize a series open-ended consultative meetings (A/CONF.224/PC(I)/INF.4, 2014)) to take place in Geneva prior to PrepCom II, in September and October. During the open-ended consultations, MS initially discussed co-Chairs’ draft and first consensus was informally built.

UN Agencies joined the consultation as observers with the possibility to provide input in the thematic discussions. The discussion was on content related matters.

Despite a diffuse enthusiasm among delegates to PrepCom II (17-18 November 2014) and rumours of a smooth session, the Committee encountered intergovernmental negotiation slowness ( (A/CONF.224/PC(II)/8, 2014)). Negotiations were based on the Zero Draft prepared by co-Chairs as outcome of the latter mentioned consultative meetings (A/CONF.224/PC(II)/L.3, 2014) PrepCom II was unable to deliver a draft document for the conference. Negotiations were limited to the first three paragraphs of the co-Chairs’ paper (preamble, expected outcome and goal, guiding principles) draft priorities were not discussed.

The conference entrusted UNISDR secretariat to organize additional Negotiation Meetings and a PrepCom III to proceed with the preparation of the Post-2015 Framework for DRR. Three additional negotiation sessions have been organized in December and January, and a final PrepCom (III) was held back to back to Sendai Conference.

The Sendai Post-2015 Framework for DRR was adopted at the WCDRR under the auspices of UN SRSG. The process, here much synthesized may also be resumed with the “numbers” below: 18 meetings of the Bureau, 3 Preparatory Committees, 4 Global Platforms (2007-2014), more than 15 Regional Platforms, annual Ministerial conferences; the preparatory process gathered more than 50 thousands people from Governments, IOs, NGOs and major groups. At the conference itself there has been more than 6,500 delegates, 187 States’ representations (including 25 Heads of State and 100 participants at Ministerial level), 38 UN Entities, 42 IOs, 236 NGOs (UNISDR).
Figure 3 Preparatory Process of Post-2015 Framework for DRR
I. III. II. Third World Conference on Human Settlements; towards the New Urban Agenda

The second process described considers the preparation of H III conference. The third UN Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development comes at the conclusion of the 20 years cycle of the Habitat Agenda of Istanbul, adopted in 1996 in Turkey.

The preparatory process, in line with GA resolutions (A/RES/66/207, 2012) and (A/RES/67/216, 2013), is meant to strengthen political attention around sustainable urban development priorities. The preparatory process is quite similar to the one of WCDRR. 3 PrepCom(s) have been scheduled, beginning September 2014.

Considering, instead, output indicators it is possible to recognize a certain difference, and greater attention on process related goals. At PrepCom I held in New York in September 2014 the discussion mostly remained in the fields of procedures and proceedings (A/CONF.226/PC.1/4, 2014)). The Committee agreed on preliminary matters including the consensus around 4 thematic areas (knowledge, engagement, policy and operations) and defined the required draft structure of regional and national reports to the conference. PrepCom II held in Nairobi (UN-Habitat HQ) in March 2015, as concerns in partner Organizations and MS were raising, adopted some procedural resolutions (but rather formally necessary) including draft date and time of the venue (A/CONF.226/PC.2/L.2, 2015)) provisional agenda (A/CONF.226/PC.2/1, 2015), accreditation procedures for NGOs and Major Groups (A/CONF.226/PC.2/L.1, 2015) and elected the Bureau.

One month after PrepCom II the report of the Committee is to be completed. The most important outcome of PrepCom II is the draft Resolution on the Preparation of the Conference (A/CONF.226/PC.2/CRP.1, 2015) that includes:

a) A urgent request to establish policy units to work on the basis of issue papers received by secretariat;

UN-Habitat secretariat, following-up to the concerns emerged during the conferences, has established 10 policy units within 6 thematic areas (Figure 4). These teams of experts (nominated by MS and other stakeholders) have the role of developing background reports and policy recommendations to identify current challenges and priorities in human settlements. The outcome will be a set of action-oriented recommendations for the implementation of the New Urban Agenda. Policy units also have the role of supporting the Bureau for the preparation of the draft outcome document of the conference.

Issue papers instead represent the point of departure of policy teams work. Issue papers are concise, generally 5 pages, documents prepared by UN Agencies and task teams to review
specific themes to be addressed by the conference. The papers also represent the entry point of discussion. For the time being issue papers have not been yet made publicly available (publishing should be effective as of 31 May 2015).

b) A request to make publicly available as soon as possible and in any case by December 2015 the results of policy units, and open for comments the outputs, comments to be published on UN-Habitat website;

c) A request to the Bureau to prepare a first provisional draft outcome document on the basis of received comments.

In addition a stakeholder (participants) proposal was passed as draft resolution (A/CONF.226/PC.2/CRP.2, 2015) inviting UN GA at its 77th Session (in autumn 2015) to discuss the preparatory process of H III in the most appropriate way, including the possible mandate for an extraordinary session of the Preparatory Committee to advance negotiations on the draft conference document.

In parallel to PrepCom(s) UN-Habitat secretariat is collecting expression of interests for the organization of Regional Thematic meetings to advance regional consultation and expert inputs to the New Urban Agenda. The meetings, in support of regional experts’ meetings should host the discussion for the preparation of Regional Reports, which each ECOSOC council prepares for the conference.

The above synthesis, might communicate also to observers familiar to UN procedures, a path rich of uncertainties. The path towards H III looks, at this point in time, rather complex. One month before PrepCom III and one year in advance to the final conference no draft document has been circulated, and it was decided that the zero-draft would be released before end of December 2015. The period for first round of comments would end in January 2016, few months before the conference.

The very wide consultation and negotiation phase that is currently on-going, also opens to the possibility of mutual reinforcement of the different documents.

The interplay and reinforcement is particularly effective when thematic agreements (i.e. Sendai Framework for DRR) are used as action plans to implement much broader agreements (SDGs) or to address specific thematic areas (UNFCCC).

The relation becomes much stronger when the it is intended to establish a set of indicators to monitor implementation. The monitoring systems could therefore play a substantial role in tracking the process achievement of thematic goals in more general documents (i.e. the monitoring of SDG 11 on resilience of cities, shall be based on some indicators of Sendai
Framework for DRR system). This interoperability of monitoring system first, limits the duplication of efforts, and second promotes the consistence of documents.

The discourse about global processes has now been addressed to provide process related information on the methodologies and ways in which the documents are discussed and adopted. Chapter 2 instead presents the thematic contents of the above mentioned documents, pointing out the strong relations those have with urban planning and policy formulation.

Figure 4 Matrix of Policy Themes and Issue Papers for H III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS</th>
<th>ISSUE PAPERS</th>
<th>POLICY UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

UN-Habitat.com
II. The Content of Planning Debate on IGO, a literature review

The following section proposes a literature review to track the emergence in the urban planning debate of activities, agreements and policy frameworks promoted by IGOs. The objective is to disclose whether the planning is aware, supports or contributes to and to what extent to the intergovernmental debate on cities. The review also proposes a critical interpretation arguing that the planning debate is partially responsive to the debate and proposes reflection on some but very specific topics of the IGO debate, and especially those that are most close to planning theory.

II. I Structure

The first paragraph briefly explains the methodology adopted for the review and the sources that have been consulted and the reasons of selection.

The second instead builds a timeline of the few topical articles that pointed at the core of the interest of this study, while in fact several articles deal with the priorities set by IGOs for cities (sustainability, climate change adaptation, governance, spatial planning etc.) a much more reduced number of articles deal with the international agreements on cities. The third part proposes a spot exploration to non-disciplinary journals that however have promoted the reflection on themes of interest to this study.

The last part presents a critical synthesis of the literature review and builds the linkages between the planning debate and the next chapter to deal with the content of international debate on sustainable urban development.

II. I. II Methodology and sources

The literature review of urban planning journals has first developed from the current ranking of journals as provided by SCImago Journal and Country rank. The platform, which provides a ranking of journals, is feed by Scopus, a database compiling abstracts and citations of literature. The literature review research has considered for the selected sources all the issues of the journals over the past ten years (2015-2005). The selection of the sources based on journals’ impact factor (in 2014) intended to point out two set of issues: first, whether and to
what extent the most cited journals publish contributions dealing with the activities of IGOs and therefore which is the attention paid by planning debate to IGOs; second, which attention has the planning debate paid over the last ten years on the activities and provisions of IGOs on cities and human settlements, and especially which kind of debate has flourished, if any, in concomitance of milestones of intergovernmental agreements regarding cities. Given their impact factor, the Journal of Urban Economics and the International Journal of Urban Education and Research have been chosen.

The second set of sources was selected on the basis on regional scope. The rationale of the selection comes from the concerns moved by the intergovernmentalism and policy analysis literature (Beckfield, 2008); (A. Cortell, 2000), (Ruggie, 1998)). It is argued that Organizations (especially regional ones, such as the European Union) are able to strongly inspire policy agendas and thus, eventually shape the thematic and disciplinary debate on the matters addressed. The journal selection accordingly considered: the Journal of the American Planning association and Planning Theory and Practice.

The last set of three journals intended to explore an eventual attention of more sectorial publishers towards the themes of interest to this study, it was accordingly chosen: the Journal of Planning Education and Research, Environment and Urbanization and Regional Science and Urban Economics.

A final set of additional journals has been considered. In fact at some point of the literature research a keyword query to consulted libraries has been entered. It emerged that keywords such as “intergovernmental urban planning”, “urban planning intergovernmental/international organizations” “sustainable urban development” etc., were often discussed in journals not necessarily related to urban planning, but for example in those related to public policy or public administration.

II. II The Sustainability Entry Point

A meaningful entry point to the matter of urban planning and intergovernmental organizations should deal with sustainable development and cities. Sustainability, and its declination of sustainable urban development is a field which both the IGOs and planning theory have faced since the 1970s since the 1972 UN Conference on the Human Environment. In the same years both communities engaged in the reflection on sustainability.

It was in fact put into question the viability of development as it was pursued since the industrial revolution; the concerns promoted an assessment of environmental impacts on the global ecosystem of human activities. Initially there has been little agreement within the scientific community on what these impacts have been and which would be in the future (i.e.
climate change models and IPCC scenarios). Some climate science seriously investigated climate change phenomena while climate change scepticism was quite widespread (Ackermann, 2009). More recently, the correlation between climate change and human activities has been officially recognised by governments and scientific consensus has been achieved on global warming (Doran & Zimmermann, 2009).
A key role was also played by international sustainability and environmental law, which achieved global binding agreements on climate change, and therefore moved governments and business to develop the green economy.

The debate about sustainability has gathered over the last decades the reflection in multiple societal sectors and research domains, while it has often gained the top of political agenda in several countries.

The wide domain of sustainability has been and it currently is widely debated within planning discourses, the first reflections within the planning discipline on urban sustainability emerged from the environmental and engineering approaches to city planning, hence from the 1970s.

It is possible to identify an alignment and time correspondence between the first comprehensive studies on sustainability, “The Limits of Growth” Meadows et.al 1972, and more disciplinary contributions on sustainability of cities being addressed from a planning perspective, i.e. the approaches to urban ecology (Register, 1987). A further example to disclose the interest of planning culture in sustainability is the establishment of “Environment and Urbanization” in 1989, one of the reviewed journals, to propose research and debate linking the domains of urban and environmental studies.

The dialogue between planning and sustainability emerged even more clearly during the 1990s, when the reflections were developed around the report of the World Commission on Environment –the Brundtland report, and the preparation and follow-up to the “Earth Summit” in held in Rio in 1992.

These two events represented a paradigm shift for mankind. The 1990s have been a period in which sustainable development has been extensively debated in search of harmonized definitions and during which framework contributions were issued to set the pillars of urban sustainability (Beatley, 1995); (Wheeler, 1996), (Camagni & al., 1996).

One example is the contribution by Campbell (1996), that explores the contradictions and directions of planning of cities in the mid 1990s at the crossroad among more environmentally sustainable strategies, programmes to promote the economic growth in cities, or strengthening social justice and cohesion (Campbell S., 1996).

A first argument it emerges from the previous set of references, planning discipline has been responsive on the matter of urban sustainability, even since the early times when IGOs introduced such topic in their agendas.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the planning debate soon moved to the urban dimensions of sustainability (i.e. (Wheeler & Beatley, 2004) for a comprehensive review) thus focusing
on: land use and urban design, transportation, energy and materials use, spatial economic development, green architecture, and to the research of measures for their improvement.

This thematic entry point to IGOs and urban planning is useful to track the emergence of an alignment of interests, here the sustainability mainstream, being addressed by IGOs and disciplinary debate, but also to disclose a certain distance between planning debate and IGOs as institutions.

II. II. I The Brick Between Planning and IGOs

To introduce this second level of analysis it is possible to consider the perspective expressed in Breheny et al. (Breheney, 1992) “Sustainable Urban Development and Urban Form”. The book establishes strong relations between the planning of cities and sustainable development. Breheny study confirms the argument expressed above, and more precisely the planning reflection on the measures to address transport, spatial planning and energy efficiency-generation to achieve more sustainable cities, but also introduces a key point for the present study.

The contribution is in fact comprehensive enough to explore the political implications of sustainable urban development, also opening to the opportunity of intergovernmental co-operation and co-ordination. In addition it is argued that the action for sustainable development taken at city level are crucial and especially to mobilize expert and sectorial knowledge and tools (i.e. planning tools) to support and implement political commitment and societal engagement.

This step is important for at least two issues: first because Breheny introduces the elements for intergovernmental co-operation for sustainable urban development, second as it discloses the key values and benefits of planning for sustainable cities.

This latter point has been extensively debated by urban studies and planning authors over the last two decades, both by framework contributions to build a common understanding of urban sustainability and its strategies and tools (Beatley, 1995); (Camagni & al., 1996); Wheeler, (Wheeler, 2000); (James, 2014)), as well as by more technical references providing design guidelines and reporting indicators for green cities (Beatley, 2012); (Jenks & Dempsey, 2005); (Bell & Morse, 2008).

This literature confirms that planning for more sustainable cities has gathered the reflections of the planning discipline; furthermore, the relevance of such studies has been increasingly validated by urbanization patterns, and its statistics and data that currently account human settlements as a key sector for sustainable development. Not only the majority of global population lives in cities, but also human settlements are responsible of a fair amount of
pollution, either generated directly in cities or produced elsewhere to satisfy urban demand of goods, services and so on. A considerable amount of this pollution comes both from energy consumption in buildings and from inadequate urban forms or ineffective transport systems (modes or consumers’ choices).

Planning literature pointed out at least other two relevant concepts: first, cities are a key domain for action to reduce environmental impacts of humans on the environment; second the tools of urban management, hence considering the portfolio of planning tools, shall be deployed to improve the sustainability of human settlements (Wheeler, 2000).

More precisely, to implement commitments to sustainable development, cities should be regarded by a new season of programmes and actions to reduce their environmental footprint, foster economic development and improve social wellbeing of citizens. These needs also opened a technical debate to research the measures to deal with urban sustainability, and the themes of compact city, transport, energy production and infrastructure, energy efficiency in buildings have emerged since Breheny contribution in 1992.

However, the major interest in Berheny contribution refers to the opportunity of alignment between the political dimension of urban sustainability and urban studies and planning. More recent contributions (Wheeler, 2000); (Jenks & Dempsey, 2005) identify in the relation between the interest and commitment of IGOs on sustainable urban development the roots and legitimation for urban studies related to sustainability.

As mentioned a rather wide set of contributions on sustainable urban development have been issued so far, while IGOs and governments have issued and agreed on a similarly wide number of agreements and policy documents to promote the sustainability of cities.

Given this framework, an in-between brick seems to be needed: on one side in fact emerging IGO priorities are strongly set on sustainability, where urban development plays a key role; on the other side planning, the discipline actively responds and it is aware of this field of theory and practice and over the last twenty years has been addressing the social economic and environmental aspects of urban development. Next to the debate related to the content of sustainable urban development, another level related to policy formulation should be explored. In fact as policy documents promoted by IGOs include multiple aspects related to urban planning and its measures, the relevance of these discussions within urban studies and expert discussion should be considered; the literature research on the selected journals has precisely focused on these latter aspects with the goal of understanding the level of attention that current planning debate pays to the activities of intergovernmental organizations.

The period considered for the literature review, the last ten years (2005-2015) does not fully overlap with the negotiation of new guidance documents on sustainable urban development, if not in the last period (2013-2015).
It was anyways expected to find a certain debate around the periodical review of the achievement of existing documents, including MDGs, the Habitat Agenda, the UNFCCC and the HFA. Furthermore since 2010 a global process of formulation and consultation for the preparation of some global agreements is under way in intergovernmental arenas, and some disciplinary input could have developed, still considering that cities and human settlements are addressed by many of these agreements and processes. The reviewed journals however contain a wide number of sectorial contributions related to sustainable urban development and other topics establishing relations between the discipline and IGOs. The review identified few more than one hundred contributions, and surfaced a certain clustering of themes as proposed by publishers, in two different shapes; the first in the form of special issues, some of the examples are reported: E&U proposes three special issues (1, 2005 and 2,2008- 1,2009) on MDGs and urban governance; the JAPA joins climate change related matters for a special edition on the first issue of the Journal in 2009; the IJURR devotes issue four in 2013 to spatial governance and public policy and issue five of 2014 to urban politics. The second type of clustering relates to the publishing of articles of interest to this study within the same period across different journals: 2011 is marked by a reflection in the JAPA and PlTh&P focusing on institutional analysis; in 2006 the debate in the IJURR, E&U and in the JPER focused on sustainability between environmentalism and social justice; in 2012, the year of the Earth Summit, the Journal of Urban Economics,PlTh&Pe and the JAPA published a series of contribution focusing on urban forms and climate change.

This latter part served to provide context information and some census of the literature review. The next section focuses instead on the key contributions identified in the journals issue precisely focusing on IGOs and planning. It is important to note that while the number of articles to focus on the items contained in the intergovernmental debate on cities are quite numerous – i.e. urban governance, slums and urban poor, environmental footprint of cities and so on, the number of articles directly focusing in intergovernmental institutions and their processes are rather fewer.
II. III Five Key Contributions of Planning Discourses on IGO Agreements

The literature review returned five topical articles and a special edition discussing from a planning perspective intergovernmental agreements on cities or their processes. The topic appears to be less discussed in comparison to others, for example a fair amount of contributions to the Journal of Urban and Regional Economics focused on the 2008 housing bubble and the related financial crisis, which has been another global fact regarding cities during the decade with remedies promoted at IGO level (IMF, WB, EC etc.).

The reviewed period opens with a special issue of E&U (1,2005) on “Meeting the Millennium Development Goals in Urban Areas”. The issue contains a set of contributions addressing the issues of low-income and developing countries’ cities, ranging from slum upgrading to housing for the poor and financing for urban infrastructures in the global south. The issue opens with an editorial contribution by Satterthwaite (Satterthwaite, Hasan, & Patel, 2005) presenting the content and structure of MDGs and proposing a reflection on the urban development implication to achieve MDGs’ goals and targets.

One of the key arguments of the contribution focuses on the role of local authorities and the required changes at local level in sectors such as: public administration, urban infrastructures (i.e. water and sanitation, heath care and education), financing and land management. It is in fact noted that several contributions and arguments in the global debate on MDGs focuses mostly on macro elements, i.e. large increases in international co-operation and aid, debt relief/loans or national poverty reduction strategies. Instead the effectiveness and efficiency of local services and decision-making processes and the capacity to raise and spend money to improve citizens’ welfare is considered as the deal for meeting the MDGs and beyond. The authors disclose a key point: local authorities and their decisions are the deal of the executive steps for investing international funds to transform comprehensive policy goals, such as those of the MDGs, into concrete actions and projects on the ground to end poverty and so on (in accordance to MDGs rationale). In addition the article challenges the patterns of co-operation on development in international agencies. While it is recognized that IGOs (including development banks) identified a common agenda for development assistance within the MDGs, a critique is moved against the ways in which development planning is conceived.

This critique has mostly to do with the engagement/exclusion in decisions and inclusion of grassroots (lack of civil society involvement and lack of representation of urban poor in civil society organizations), and most of all on the little support these social groups may receive from traditional institutions and local authorities.
Matching the theses synthetized above it emerges that it is urgent to: improve the capacity of local authorities to respond to the needs of low-income groups, to strengthen the role of these groups’ organizations and to improve the capacity and effectiveness of local authorities to cope with implementation of programmes and management of funds. Later, the text also proposes the reflection of four priority areas for achieving the MDGs in urban areas: water and sanitation, land tenure and financing.

In addition to that, the contribution also puts forward another relevant argument, the role of “citywide action”.

It is in fact recognized that pilot/development projects designed by professionals and promoted by IGOs and NGOs at local level often remain examples and do not build the capacity of local authorities to cope with new cycles of actions, and thus limit the impacts to the targeted neighborhood or community. On the contrary, when these projects are designed and planned from a citizens’ consultation with the involvement of local residents can strengthen horizontal linkages between poor resident groups promoting a civic engagement (example of policy targeted at shaping new patterns of interactions). These and other changes in the participation of stakeholders and increased capacity of local authorities to implement globally agreed strategies with governance and financial support of intergovernmental agencies also improve transparency and accountability of political parties, local authorities and social groups. The citywide approach, by contrast to what later in the text is described in the national framework sections, directly points at the stake of this present study. It is argued that the opportunity to achieve the MDGs in urban areas is not in the hands of agencies, but much more in the ones of local authorities and their portfolio of tools. Therefore the integrated tools of urban planning and land management turn out to be the fundamental merges between strategies agreed at international level, i.e. those related to eradication of poverty such as the MDGs, and the implementation of these strategies by programmes with place-based focus.

As last argument the editorial introduces the important aspect of institutions and institutionalization towards funding and effectiveness to achieve MDGs.

The role of traditional intergovernmental agencies and Organizations was mostly conceived as capital assistance –i.e. development banks, to provide credit and debt relief to least developed and developing countries to implement projects designed by intergovernmental agencies. At the time of the contribution, and even more now, the role of intermediary institutions and local organizations is growing, as it seems more effective to support during the implementation of projects and plans local authorities with organizations more rooted in the context of intervention, that often has greater understanding of local dynamics.
This first contribution emerged from the literature review has surfaced at least two core elements: a) there is a disciplinary concern to study the ways in which global agreements can be met in cities, and especially which tools shall be deployed and which changes in the institutions and problem setting should take place to achieve the agreed goals; b) cities are a key field of action given the concentration of population and economic activities, and much of the effort of assistance programmes should be targeted at improving the capacity of local authorities to design and implement place based projects conceived within a city-wide approach.

The second framework reference was published on PITh&P in the form of *interface* in the second issue of the Journal in 2008 (Roy, Giovannini, & D. Satterthwaite, 2008). The contribution by A. Roy, F. Giovannini, D. Satterthwaite and B. Chaturvedi, proposes a reflection on the role of the MDGs, referred to as a global norm, promoted by the UN for the discipline and practice of planning.

While there is no certainty whether the MDGs can be identified as global norm –i.e. considering their genesis (Mohammed, 2014), the *interface* argues that the content of the MDGs might not be so effective and relevant for planning, but it recognizes that the Goals have a quite marked “distinctive urban character” (*ibid*). In addition it points out that the MDGs, similarly to Kyoto Protocol, could be seen as occasion to strengthen the relations between “global norms and planning forms”, and therefore to align planning practices to the need of environmental sustainability and poverty eradication expressed in the agreements. The author also proposes an argument for the relevance of planners to take into consideration the MDGs: in particular trough the Goals –endorsed as “global social contract”, it is possible to put into question some vicious forms of planning that have generated the urban problems MGDs try to revert (i.e. inadequate living conditions in slums, lack of urban infrastructure and access to basic services for some resident groups, environmental risks and low environmental performance of settlements etc.).

The capacity of planning to effectively revert these challenges indeed is rooted in the integrated and broad nature of policy tools approach to planning in juncture with an improved and convergent institutional capacity, engagement and accountability to solve such urban priorities.

The second section of the *interface*, by F. Giovannini, proposes a reflection on the role, competences and capacity of the United Nations to trigger a norm-generating process. The author recalls the concept of norms, in international contexts. This notion refers to the ideas, principles and moral values and standards of state behaviour defined as rights and obligations (Krasner, 1983) developed in a context where states aims at maximising their own
ability to maximise domestic pressures while minimizing the adverse consequences of foreign development (Axelrod, 1986).

Given this framework the intergovernmental arena is also challenged by emerging collective expectations of states’ behaviour especially to address the matters in with single state lack of interpretation capacity, legitimation or simply scale capacity. This matter has mostly to do with international institutions and the procedures of international regimes, especially considering the different levels and degrees of normative standard capabilities and agenda setting influence (Simmons & Martin, 2002). However, the relevance for the purpose of this present study stays with the linkages between thematic debate –i.e. the one on the sustainable urban development implication for planning, and the capacity of IGOs to drive “international socialization” around priority topics such as sustainability (Giovannini, 2008); (Finnemore & Sikkin, 1998)– IGOs drive socialization more in general in the fields of peace, rights and well being, as per the UN declaration.

The importance of socialization and agenda setting is also related to the capacity of IGOs to introduce new, or gather efforts and commitment on, topics in the field of common goods management, like the environment and accordingly to sustainability (Ostrom, 1990). Some authors in the field of international relations and political science consider IGOs as drivers of “norm cascades”, referring to the escalation of consensus on some new positions, transforming into “standard behaviour”, as consequence of a growing number of states adopting or supporting agreements at international level, i.e. on climate policy or on human rights (Wendt, 1999), (Finnemore, 1996); (Katzenstein, 1996). This argument plays a relevant role in the field of agenda setting, especially considering the impact of global norms on national contexts.

The third part of the interface, by Satterthwaite (Satterthwaite, 2008) that proposes, similarly to his other 2005 contribution to Environment and Urbanization, the linkages between international development assistance –that needs to be reframed, the effectiveness in meeting MDGs locally and the improvement of coping capacity of local authorities. The most relevant advance to the previous contribution stays in the governance approach. While the role of local NGOs and CSOs is acknowledged to increase the effectiveness of project design and implementation and to better catalyse development assistance funds made available by development banks, the local deal for meeting the MDGs is made by the public administration sector. This argument is made by two levels: first, the authorities need to improve their responsiveness in the administration procedures to operationalize projects and initiatives, but also to monitor services delivery by making basic service providers more accountable; this first aspect requires the development of new and stronger local organizations skills for urban management. Second, the groups of poor citizens and their organizations – i.e. the federations of slum dweller, should be fully considered in the decision-making process and actual driver
of projects for change. These two, major, changes called by Satterthwaite would allow to facilitate the evolution of development assistance to a more close-to-poor level and empower local development assistance organization to implement projects to improve quality of life of urban poor – the main goal of MDGs. This framework, where local authorities can manage and address local transformations and grassroots associations can propose initiatives and implement them reverts the traditional “foreign” development assistance based, first on state level debt relief mechanisms, development banks and NGOs that are supposed to be less familiar with local contexts and less keen to develop specific place based responses to poverty in disadvantaged urban situations.

These changes would open up to the opportunity to innovate the way in which development assistance is delivered, rather than only in the ways it is conceived in IGOs arenas.

As last element it is meaningful to try to merge both Satterthwaite’s contributions, arguing that a citywide approach to tackle poor living conditions in slums may also require innovations in the way plans are conceived and therefore consider governance approaches to build widely accepted programmes with the participation of most residents’ group equally able to mobilize resources. These changes do concern the ways in which urban planning is prepared, and requires new skills in the public guidance. The latter looks like an ambitious exercise that involves multiple levels of decision-making and a wide, and international, set of stakeholders (local authorities – for the plan, national government – for the national MDG strategy, NGOs – for project proposals, citizens’ group – for lobbying and access to services) that require adequate co-ordination. However, as Satterthwaite argues, the opportunity to deliver projects driven by urban poor direct demand should increase the quality and effectiveness of development assistance.

This second contribution from the Journals’ review highlighted other two core concepts for the integration between IGOs and urban planning: a) the content of MDGs – according to Roy, does not seem to be directly relevant for the planning discipline and practice, if not to improve institutional capacity of planning to address underlying urban priorities. Instead the Goals seem to be more an occasion to rethink the ways in which some cities, in developed countries may trigger a more environmentally responsive urban development; in the global south to put into question and reverse the ways in which planning tools are misused or underused to cope with very rapid urbanization. b) The section of the contribution on the UN norms has provided the opportunity to think about IGOs as forum for policy reforms, especially to the extent to which the UN is able to emerge as “leading intellectual organization” (Giovannini, 2008) for the introduction of general frameworks to address human development and the related opportunity to generate cascade effects.
This point is quite relevant when put into relation with the domestic salience of international norms as proposed by A. Cortell and P. Davis (2000) and to the “relational approach” by Jessop (2001). The two authors argue that agreements at intergovernmental level are often able to guide and give rise to obligation of national governments and stakeholders to align their actions and decisions to the principles expressed in the international arenas through the processes of thematic, methodological and ontological turns.

The signs of such influences are reflected in the appearance in the national debate of the topics discussed at intergovernmental level, for example on sustainability (i.e. Agenda21).

A second step is related to institutional change, i.e. establishment of co-ordination agencies or issue of norms and policy principles. A further institutional step is the preparation of a national norm on the matter. The reasons of national salience might be rooted in cultural match (i.e. it is likely that there might be a cultural match between some principles of environmental conservation and citizens’ understanding and beliefs) or a domestic interest (i.e. still related to sustainability the concerns of LLDCs or SIDs against sea level rise) between citizens’ expectations and intergovernmental norms.

The salience concept allows adding another element to fill the missing brick between IGOs and planning discipline. Salience in fact may add an argument for the increased interest that planning pays to the technical content of IGOs agenda on sustainable urban development. While governments were introducing policy principles on sustainability of human settlement, as consequence of national cascading of international agreements, planning also felt societal commitment to research on the topic; this argument also explains the quasi simultaneity of IGO concerns on sustainable development and the first planning studies on sustainable cities.

By the time of 2012, the year of the Earth Summit in Rio, disciplinary journals appear to have incorporated the debate on sustainability and the role of institutions – not at intergovernmental level, in a substantial way. The period 2006-2012 in fact returns a number of contributions to the seven reviewed journals dealing with: environmentalism (Lee, 2006; Heijden, 2006); (Satterthwaite, 2008), (Aylett, 2010), climate change in urban areas (Newman, 2006), (Wheeler, 2008); (Kellenberga & Mobarak, 2008) (Aylett, 2010); (Doodman, 2009); sp. Edition of the Journal of the American Planning association, 2010; (Glaesera & Kahn, 2010); (Hoornweg, Sugar, & Gomez, 2011)), reforms in institutional arrangements and decision-making (Melo & Baiocchi, 2006); (Navarro, Magnier, & Ramirez, 2008); (Payre, 2010); (Holden, 2011); (Ward & Imbrosco, 2011)).

The disciplinary debate appeared to be in line with the matters discussed by IGOs, while the topic of intergovernmental organization on their own did not emerged.
On the contrary a growing reflection was paid to institutions and their capacity to influence urban development and planning practices.

Kim (2011) refers to the role of institutions as a central element to contemporary urban planning. Planning is considered not much as an action but about interaction requiring coordination of actors and organizations mediating trough institutions. A second article, by Henderson and Wang, (2007), empirically demonstrates that development, urbanization and institutional evolution are strongly intertwined. In principles institutions can affect the distribution and size of cities while urbanization grows with the level of development of the country.

Another important argument is introduced by Neuman (2012); he refers to planning as an applied field of politics and sociology in which planning governance is strongly bound to institutional settings, agendas and political cycles meant to inspire, adopt and set the procedures of the planning process, whereas the institution is defined as the structure able to order social behaviour according to accepted norms.

The relevance of these arguments on institutions for the present study resides in the effectiveness of cooperation on spatial planning aspects in institutional settings. The lack of effective intergovernmental coordination for spatial planning and growth management is frequently cited ( (Albrechts, Alden, & ., 2001), (Alexander E., 1993), especially considering that planning lies between broad social arrangements –i.e. markets and governments, and single organizations – i.e. municipal planning agency, has specific spatial polity – i.e. a city, region or state, and it is configured as a multiorganizational construct spanning several spatial scales (Neuman, 2012). The latter linkages between planning institutions and sustainability have been further explored by Steele ( (Steele, 2011). While a broader study on institutional changes in the face of sustainable development has been proposed by Connor and Dovers ( (2004)) and argued about an intensification of institutional changes – quasi incremental, rather than deep institutional reforms; Steele, instead, focuses on the institutional approach to planning. First he argues that planning for sustainability promoted the shift of planning systems and plans to more performative and “strategic flexibility”– rather than conformative, settings. Furthermore the recent institutionalism studies surfaced the role of decision-making patterns, especially with regards to spatial strategy making in complex and evolving governance landscapes. Steele also introduces the emerging “strategy making for sustainability” developed under the influence of the studies of Healey ( (2007)) on spatial strategy making and Connor and Dovers (2004) on institutional changes to address sustainability (reflecting on the institutional accommodation of a sustainability discourse, normative change, legal change, and international law and policy as driver). The framework is composed by three steps with similarities to planning processes and policy formulation: 1) the first step is problem re-framing, to determine the ways in which institutional practices deal
with sustainability, and the extent to which the understandings of sustainability are convened into action; 2) the second step deals with governance re-organization and the deal stays in the ability to build new governance capacities around the thematic agenda on sustainability (therefore also in this case the topic introduced from the intergovernmental debate set in as opportunity of change, similarly to what was argued by Roy); 3) the third step call for a transformative change and learning, and therefore a sort of knowledge construction from experience.

A last important reference on planning and institutions, by Matthews, appears on PlTh&P in 2013. Matthews (2013), building on Faludi (2000), Forester (1989) and Alexander (2005), attributes to planning a key function to bridge between territorial transformations and compliance with, and implementation of, intergovernmental agreements on sustainable development. Planning involves the coordination of development activities and the governance practices for developing and implementing strategies and policies determining the location, timing and form of development; more precisely “planning regimes act to regulate development activities and […] the social outcomes relate to the institutional governance of spatial and land use development” (Matthews, 2013).

These contributions focusing on planning and institutions further strengthen the identification of the linkages between IGOs and planning studies on the role of institutions and agencies’ work. The latter reflection on institutions seem to prove that very much of the planning capacity to address emerging urban issues derives from the relevance these assume in political and institutions’ agenda. Oftentimes, as noted by Connor and Dovers (2004), institutions are able to incrementally or radically evolve to set the enabling conditions to cope with emerging needs, therefore to facilitate planning procedures and responses. According to this perspective planning assumes a connotation of public tool to be deployed for addressing the priorities of governments and administrations (i.e. those included in development strategies).

Being aware of the linkages between agendas, planning and the capacity of institutions to adapt to cope with development strategies, the article by Lefebvre in (2012) E&U (the third topical article) precisely bring to the fore the issue of local authorities organizations and climate change negotiations.

Lefebvre points out that while the climate change agreements (Kyoto and UNFCCC) attribute to cities an important role and responsibility in addressing climate change, there are difficulties for cities to join the negotiations in a substantive way. The rationale of cities involvement mainly stays in the growing awareness of human settlement to reduce GHG emissions, and a consolidation of best practices and decentralized cooperation in implementing at city level recommendations on sustainable development. Cities also emerge
as key players to address climate change given the density and spatial organization of consumption facilities (i.e. buildings, transport networks, goods consumption), the need of local coordination to implement emission reduction plans, and third because the endeavours to limit climate change may not be only concentrated at high levels (i.e. state level) but requires an intermediate institution control and engagement. However the same agreements do not contain binding obligations directly upon cities. The institutionalization of city involvement has followed two main directions: the first, related to the legal status of cities in negotiations, the second related to the contribution of cities to climate change agreements. Both directions however are mostly related to institutional discourses rather than to planning.

Cities are moved by three main concerns, first to be recognised for their critical role in achieving GHG emissions reductions; second to be supported in their actions ranging from capacity building to carbon finance and technology transfer; third to be included in consultations and negotiations on climate related policy formulation. The difficulties of cities inclusion are multifaceted. On one side the demand of cities is to add a new category of stakeholders at a new level of power to overcome the contradiction expressed above: cities are meant to be important by the agreements but the assistance to this level for implementation and the role of these actors in negotiation is not institutionalized or substantially formalized. On the other side, following the second direction hinted above, the nature of cities involvement is limited to the capacity of cities to act on specific climate related target (and therefore the capacity of local authorities to coordinate with national commitments and pursue long term strategies, often conflicting with the logics of mayors’ selection), the limited scope and territorial extension of cities, but is also rooted in the UNFCCC preamble.

What is more the legal status of local authorities in climate change negotiations presents an interlocutor’s identification issue and this required local authorities to organize themselves in urban and regional networks (i.e. the United Cities and Local Governments, or the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives); these networks became increasingly active in the intergovernmental debate proposing common positions and voluntary policy principles (i.e. the COP13 Local Government Climate Roadmap).

An important advance toward a stronger recognition of cities involvement in climate diplomacy was set during COP15 with the Copenhagen accord (2009), during which the Copenhagen Climate Catalogue was launched. The Catalogue is a periodical repository of mitigation targets and action developed by local governments, the catalogue currently contains the strategies of more than 3200 across developed and developing countries. Another relevant step was done during COP16 where a World Mayor’s Summit on Climate was organized; the summit adopted the Mexico City Pact and its Cities Climate Registry, a global repository of measures and reports on climate actions.
and GHG reduction schemes. Lefebvre in his contribution further explains some technicalities of GHG measurements in cities, but toward the ends also open up the issues of financing and city capacity to cope with the monitoring and implementation of these ambitious climate strategies.

This reflection on cities involvement in the diplomacy of climate change is a good example of socialization and cascading effect promoted by IGOs. Cities interest in the involvement in these agreements both follows the principles of standard behaviour as well as the one of policy coordination across the different government levels. The article is a clear reply to the research question of the literature review concerning the interest of planning on the intergovernmental debate on cities. Lefebvre has carefully portrayed the dynamics and issues of negotiations that occurred after the Earth Summit and during the periodic review in COPs of the UNFCCC. What is more, Lefebvre, Satterthwaite editorial and the previous interface on Planning Theory and Practice constitute a clear disciplinary input dealing with the role of cities in IGO activities faced from an “insider”, professional or disciplinary perspective. It is important to point out that with regards to the past cycle of intergovernmental agreements with attention on cities but without strong involvement of local authorities and clear target for cities, the new season of documents, first of all the new set of Sustainable Development Goals, include specific goals for cities and a wide consultation process is taking place involving all societal sectors. However, to date (June 2015) no disciplinary contributions have been sighted in the reviewed journals dealing with the preparation of the new series of IGO agreements, even if the agencies attention towards cities has even increased – i.e. DSG 11.

The fourth topical contribution was published on the International Journal of Urban and Regional Research in 2013 and it is related to the UN-Habitat e-debate on the right to the city held in 2009. The contribution is of interest to the present study not necessarily for the topic it is addressed, but mostly for the rationale with which it is built.

The article, by A. Brown (2013) puts in relation a topic of great relevance in disciplinary debate, the right to the city and the procedures of intergovernmental agencies. The contribution is an example of mutual adjustment and reinforcement between the disciplinary debate – that can elevate to IGO level, but also an opportunity for IGO to get in touch with expert knowledge to support their work.

Brown (2013) also recalls that the idea of the right to the city emerged in 1968 in France as slogan during the protests that occurred in the country on the roots of Lefebvre analysis of urbanization. Within the planning theory however, the term “right to the city” has evolved over the decades. In the original conceptualization by Lefebvre, the right to the city is proposed as profound restructuring of social, political, and economic relations in the cities and in societies developed under capitalism. The objective was to inspire to reframe the arena
of decision-making for the production of urban spaces (both perceived, lived and conceived space), which in the making represent the reproduction of society. The term therefore is strongly inspired to a strong relation between citizenship and right to participation in decision-making and appropriation of urban space. Lefebvre proposes an analysis made of two components, the first related to citizens’ inclusion in the new governance structures introduced by the enfranchisement contemporary society; the second related to the challenges posed by urban capitalism and its dynamics (capital capacity to value urban spaces, prioritizing exchange values and excluding citizens with affordability constraints). Given this framework, Purcell ((2002)) confirms the uncertainty raised around Lefebvre term by arguing that Lefebvre’s formulation leaves more question than answers and this indeterminate character leaves much room to influences by the urban politics of the inhabitants.

A second reflection on the term was proposed by Harvey in the IJURR in (2003), maintaining a more political economy perspective. He argues that cities are the products of daily lives of residents where these, by contrast, have unequal access to the city and to the processes to shape its changes. These arguments are particularly true considering that urbanization has been a class phenomenon where wealthier groups, through monopoly of interests and power, were able to influence the evolution of the urban landscape. Harvey claims an equal right for residents to participate in the process of urban change, and also to draw upon the organization of civil society organizations and mobilize sufficient resources (i.e. collective voice strategies) to “be heard”. It is important to note that the term right to the city, as confirmed by Purcell (2002) and Brown (2013) is neither a panacea for contemporary urban issues, or a multipurpose concept to call the attention on social action and struggle against exclusion processes under globalization. It is also true that recent fast development of urban areas have often exaggerated the privatization, segregation and social exclusion, it follows that movements to reclaim the individual rights to access urban resources their distribution and transformation emerge like in the past season of civil movements in the end of 1970s.

These aspects regarding the right of citizens’ inclusion and access to decision-making are very close to the concept of democracy and public participation – intergovernmental agencies are particularly responsive to the matter being it precisely addressed in the UN Declaration, and the concept of the right to the city might be one of the principles to brake the chain of urban poverty. The concept of the right to the city is taken exactly for its double purpose, the first against urban poverty (in line with Marcuse groupings - (2009)) and for the human rights component for its citizenship and “access to” implication.

The relevance of the article stays in the opportunity of mutual contamination between planning theory and practice and intergovernmental agenda. The UN-Habitat e-debate in fact was developed around a concept emerged from urban studies and that could be transferred in the stake of multilateral agreements on sustainable urban development, therefore introducing
a potential innovation after many traditional attempts of development assistance and calls for inclusion of disadvantaged groups in decision making (arguments also advocated by Satterthwaite –2005, in the contribution reviewed above).

The fifth and last topical article on IGOs and planning was published on Planning Theory and Practice in 2012. The contribution by C. Walsh (2012) comes as a “policy & planning brief” and reports the agreement reached in 2011 at the informal Ministerial Meeting of Ministers responsible for spatial planning and territorial development on the (emended) Territorial Agenda for the European Union 2020. The brief represent another typology of relation between planning debate and IGO agenda, the article is mainly an information/report about the approval of a policy document in the domain on urban-regional development and planning. The brief reports the content of the new Territorial Agenda, a high-level European commitment to balanced and sustainable regional development and place-based approach. The Agenda is also a message endorsed by the Ministers to take into account the spatial dimension of development to put into coherence other sectorial policies of the Union and its MS.

The Union has only recently endorsed the importance of the spatial dimension of policies (Barca, 2009) and a strategy with a 2020 horizon with a strong emphasis on a territorial cohesion and cooperation principles might strengthen the attention to spatial planning also in relation to complementary and policy coordination. The relevance of this policy commitment is also related to the new research programme Horizon 2014-2020 and the opportunity to develop research and projects with focus on cities and human settlements.

The brief points out several points of contact between planning studies, especially those related to the institutionalization of European planning systems (Waterhout, 2008), to the theoretical references of spatial planning in Europe (Newman & Thornley, 2002; Faludi, 2014); (Atkinson, 2001); (Servillo, 2010) or on strategic planning (Albrechts, Kunzmann, & Healey, 2003)), policy integration and governance (Camagni & Capello, 2013); (Schout & Jordan, 2007); (Stead & Meijers, 2009)). Especially in the context of the European Union the debate in the scientific community has been a relevant promoter of policy and institutional reforms for territorial policy and planning in European institution and its programmes. Especially the scholars of northern Europe, the Netherlands for examples, have inspired, and adjusted trough disciplinary debates some of the decisions of the Commission or the institutions of the Union.
II. III. 1 Non Disciplinary Contributions on IGOs and Cities

The last part of the literature review focuses on some contributions not necessarily related to planning studies that however faced the topic of interest of this study. The first contribution by M. Cohen was published in the Journal of Urban development and Capabilities in (2014). The contribution comes from a research sector related to international affairs and deals with cities and MDGs. The article proposes a typical approach of international agencies, proposing a reflection on urbanization, its genesis and trends, followed by a section dealing with economic values of cities to put into contrast with the other section on urban poverty. The author then presents the way in which the MDGs were conceived, underlining the criticalities of the Goals and their targets, especially with respect to Goal 7 target 11. The section dealing with “planning for achieving the target” focuses on political science implications related to the slum upgrading (i.e. land tenure, occupancy rights, employment and subsidies) and physical improvement demonstrating a little consideration of spatial transformations to be able to trigger much greater processes of transformation.

Another important argument introduced by the author relates to MDGs achievement and progress made for its achievement, the figures are just partially satisfactory: while the 2012 MDG Report affirms that the share of global population living in slums is declining from 39% in 2000 to 32% in 2012, the absolute number of people living in slums has increased from 1990 to 2012 of some 130 million people.

However the importance of Cohen’s contribution is not limited to this, mainly proposing a different perspective on urban MDGs to what has been discussed above in the urban studies related literature, in fact the author provides some elements for considering the new set of goals and targets for the Post-2015 Development Agenda, the policy effort that is involving the UN its MS, NGOs and civil society over the last four years. To date, planning literature – in the reviewed journals, has not proposed a reflection on the new season of agreements to guide development from 2015 to 2030. Indeed the five approaches to new urban targets proposed by Cohen derives from an international affairs perspective, and therefore focuses more on development indicators rather than on urban form, housing and infrastructure, etc. This approach seems to collide with the limitations argued by Sattertwaite related to the traditional forms of development assistance.

Towards the end Cohen proposes approaches related to income and employment targets, rent to income indicators and urban economy parameters. The current work of the high level group of experts and the high level political forum on SDG have proposed targets very much in line with this approach; especially for what concerns SDG 11a,b,c.
A second contribution coming from another discipline (public administration) is the one of Tosics and Dukes (2005). The contribution explores the role of public administration competences and powers, governance structures and capacities, and policy formulation mandate – especially considering devolution and decentralization, to address urban development programmes. The article also deals with the restructuring of intergovernmental relationship that opened the possibility of exchanges between different governmental levels. This aspect is particularly evident in the process of European integration and in the emergence of the subsidiarity principle. These elements build a relation with three articles previously considered: the first, related to meeting the MDGs and the requirement of changes in urban management; the second related to institutional settings; and the third related to the inclusion of local authorities in climate change agreements. An important argument by Tosics and Dukes relates to the role of national urban policy frameworks and therefore to the actual salience of specific policy topics in the national debate on cities. The linkages between politics, government priorities and urban development determines much of the capacity and interest to develop public-public partnerships (horizontal and vertical integration and coordination of public authorities, bodies, and financing institutions) and design urban development programmes.

A final contribution should be considered, not only to be more complete in the argumentation, but also to report a disciplinary position in favour of planning care to intergovernmental affairs. K. Christensen published in (1999) a book dealing with “Cities and Complexity” not referring to complexity theory of cities – i.e. Batty, (2005), but rather to the intricate and overlapping layers of governments, questioning the effectiveness of planning – a practice clearly dependent on institutional arrangements also as it has been previously noted, within complex institutional settings. The book title also continues with “Making Intergovernmental Decisions” referring to the focus of the analysis on the role of the constant flux of intergovernmental activities and the role of these for a place-based policymaking. The book further explains the linkages between planning and institutions and the eventual competition that emerges in policy initiatives by specialized and sector based agencies. The argument is particularly relevant as it touches upon three several elements that have been previously presented on policy coordination. Christensen questions the opportunity to develop sector versus place-based policies, whereas sectorial ones are the one developed by ad hoc institutions – i.e. those on climate protection resilience or housing, and place-based are those conceived in a more integrated manner with the coordination of multiple actors and government sectors. The position of the author was not too complete in the argumentation of the latter dilemma and Campbell review of the book ( (2001)) does surface the issue.
II. IV Comment

The literature review returned a number of important issues to understand the linkages between intergovernmental organizations and urban planning.

As first element it is possible to categorize the reviewed contributions into four typologies: first – topical contribution one and two, analyse the urban implications of intergovernmental agreements (Roy, 2008; Satterthwaite, 2005 and 2008, also including the section on institutionalism) and propose fields of action and changes to improve the achievement of these agreements; a second type – the third topical contribution, carefully analysing negotiation patterns of IGO agreement with respect to the role of cities as actor and field of intervention (Lefebvre, 2012); a third type – the fourth contribution, proposing a planning/urban studies to IGO knowledge transfer to innovate intergovernmental responses to unmet needs; and fifth – the last contribution instead, in the form of a brief informs and update journal readers on the latest decision taking place in an IGO.

The typologies contribute in a different way to the exchanges between the planning community and IGOs, but all are relevant to consolidate the brick between these two domains.

The linkages between the domains appear to be established but the topics seem to be less frequent in the literature with respect to other domain themes. In addition, in conjunction with specific events and agreements occurred in the intergovernmental debate the number of contributions – either more informational after the agreement or more related to knowledge transfer for the preparation of the agreement, does not necessarily increase confirming that the specific attention of planning and urban studies to the content of the documents is not strictly useful to planning theory and practice, as hinted by Roy.

Furthermore some journals give very partial attention to content of the debate of IGOs (i.e. on sustainable urban development and related matters), the Journal of Urban Economics returned over the reviewed years only seven articles related to sustainability, policy coordination or climate change. On the contrary, more topic oriented journals i.e. Environment and Urbanization, not only publish more frequently such kind of contributions but also frequently publish editorials or special issues related to IGO activities. It is however important to recall the initial argument related to the strong planning responsiveness to the more technical debate related to sustainable development (Wheeler, Beatley etc.), the key priority of IGOs, while from the review a lower attention emerge towards intergovernmental organization agreements in particular.
Another consideration based on Journals and the rationale of their selection can be done. With respect to the first set (Journal of Urban Economics and IJURR) selected on the basis of impact factor it results that most cited journals are only partially responsive to IGOs. The Journal of Urban Economics published no article directly reasoning on IGO agreement and only seven related to the matters discussed at intergovernmental level. The IJURR instead hosted a topical contribution (the fourth by Brown, 2013) and some 30 articles on matters related to IGO agenda. The second set, identified for its regional scope (JAPA and Planning Theory and Practice) confirmed the relevance of the topic. Much of Planning Theory and Practice is related to the debate in the European Union, but two of the topical article were published, the one on MDGs and the one on the Territorial agenda. However, most of the topical articles and contributions in general come from Environment and Urbanization, confirming the specific attention of ad hoc journals, attention that not too often emerges in other disciplinary publishers.

As critical review of the selected sources it emerges that planning and urban studies are not necessarily concerned by IGO agreements in their formulation. No disciplinary contribution was found on the preparation of the new season of agreements, as in fact much of the input comes from political affairs, international relations and public administration scholars. This might sound like a missed opportunity considering the bright analysis by Satterthwaite in the identification of current limitation to the implementation of IGO agenda in urban areas, but also that the new set of input (as reported in Cohen article) do not propose a substantially innovated approach. The attention of disciplinary debate to cities diplomacy is limited to Lefebvre contribution, which however demonstrates the relevance of the double level of involvement of planning: the one on content related issues (i.e. the technical aspects of urban sustainability and the measures to address it, as the first argument of this review), and the other on negotiation and institutional settings. This confirms some part of Roy position on the little relevance of IGO agreements for planning.

However the brick that was earlier taken into the discussion between planning and IGOs, looks now more evident: the mutual tendency of the two domains is identified in the concept of salience, which is a mutual interest and concerns. Planning in fact identifies in IGO agreements as an occasion to renew its paradigms and practices introducing new themes; on the other IGOs and institutions find in planning a public policy tool to implement – with a place-based and integrated tool, their agreements and provisions.

Once the portrait of the planning debate on IGOs has been built, the focus of the next section is oriented to the content of intergovernmental debate on cities.
III. The content of international debate on sustainable urban development

Since the first decade of the XXI century the majority of world population lives in cities. (UNDESA, 2014) reports 54% of global population to live in cities (2014). It is important to recall that urbanization and agglomeration processes, through their spatial dimension, generate economic and social benefits, innovation and societal progress; these features support the concept of cities as engines of economic growth (World Bank).

Urban development has reached the international debate in the 1980s (considering the report “Our Common Future”, (1987), as the follow-up to the UN Conference on the Human Environment). The contribution of urban growth to achieve sustainable development is critical (UNECE, 2012).

Urban dynamics, in fact, touches all the four areas of sustainability, including culture -urban governance as additional pillar to the traditional three (social, economic and environmental). In addition, the spatial and physical dimension of urban structures, are rather rigid and characterized by long lifecycles. This put the stake of decision makers on sustainability of cities, and also on the opportunities for building sustainable human settlements (United Nations, 2012). The latter also recognise that the building of a “green” city is equivalent to the building of sustainability (Beatley, 2012).

It is important to note that the opportunity to effectively make the best use of urban development trends is often put at risk by several factors. A first element resides in the complexity of these processes, and their mutual linkages; the second, and probably most important, concerns the capability of urban governance to adequately cope with and respond to these challenges.

In 1991, the Sustainable Cities Programme (UNCHS) provided a first definition of sustainable city as “where achievements in social, economic and physical development are made to last” (United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2002). If definition was fully in line with the Brundtland Commission definition of sustainable development, it is unresponsive to the need of limiting the environmental footprint of human settlements.

The preparation of Rio Conference on Environment and Development in 1992, promoted the reflection and analysis of urban conditions. UN GA resolution (A/RES/66/288, 2012), better known as Rio Declaration, has marked with a specific section the role of cities and human settlements. Points 134 to 137 of the Declaration are dedicated to the principles of urban sustainability.
sustainability in accordance with the three pillars of sustainable development. With the role of indicating the long term strategy, the Declaration, provided MSs with no action oriented materials; Agenda 21 too, did not explained how the principles of sustainable cities could be translated into measures. The Agenda instead, achieved positive results engaging local authorities and citizens to build awareness on the outcome of Rio Conference.

In the second part of the 1990s nations reported on the progress towards achieving more sustainable cities in the occasion of Habitat II Conference (UN Conference on Human Settlements), held in Istanbul in 1996. The conference also adopted the Habitat Agenda that still did not included climate change as one of the threats for cities (United Nations, 1997).

The most recent events (World Urban Forum 2002, World Summit on Sustainable Development 2002, and Rio+20) have consolidated a framework for the achievement of sustainable cities. The framework is structured around four thematic pillars: social development, economic development, environmental management and urban governance. This structure is the outcome of the experience built at national level, where the role of urban governance, and planning, demonstrated the need of mobilizing and integrating multi-sectorial knowledge and tools.

Figure 5 UNDESA Pillars for Sustainable Cities

The four pillars are composed by a number of core sub-themes to address more specific domains for action.

Social development pillar is achieved with the integration of measures to promote education and health, food and nutrition, green housing and buildings, water and sanitation, green public
transportation, green energy access and recreation areas and community support. Economic
development is to be built with the integration of: green productive growth, creation of decent
employment, production and distribution of renewable energy and R&D. Environmental
management should take into account: forests and soil management, waste and recycling,
energy efficiency, water management, air quality conservation, adaptation to and mitigation
of climate change. The last pillar, urban governance, is meant to conceive the tools to
translate the principles into effective actions through: planning and decentralization, reduction
of inequalities, strengthening of civil and political rights, and the support of local national
regional and global links (multilevel governance).
Urban planning is a very wide field of theories and practices. The traditional birth of planning dates back to the XIX century, in response to the unhealthy and unsafe human settlements conditions generated by the rapid growth of industrial cities, especially in Europe. Effectiveness, over time, of statutory systems has been put into question (Healey P., 2009) for at least two main reasons. First, rigid systems proved to be only partially able to respond and capable to adapt to urban dynamics. Second, the governance of these latter processes became dominant over the traditional responses provided by planning documents.

Urban planning, and its traditional tool, the plan is a specific type of public activity to regulate, address and coordinate the transformations of a given territory (Moroni, 1999). Traditionally, urban planning practices, especially in some parts of the world, were based on statutory documents (the city plan) to address simultaneously mid-term development provisions, and procedures to manage urban transformations. Planning systems may considerably vary across countries, being strongly related to the States’ organization, levels of power and degree of decentralization.

Urban plans are regulatory instruments and consist of public acts regulating behaviours for the use and transformation of land. Decisions dealing with land-use are intrinsically conflictual (Forester, 1987). Contemporary city making often requires procedures and instruments that city plans do not manage at their best. The increasing need of flexibility in planning documents and the opening to discretionary planning systems has surfaced a governance and policy dimension of planning. The complexity accompanying the territorial development process has reduced the urban plan to one among many tools to be deployed.

In addition, the focus of planning moved towards a territorial development approach, in which the process of governing a territory was conceived as the action-oriented interaction among groups of stakeholders (including social groups, institutions, and economic forces) to address a collective problem (Magnaghi, 1981). This dimension, reminding that territorial development decisions cannot be reduced to planning acts (the plan), required a much stronger integration, interaction and coordination between the state (and its level of powers), society (involving stakeholders participation in the decision making process) and the public administration (as coordinator of the planning process) (Palermo, 2009).

---

5 Lack of urban infrastructures (i.e. sewages)
6 Built-up patterns were often prone to fires
According to this evolution it might be possible to propose the classification of three tendencies of recent panning: governance, urban policy and spatial planning. The three tendencies disclose an evolutionary path of planning (Marcuse, 2011) from a technocratic discipline able to enforce its provisions, towards a more complex collective process of interaction and mutual adjustment of interests and expectations to frame a territorial development strategy to be implemented with increasingly complex and integrated tools and with the use of supra-national funding programmes.

III. I. II. I Governance

The first element considers the paradigm shift from planning tools to decision making. Traditional planning most often relied on the plan, that was an evidently rigid tool, to control and address urban dynamics. A new path emerged in the last two decades introduces a grater attention to the patterns of interactions among the actors involved in the processes of territorial transformations. Governance is defined as a process of coordinating actors, social groups, and institutions to attain particular goals, discussed and defined collectively in fragmented, uncertain environments (Le Galès P., 1998). Thus, governance relates to all the institutions, networks, directives, regulations, norms, political and social usages, and public and private actors that contribute to the stability of a society and of a political regime, to its orientation, to its capacity to direct, and to its capacity to provide services and ensure its own legitimacy (Le Galès P., 2011). This new scenario, builds on the recognition that regulation alone is not adequate to guiding collective decisions regarding urban land use (Mazza, 2004), taking into account the frequent risk of regulator capture by particular interests and more generally the inefficacy of public intervention (Ponzini, 2008). It appears that the attempt to respond to planning difficulties has also opened to a set of elements related to the decision-making process. The process becomes the moment in which stakeholders (of different types) interact within a specific institutional setting deploying their resources to achieve their interests and goals. Public authorities therefore are called to manage a dense network of actors and stakeholders (i.e. civil society organizations, economic groups, etc.,) to conceive shared mid-term territorial/spatial strategies; the strategy will guide the development of the territory or city with non-binding provisions. The need to coordinate strategies and take cooperative decisions across the different levels of public power has posed institutional challenges, while governance responses stress the institutional architecture of administrations (Palermo, 2009).
Le Galès (1998) has pointed out a critical area for the relation between territorial governance and public authorities. Institutions are in fact characterized by a degree of integration that a context is able to generate and provide. That is related both to capability to include multiple stakeholders (internal integration) and to the capacity to represent and defend the agreed strategy when this is challenged (external integration).

These features are particularly relevant for at least two reasons. On the one hand (internal integration) in fact the public authority shall grant that the planning process includes adequate representation of citizen proposing balanced decision outcomes (Le Galès, ibid.). On the other (external integration), the public authority shall also grant that the outcomes are pursuing the public interest reporting to citizens for its accountability (Palermo, ibid.).

This dimension intertwining decision making and planning has put a great emphasis on the conflicts that might rise (between stakeholders or against the decision making process itself). Given this governance framework, planning overcomes its traditional area of work, and enter into a more process related field. Accordingly, it is believed, that the wide participation for the construction of shared visions coupled with the coordination of public authorities at its various level, is more effective to grant an actual implementation of planning decisions.

III. I. II. II Urban policy

A second element of improvement in planning practice comes along with the innovation in the planning tools, and consists of the design of urban policies.

The roots of change grow once again from limitation of traditional tools: this time put into question not due to their rigidity but for their narrow and sectorial responses to complex urban challenges.

Public policies are complex programmes and decision chains addressing the solution of an unrealized need, value or opportunity, which may be attained through public action and tend to cope with a collective problem by designing integrated, multi-sectorial and multi-tool programmes (Dunn, 1993); (Palermo, 2009) and (2004); (Dente, 2014); (Rein & Schön, 1993)).

Urban policies, accordingly, deal with a fairly wide range of issues, including: land use, transport, housing, health, and most of all investment programmes etc.

Such policies shall be framed in a context where the devolution of powers to local administration has been growing over the last decades (Kazepov, 2008).
The relation between policies and planning is prone to two considerations: the first focusing on the relations between plans and territorial strategies, and it considers the (strategic) plan as the catalyst of a territorial vision; the second instead, might suggest the role of planning as one of the instruments in the policy toolkit of public authorities. In fact, taking note that urban plans remain the key (statutory) acts and point of reference in most countries (UNECE, 2013), it might be noted that since the 1990s several countries introduced strategic planning and spatial strategies (Albrechts, Kunzmann, & Healey, 2003). Strategic planning followed three main directions: the first one considered the institutionalization of the strategic dimension of planning, thus oriented at legitimizing planning activity, as an opportunity for the implementation of plans and projects; the second, a communicative and discursive approach to improve performance in planning; and lastly, a process-related tendency, focused on the inclusion of society and emergent citizenship (Salet, 2000); (Sartorio, 2005).

Strategic planning therefore selects those key opportunities emerging from a territorial context and gathers momentum and partnership to effectively address its solutions with a multi-sectorial programme. Indeed, the process of spatial strategy formulation and decision-making is a complex path. The interaction among different actors (managing and influencing a wide set of resource typologies, with goals that often do not necessarily converge) for planning related decisions often triggers conflicts for the intrinsic competition rise in the use of space, the distribution/re-distribution of economic and symbolic values, the generation of externalities, the inclusion and exclusion (or marginalization of needs expressed by minorities) of stakeholders and decisional input, and to the asymmetric relation of powers (Dente, 2014), (Healey P., 2009).

The implementation of such strategies (that shall involve spatial-physical transformations, socio-economic programmes etc.,) is demanded to public programmes (policies). It seems to emerge that the urban plan can be the point of connection between the emerging collective vision for the development of a city or territory (the strategy), and the related programmes of action.

This consideration leads to the second argument. In a policy tools approach, planning in fact can be used as tool to implement complex public programmes such as a “compact city policy” (OECD, 2012). Planning, in this perspective deploys its tools, i.e. building codes, land-use provisions etc., to support the achievement of a broad goal that often mobilize resources and actors at different government hierarchies, and that requires the coordination of multiple sectors of the government to become effective. Moving the focus on urban policies (d’Albergo, 2010) has proposed a classification of the governments’ degree of commitment towards urban policies, and it was noted that, by tradition, countries in the European Union, proved to be more responsive on the matter. The author reflects upon two main pillars: the
institutional implications of urban policies (in four EU countries) and the behaviour in the policy framing (problem-setting).

**Figure 6 Topology of National Urban Policies**
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D’Albergo, 2010

The degree of intensity of public guidance to shape cities and the process for their transformation is considerably variable (Ben-Joseph & Szodt, 2005). Similarly, in the field of urban policies, the degree of intensity and the level of political attention generated fairly different policy responses. According to d’Albergo (*ibid.*), it is possible to detect four types of urban policy categories. The first, in which the highest involvement and commitment of the government is disclosed, are area-based programmes. Those are spatially explicit, having a very clear spatial focus, and addressing an explicit urban challenge (i.e. area based programmes). The second consists of mainstream policies, in which it is still evident the explicit urban challenge, but the specific spatial reference faints. In both these two cases the government designs policy responses without including in the decision-making international and intergovernmental actors. Instead, indirect policies, aims at providing local actors with adequate resources (political, financial, cognitive etc.,) to prepare policy directly at local level.

Territorial policy tradition dates back to the 1960s with the attempt to manage demand conditions in less performing regions. These policies were often distributive, or partially re-
distributive financial policies transferring resources to regional institutions funding the development programmes. Since the 1970s given the strong political and economic transformation in most countries, resulting in serious budget constraints, territorial policies shifted towards a supply condition, in which the production cost and labour conditions were favoured with subsidies and tax-brakes so to allow the attraction of private investment and stimulate firms’ locational choices. Since the 1980s, instead, given the limited capacity to reduce path dependency underperformance of several states’ regions, policies steered towards competitiveness, thus promoting territorial growth with instrument that have broader scope and coordinating financial resources coming from different sources, i.e. the European Structural Fund (OECD, 2010). More recently, the key drivers of territorial development policies are specialization (also smart-specialization), concentration of skills and education, SMEs networks and innovative business incubation.

Urban policies, therefore, configure as public tools that integrate different powers and sectors of the public authority to respond to emerging complex challenges. It follows that, as most of global population lives in cities and also national GDP is concentrated and spent in cities, the field of urban policies, with the urban planning (either limited to its tool or with coordination purposes) substantially contributes to the design of such complex programmes.

III. I. II. IIII Spatial planning

This last tendency, might to some extent and according to some scholars (Stead & Meijers, 2009); (Palermo, 2009)), be considered as a converging path of the other two mentioned above.

Spatial planning, in fact, is largely a public sector function to influence the future spatial distribution of activities. It aims to create a more rational territorial organization of land uses and the linkages between them, to balance demands for development with the need to protect the environment, and to achieve social and economic objectives (UNECE, 2008). Spatial planning, consequently, addresses the problems of coordination or integration of the spatial dimension of sectoral policies (Cullingworth & Nadin, 2006); (Palermo & Ponzini, 2010)).

Spatial planning configures itself as a fairly wide field of study, practice and also institutional settings. The ambition is to coordinate sectoral policies with converging spatial focus, deploying a set of tools and decision-making chains for territorial development.

Given this framework, it clearly emerges the relations between the governance and decision-making implication and the integrated-tool nature (policy) of most recent planning practices.
These systemic innovations are also accompanied by the introduction of new themes such as the sustainability and inclusiveness of urban development.

Accordingly it also seems to take place paradigm shift: territorial and urban development, apparently overcomes the most traditional concerns of urban plans (that in several countries and for several decades were limited to formal provision regarding the norms of transformations, i.e. building codes and land-use provisions) and reframes part of the discipline into tools, while increasingly paying its attention and efforts on the way in which future-oriented spatial provisions are conceived and implemented (governance and policies).

The spatial planning framework is accompanied by the need of adequate institutional settings that promote multilevel-governance and subsidiarity. Indeed spatial planning, in its territorial development component, serves as framework for the strategic allocation of programmes funding within and across countries (i.e. EU territorial cohesion).
III. II Urban planning in the face of International Organizations

The three tendencies introduced above build the link between the evolutions of planning/territorial development practices and the increased importance that IGOs pay on planning.

Several IGOs in fact have specific competences in the development, policy and governance fields. These competences are usually recognised in the IGOs’ mandate that define the type of activities (advisory, policy dialogue, norms setting, treaty and agreement negotiations etc.,) that the specific Organization can address. The degree of competences and enforcement capacity is considerably variable. Most of these organizations act under the principles of intergovernmentalism (Garrett & Tsebelis, 2001) and therefore might have limited binding/enforcing powers with respect to sovereignty and authority of national states.

For example most public policies, are part of the world of overlapping powers within the global and regional (such as European) governance in the making: municipalities, metropolitan authorities, regions sometimes, federal states or autonomies, the nation state, the EU and sometimes the OECD urban group, the UN (Habitat Summit) with international rules comprising environmental norms, can all play a role in urban policies (Le Galès P., 2011).

Le Galès (ibid.) reports an endless number of urban and territorial polices being shaped at international level. This reflects the relevance of commitment taken by the international communities on programmatic and long term-strategic agreements. Accordingly, the stake of decisions included in international agreements described earlier, do play a substantial role for the future of urban policy and territorial development trends, as those will set the principles of national policy alignment/convergence. IGOs in synthesis prove to be effective in the broad patterns of interaction states build to overcome the trade-offs between interdependencies and co-operative behaviour and interdependence costs of autonomous action (Ruggie, 1998).

By consequence, the room of intergovernmental co-ordination is rooted in the trans-boundary policy interdependence, and most of all in the externalities produced by national policies and behaviour, for example with regards to environmental impacts.

What is more, the achievement of global targets (i.e. SDG 11: make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable) goes hand in hand with national policy commitments. This nexus is strongly rooted in the subsidiarization of public policies (Kazepov, 2008); the Treaty of the European Union, C 326/15 –principle 4) and in the nature of the level of challenges to be addressed. Individual and un-coordinated actions in the field of climate change would deliver limited and unfair payoffs to individual states. The capacity of sub-national governments to make the right investments and deliver public services for both growth and inclusion remains a core issue in development efforts (OECD, 2009),
(2011)). Other than the challenges of policy co-ordination within and among states, a relevant point of concern (Stead & de Jong, 2009)) considers the possibility of policy transfer across countries.

The next section introduces planning related debate under the auspices of IGOs. Each Organization, according to its structure and scope, addresses urban policy, governance and spatial planning in different ways. The list below considers the following IGOs and specific approach: World Bank Group –urban development, OECD –policy analysis, UNECE –spatial planning, European Commission –spatial planning/territorial cohesion.

III. II. 1 World Bank

The World Bank (Group) is an intergovernmental institution that provides financial and technical assistance to its members and developing countries, its main goal are to eliminate extreme poverty ($1.25 a day threshold), and to improve the prosperity of the disadvantaged groups in its MS. The Bank was established in 1944 and has 188 MSs and 6 regional units. Furthermore, a major role of the Bank is to assist member states with policy advice, thematic studies, research and analysis in the more than 40 sectors. These also include treasury, development finance and trade, energy, agriculture and social protection.

The Bank has a specific section to deal with urban development which activities are mostly concerned with sustainable urban development and urbanization, urban resilience, planning and financing sustainable cities. The Bank has reported that cities account for 80% of global GDP, 70% of GHGs. The work of the Bank on urban related issues includes especially studies on spatial development (i.e. urban growth and urbanization reviews) and urban finance.

Recently (2013) the Bank has released the report Planning Connecting & Financing Cities Now, the work includes an urbanization policy framework and also an analysis of planning focusing on three main elements: land-use and urban infrastructures, connecting cities, financing urban development.

It emerges that the inefficient allocation (non best-use) and exchange of urban land fairly reduces advantages and spillover of agglomeration economies and benefits of proximity. For economic efficiency, in fact, land should be able to shift among various uses -though public intervention may be required to offset market failures (Vernon & Gun Wang, 2007) and allow adequate social mobility (Park, Burgess, & McKenzie, 1925). This issue is particularly relevant in developing countries where property values records are often not present
(infrastructural or systemic limitations), or do not reflect the actual land price (informal market transactions).

In strong relation with the latter, it is important to consider the asset value of urban infrastructures in the shaping and developing of urban areas. This element opens a deadlock: urban infrastructures are fix assets with long life-cycle; these typically survive for more than 100 years -buildings and housing from 20 to 150 years, transport infrastructure from 30 to 200 years (Hallegatte, 2009). By contrast, the demand of such assets and facilities changes over time. What is more, infrastructure will determine how the city’s land can be used and reused, dictating whether the urban economy can take full advantage of agglomeration and can contribute to social equity and environment sustainability (WB, 2013). Planning tools, however can manage the distribution of building/population density and consequently address the demand of such infrastructures (either energy grids, hierarchy of transport networks, etc.), but also the physical setting of the town, by acting on building-codes and on the allocation of building rights. The capacity of planning to deploy such tools should also address the social construction of cities by understanding that urban spaces are particular enough to embed a commodity value and a sense of place that shape the life and experiences of urban dwellers (Logan & Molotch, 1987).

The second item considers the degree of systemic connection cities develop within and among themselves managing the advantages deriving from scale economies (internal connectivity), and network of cities and specialization (external).

Cities function as nests of innovation (Vicari Haddock, 2004) and are the economic cores of countries providing at least three typologies of benefits in the agglomeration, urbanization and location economics fields (Camagni, 1998), including the opportunity to experience the urban dense fix social capital, the synergic spin-off, the concentration of public goods and services, specialization, and most of all, spatial proximity. What is more a high degree of urban connectivity, still internal and external, allows more specific benefits. Internal connectivity, boosted by efficient and well functioning urban transport systems and adequate spatial organization of the urban settlement, promotes the reduction of firms’ costs (i.e. transport) and the densification of market areas. External connectivity, instead relates to the assets a city can value in the scenario of globalized economy competition, and it is based on the degree of integration the city achieve with the world economy (Friedmann, 1986)). The importance of systemic connection of cities is further rooted into the restructuring strategies of territorial development, emerging from the urbanization of neoliberalism (Brenner & Theodore, 2002)), that exposed cities to global competitive forces, fragmented national-state economies and inter-local policy transfers.

The third element is expressed as the need to catalyse the urban development investments and financing partnerships. The point of concern considers the gap between investment capacities
of local and public authorities and the financial resources needed for the implementation of policy and programmes to address urban development.

Figure 7 Mismatch Between Capital Needs and Budget Resources of City Governments

![Diagram of capital needs and budget resources](image)

Fig. 3.1 p.68 in Planning Connecting and Financing Cities Now, The World Bank, 2013

Investments in the built environment and in the secondary circuit of capital (Harvey, 1978) require high economical resources for the construction, operation and management of the stock. Since the 1970s the restructuring of welfare state principles and the retrenchment of public finance has exposed local authorities, to which competences were increasingly devolved, to fiscal austerity and serious caused limitations in the public provision of services (Brenner & Theodore, Cities and the Geographies of “Actually Existing Neoliberalism”, 2002).

These heavy restructuring have also evolved in privatization and contracting of municipal services (water supply, sanitation treatment, and waste management among others) and paved the way for the creation of new markets for the service delivery ad infrastructure management. The Bank has explored the possibilities that currently local authorities in developed and developing countries might chose to implement urbanization and infrastructure financing. A first set of alternatives is offered by the loan sector. In this field, local authorities or national governments issue bonds or borrow money applying to wide number of public and international financial institutions (including the World Bank itself, and regional development banks, i.e. the Asian Development Bank, or national funds for development i.e. the Norwegian Investment Fund for Developing Countries). This path requires a sufficient level of trustworthiness and securization of local tax cash flows (as loan guarantees).

The second set of alternatives, that has been increasingly used, is the integration of public and private capitals trough public-private partnerships. The issues related to these new forms of co-operation are numerous and serious. PPPs in fact represent a good opportunity to improve
the efficiency of infrastructure operation, but require clear and consistent rules for an adequate distribution of risk and competences among the parties. The degree of private sector risk and involvement generates different typologies of PPP; usually the categorization criteria are based on four principles: design, build, finance and operation/concession. The ease in which cities attract private investment lay in the creditworthiness principle (especially for developing countries were the solvency and liability/accountability of public bodies and officials might be little known).

These three components, land-use, systemic urban connectivity and financial capacity have been used by the Bank to introduce a framework for urbanization policy.

Figure 8 Urbanization Policy Framework by the World Bank

The model builds on the three pillars and put in relation three type of actions: valuing, coordinating and levering. Probably a meaningful interpretation of the matrix should consider the horizontal linkages (based on actions and programmes) rather than on the vertical themes and field/chains of action. Accordingly, the governance and public policy dimension of the planning process seem to emerge clearly. First the decision-making process builds on the strengths of the concerned context analysing the urban settings in terms of land-use and city structure (the strengths and strategic elements of development), second the level of integration and territorial competitiveness is assessed (to understand the scope and potential impact of the planning decision). The economic feasibility is addressed by gathering momentum and partnership around the local excellences and creditworthiness to attract investment.
The second layer, calls for the co-ordination of the different decisional input, stakeholders and resource mobilization. It is rather important to point out how attached to the territorial dimension the coordination is called to be. The final step consists of managing the opportunity cost of alternative solutions, by understanding which development strategy shall be mostly economically viable, socially desired and financially implementable. In support to these framework activities, the Bank also collects urban development related data.

Recently the urban section of the Bank has developed a number of technology related recommendations for improving efficiency and effectiveness of MSs’ urban and economic governance and policy. Thanks to these technological platforms and datasets it was developed a global urban expansion (1990-2000) comprising 120 city samples to monitor key urbanization indicators such as: population, built-up, density, compactness and others. The Bank is also leading a global partnership, the GFDRR (Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction) that provides technical and financial assistance to governments to improve resilience of territories. As part of these activities a series of studies and recommendations driven by geospatial technology and urban science based studies provided several estimates of asset exposures to disasters in several countries of Central America.

In conclusion, the guidance role of the World Bank Group in the matter of sustainable urban development has provided governments with a framework to conceive urban development policies. Even if the reference is mostly targeted to developing countries, in which cities are expanding (rapidly), there are some elements, especially those concerning the linkages between coordination of land policy choices and financing opportunities, useful to most planning systems.
European Union with the adoption of Maastricht Treaties in 1993 reinforced the regional dimension of its policies, also empowering the Union to undertake certain measures in the field of urban and regional planning. However, urban and territorial planning matters still remain national competences. The Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy supports Member States on regional and territorial development related matters. Differences in the planning systems of MSs are evident, while common framework documents, including the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP), have been adopted to address common challenges. Territorial impacts of sectorial policies have become more evident than in the past. Currently several organizations, including the Commission, its DGs and International Organizations including OECD, provide guidance and advisory to Governments supporting the transition to an integrated approach to policy making. Linkages between economic, environmental and social aspects become key components to achieve a balanced and inclusive development for cities and regions.

The need of integrated and coordinated policy responses become even more evident when the attention of the Commission moved to cohesion concerns. Environmental sustainability and the balanced territorial development in the Union require a multi-level and co-operative approach. The Commission introduced in 1999 the European Spatial Development Perspective with the objective of defining at the Union level objectives and general principles of spatial development to ensure the sustainable balanced development of the European territory (European Commission, 1999).

The process towards the ESDP started in 1988 when Ministers with mandate on urban and spatial planning met in Nantes. At that time the Community had a fairly different institutional architecture and geographic coverage. The 11 years lasting process is rooted in the nature of international agreement and negotiated document. Ministers of the 15 MSs in fact adopted the ESDP in 1999.

The ESDP is a non-binding document. It proposes a common reference for European planners, regional authorities and policymakers for designing in a coherent way policies with spatial impacts. A primary attention, hence, is paid to explain how European policies and directives could shape the territory and regions; the second parts contains 13 policy aims, and 60 policy options for a sustainable inclusive and balanced development across the region. A chapter also deal with the ESDP application to the EU enlargement process.

---

7 Including: the role of Trans-European Network, European Structural Fund, competition policies, environmental policies and common agricultural policies.
Spatial planning in Europe is also based on INTERREG III (2000-2006) conceived within the framework of the ESDP to promote higher degrees of territorial integration among regions of Europe.8

A third component of European spatial planning framework of reference is the Territorial Agenda adopted in Leipzig in 2007. The process towards the Agenda begun two years after the adoption of the ESDP and was developed primarily by MSs. The document mostly reaffirms the principles of the ESDP, and the Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities accompanies it. The Charter includes the commitment of MSs to making greater use of integrated urban development policy approaches.

The application of the ESDP should be achieved at two levels: at supranational level, in the forms of international and cross-border cooperation to further strengthen INTERREG initiatives and impacts; and at national level by promoting the application of ESDP principles during the revisions and reforms of planning documents. The efforts aim at promoting convergence both in programmatic aspects of national and local planning decisions therefore promoting a shared vision for the future asset of European territory.

On the contrary, the implementation of the ESDP, is devolved to national Governments and their own and quite different planning systems and tools. European MS have rather country specific planning systems. Differences are mostly rooted in the administrative and institutional architecture, in the distribution (centralization or devolution) of powers at different levels of hierarchy or geography, and for the nature and content of building rights. Increasing attention to spatial planning policy at the European level and increasing transboundary cooperation will inevitably affect the planning mechanisms in member states (Newman, 1996). The divide is notable not only in the administrative procedures but also in the outcomes and effectiveness of planning tools and decisions. The mismatch between territorial processes and the tools meant to regulate and guide them is notable in several countries. The fragmentation of planning practices is a point of concern of DG-Regional Policy that has commissioned the study “Compendium of EU Spatial Planning Systems and Policies” (European Commission, 1997) to take a snapshot of current tendencies and institutions related to planning practices. The Compendium reports that, if MSs have undertaken common strategic programmes to design policies, and a certain convergence of national experiences can be noticed; no significant innovation or examples of formal mechanisms of planning were introduced under EU guidance. Additionally the Commission

---

8 The programme also introduces the concept of performance while addressing the challenges of polycentric spatial development, access to infrastructure and knowledge and wise management of natural and cultural heritage.
established European Spatial Planning Observatory Network (ESPON) to provide support and research background to MSs.

III. II. III OECD

The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development is an IGO promoting at intergovernmental level policies to foster economic development and social well-being. OECD was established in 1961 and has 34 MSs, it is organized into three main structures: a Council (the executive and oversight body), a series of Committees and the Secretariat. The IGO has over 200 Committees, the thematic bodies in which discussions analysis and policy dialogue is established. OECD also has a Public Governance and Territorial Development Directorate that co-ordinates activity in the domain of urban development, territorial cohesion and urban-territorial policy that also include a Territorial Development Policy Committee and an urban working party. OECD work on urban development is considerably characterized by a policy approach. National territorial policy reviews are one of the examples of its activities. The Regional Outlook 2014 reports that policy coherence across levels and sectors of government is still a challenge, and that cross cutting policy challenges are frequently addressed by fragmented, narrowly sectorial responses (OECD, 2014). OECD Ministers endorsed (in the occasion of the Netherlands policy review endorsement) the design of national urban policy framework to address the economic, social and environmental needs and opportunities in cities of all sizes and the need to develop new data, policy and governance tools that enable governments to better fit policies to places, thereby promoting policy action at the relevant scale (OECD, 2014).

The OECD has recently released two reports, the Regional Outlook (2014) and Governing the City (OECD, 2015) reviewing regional governance and public investment practices in its MSs. The IGO has put emphasis on two main issues, the fragmentation of powers and the need of institutions with competence on urban development to improve the capacity to manage financial resources and allocated investments. Territorial policies are managed at states level in considerably heterogeneous ways and according to the governments’ institutional architecture. Territorial policies, in fact can be in the portfolio of the Ministry of economic development (i.e. United Kingdom), internal affairs (i.e. Spain), or those with focus on infrastructure/construction (i.e. Japan), rarely it is found an ad-hoc ministry on regional development. The consequence of this fragmentation is related to specific national approaches to such policies. In addition the wide range of competences
and tools to be used in territorial policy design often requires innovation in the institutional arrangements of states (i.e. cross-ministry committees). The second institutional challenge to effective territorial policy is rooted in the local government fragmentation. The degree of municipal fragmentation and the consequent limited territorial scope and influence of local authorities decisions limits the efficacy of the measures and the capacity to address the underlying and actual territorial problems. In parallel, decisions concerning a specific urban context which dynamics overcome (as in most cases) its administrative boundaries, will determine consequences and outcomes in neighbouring municipalities. Since the 1980s, practitioners and theorists, of traditional planning (aware of such limitations and correlations) already strived to introduce, yet programmatic, and rather general structural plans, to coordinate the planning of adjacent municipalities (Campos Venuti, 2010), (Palermo, 2004)). Since the first decade of the 2000s several countries have adopted municipal reforms acting on the economic, social and political pillars of the states structures.

OECD has consequently identified three common trends of such reforms, the first two examples mostly attain small and medium municipalities, the third focuses on large urban zones. First, in more than 15 countries municipal merges were envisaged to reduce the number of municipalities (resulted in increased territorial scales and population to be managed, but simultaneously has reduced a part of the costs of the administration); second there has been a promotion of inter-municipal co-operation establishing jurisdictional synergies (i.e. shared provision of services and mutual support in investment programmes); third a common tendency address metropolitan governance to respond to the needs of large urban agglomerations.

Out of the last category, OECD has identified 4 models of metropolitan governance that are currently implemented.

**Figure 9 Common Approaches to Metropolitan Governance**

1. **Informal/Soft Co-ordination.** Often found in instances of polycentric urban development, lightly institutionalised platforms for information sharing and consultation are relatively easy both to implement and to undo. They typically lack enforcement tools and their relationship with citizens and other levels of government tends to remain minimal.

2. **Inter-municipal Authorities.** When established for a single purpose, such authorities aim at sharing costs and responsibilities across member municipalities – sometimes with the participation of other levels of government and sectoral organisations. Multi-purpose authorities embrace a defined range of key policies for urban development such as land use, transport and infrastructure.

3. **Supra-municipal Authorities.** An additional layer above municipalities can be introduced either by creating a directly elected metropolitan government or with the upper governments setting down a non-elected metropolitan structure. The extent of municipal involvement and financial capacity often determine the effectiveness of a supra-municipal authority.

4. **Special Status of “metropolitan cities”.** Cities that exceed a legally defined population threshold can be upgraded into a special status as “metropolitan cities”, which puts them on the same footing as the next upper level of government and gives them broader competencies.

Source: OECD (2014), OECD Regional Outlook 2014: Regions and Cities: Where Policies and People Meet,
The models are characterized by different legal status, composition and competences, while 80% of institutionally established metropolitan authorities bodies address urban development and 60% address spatial planning. The first model of territorial governance, that is also the least institutionalized and empowered, consists of informal network of municipalities or soft forms of co-operation; in such situations the interaction among municipalities is limited to exchange and sharing of information. A second typology the inter-municipality authorities, are established to address a single purpose (i.e. local transport). The third, with which the level of institutionalization and related power and enforcement capacity become relevant, are the supra-municipal authorities. These structures might envisage the election of citizens’ representatives or the appointment of public officers from upper governmental levels. Even if supra-municipal authorities seem to have a higher degree of responsibility and room of action, much of their effectiveness is bound to financial resources made available; the role of public financing and international investments is rather relevant for the operational capacity of these authorities. The last model describes the most complete and formal typology of metropolitan governance structure, the metropolitan city. This latter call for a common definition of metropolitan city; so far the attempts to define such territorial entity have been based on population, geographic dimension but also on GDP, building density and transport. OECD (2015) also proposes criteria to define and set metropolitan governance structures, these include 4 dimensions: the geographical scope, the involved actors, the thematic focus and its width. These four dimensions seem to be fully in line and recall the features of territorial policy focus and need, also tackling the governance patterns for successful decision-making.

The second field of OECD’ analysis addresses the need of public administrations that implement urban and territorial policy to improve their capacity to manage investment to mainstream for example the European Union framework of regional policies (territorial cohesion, convergence and integration) and the Structural/European Regional Development Fund.

The opportunity of financing from intergovernmental institution programmes has posed new managerial challenges to local authorities. The additionality principle comprised in several intergovernmental funding programmes asks to local authorities the capability to apply to competitive selection and to mobilize national or stakeholders’ resources to match funding opportunities. OECD member countries employ various mechanisms for strengthening vertical co-ordination across levels of government. These include national strategies with clearly specified goals for public investments, national territorial representatives, nationally funded regional development agencies, formal agreements between levels of government, programs for intergovernmental dialogue and a combination of the above ( (Mizell & Allain-Dupré, 2013); (Barca & McCann, 2012)).
Co-financing of public investment is among the most basic forms of national/sub-national co-ordination (OECD, 2014). This principle reinforces the opportunity of convergence of strategic views across government levels and supports the local implementation of programmes and action to achieve the goals agreed at higher tier of government or even at intergovernmental level. At last, it is important to recall the role of integrity in the procurement process and the accountability of government officers to minimize wasted or underperforming investments.

In conclusion the activities of OECD in the field of sustainable urban development are advocated at strengthening the capacity of policy coordination within and among its MS, exchanging and comparing governance, financing and policy initiatives. OECD has acknowledged (2014) that geo data are responsible of improved policy responses and encourages the production of national and sub-national data to produce evidences for the formulation and to monitor the impacts of investments.

III. II. IV UN-Habitat

UN-Habitat is the UN programme on human settlement rooting its constituency in the series of conferences organized under the auspices of the UN system since 1975 to address at intergovernmental level the challenges of urbanization. The political attention on the topic has grown over time, together with the share of global urban population: under 30% in the 1950s (746M), 46.6% in 2000 (2.85B), reaching 54% (3.96B) in 2015 and forecasted to exceed 2/3rd in 2050 (UNCTAD/DTL/STICT/2014/2, 2015) and (United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2015)).

The Organization is the host of the UN conferences on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development that took place in 1976 in Vancouver –Habitat I, in Istanbul in 1996 –Habitat II, and is currently coordinating the preparation of H III in Quito in 2016. In these conferences MSs adopt the urban agenda to guide and harmonize goals for the sustainable development of their cities.

UN-Habitat has a rather broad mandate, giving the opportunity to address a wide set of matters including: urban governance, urban planning and design, urban economy and housing, and also to engage directly with local authorities. In the past Habitat has prepared policy briefs also dealing with urban patterns for green economy (2012), strategic planning (2010)) and decentralization (2009).
In spring 2015, after a 2 years negotiation and drafting process, UN-Habitat Governing Council has adopted the International Guidelines for Urban and Territorial Planning (IGs-UTP) during H III PrepCom II intergovernmental summit in Nairobi. The compendium serves as framework for improving policies, plans and designs for more compact, socially inclusive, better integrated and connected cities and territories that foster sustainable urban development and are resilient to climate change (United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2015).

The guidelines propose a multi-scale approach taking into account the supra-national and trans-boundary dimension of planning, the implication at national scale, the dimension of city-region and metropolis, but also the city and the neighbourhood level. The definition of urban planning included in the guidelines stresses the dimension of decision-making process, the spatial development scope, the policy tools approach and multilevel governance implication of contemporary planning.

Such broad scope was made possible thanks to a very wide partnership with stakeholders, including not only national governments, but also IGOs (WB, OECD, UNCRD), NGOs (UCLG, ISOCARP) academia, civil society organizations and UN regional offices. The guidelines in the definition and scope section make a clear reference to the role of supranational planning where global strategies of development are agreed. (6.a in HSP/GC/25/2, 2015)

The IG-UTP propose 12 principles that are organized into four pillars; each of the 12 principles is further broken-down into recommendations to national governments to improve co-ordination of policy and objectives, to local authorities to manage in a effective and collaborative way operational planning practices, to civil society organizations to advocate and include plural viewpoints, and to planning professionals association and practitioners to endeavour to promote professional knowledge and best-practices sharing and to support in a provide technical assistance to public and private sector to achieve better planning results (the latter two categories are engaged not in all the principles).

The most relevant impact of the guidelines consist of the future regional adaptation of these principles, especially transferring into national government structures, decision-making patterns and planning systems the capacity to develop enforceable and transparent legal frameworks, sound and flexible urban planning and design, and financial systems for affordability and cost effectiveness (UN-Habitat, 2015).

The first pillar considers the role of urban policy and governance. The pillar is fully in line with the three planning tendencies that have been previously described and synthesize the
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9 Principle 1 a and b:
   a) Urban and Territorial Planning is more than a technical tool; it is an integrative decision-making process that must address competing interests and be linked to a shared vision and an overall development strategy as well as national and local urban policies
   b) Urban Planning represents a core component of the renewed urban governance paradigm which aims at promoting local democracy, participation and inclusion, transparency and accountability with a view to ensuring better
competences of the different levels of government; for example national governments are entrusted to set urban and territorial policy frameworks identifying key priority areas (both area based and topics, to facilitate investment targeting). The second pillar addresses the role of planning in promoting sustainable urban development across the three dimension of sustainability: social development, economic growth and environment that should be managed in a coherent and synergetic way by the government. Planning practices should strive to improve citizens’ living condition, providing adequate infrastructures, safeguarding the environment also improving resilience to disasters, and guarantee adequate inclusiveness of decision chains.

In the third pillar UN-Habitat provides guidance on the components of urban and territorial planning. UN-Habitat in this section further discloses the role of planning as catalyst and coordination framework to conceive and put into systemic convergence public policies with territorial impacts. The second part of the pillar focuses on spatial planning where it is recommended that spatial planning shall be used as flexible “product” (the plans and associated rules and regulations) and “process” (the mechanisms to elaborate, update and implement the plans -36.a in HSP/GC/25/2/Add.6) to conceive participated and collectively-shared territorial development strategies. In this part, where the role of local authorities shall be very operational, it is recommended that plans include a strategic component (scenarios, priorities and phasing), and an executive dimension to manage and regulate development (land-use and infrastructure provisions, morphology and urban forms compendia, but also measures to address the promotion and safeguarding of natural resources and environmental endowments).

The last pillar deals with the implementation of urban and territorial planning. The first concern of UN-Habitat is to assure that adequate institutional conditions and political guidance are built on the matter of planning. Accordingly, a clear public guidance and adequate political leadership is needed to support the efficacy of translation of spatial strategies into effective programmes of action on territorial development matters.

UN-Habitat IGs-UTP provide the most recent and, probably, the first comprehensive example of guidance on urban planning agreed at intergovernmental level. The framework represents an attempt to contain, in a single set of recommendations, the guidance on the three dimension of planning: urban policy (why plan), management process (how to plan), and technical products (what urban and territorial plans tools -10. in HSP/GC/25/2/Add.6). The

Urbanization and spatial quality, environmental sustainability, social and cultural development and economic prosperity.
Habitat Governing Council has just (mid April, 2015) endorsed the guidelines, and therefore it is not at all possible to assess implementation or alignment in MSs.

III. II. V UNECE

UNECE is one of the five ECOSOC Regional Commissions, and it is part of UN Secretariat. UNECE reports to ECOSOC and UN SG and has the capacity to negotiate convention, set standards and propose policy reforms in the fields of: transport, forestry, housing and land, environment, population and also gather regional data in the 5 latter sectors thanks to its statistical division. The Housing and Land Management unit has 5 main areas of work: sustainable housing and real estate markets, sustainable urban development, land administration and country profiles on the housing sector.

**Figure 10 Areas of Work of the ECE Regional Commission of the UN**

In the 2000s in line with the momentum built around spatial planning debate by the European Commission, the UNECE CHLM prepared a compendium of spatial planning principles: Spatial Planning: key instrument for development and effective governance (UNECE, 2008). The opportunity of such contribution was to extend the knowledge exchange and planning policy debate across a large region. UNECE mandate in fact covers 56 MS across North America (US and Canada), Europe28, Switzerland, East Europe, Israel, Caucasus Independent States, Russia, Kazakhstan and Central Asia states, that is mostly all the northern
hemisphere. The focus of the study, commissioned in 2005, was paid to countries in transition, given the attention paid by the European Union in the late 1990s and beginning 2000s on spatial planning matters in its MSs (EU Compendium on Spatial Planning Systems and Policies, 1997; ESDP, 1999; (Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development in the European Continent, 2000). One of the goals was to broaden the geographical scope of spatial planning debate and to transfer the principles of spatial planning to UNECE MSs that were not concerned by other similar studies, and at the same time, urged guidance to speed the reform of their national planning systems after the strong political changes in the early 1990s.

In fact, it was reported that in countries in transition most municipalities have no physical or spatial plans (Tsenkova, 2005), and where plans existed it often occurs that those are not up to date, or do not anticipate the strong urbanization dynamics that these countries are experiencing (UNECE, 2008).

UNECE identified six spatial planning principles, that should lay at the basis of national planning system: democratic principle referring to the linkages between democratic representation and decisions to be taken by elected officials, these shall follow the national procedures and laws for decision-making granting legitimacy of decisions, and when appropriate, take into account recommendations and advisory. Second, subsidiarity principle, stresses the opportunity to take decisions as locally as possible, unless the stake of clearly requires the mobilization of higher level of the government. Third, participation to reaffirm that given the wide impact of planning decisions, these shall be taken not only in line with democratic principles (see above), but also within a wide participatory process allowing the expression of a plurality of viewpoints. Fourth, integration, promoting policy coherence and co-ordination between policy sectors (mutually reinforcing policies; (Stead, Geerlings, & and Meijers, 2004)). Fifth, proportionality, to reinforce that spatial planning authorities shall use flexible tools to address mid-term development patterns, while deploying statutory measures to guarantee the procedural transformations of the built environment. Sixth, precautionary principle, especially applied against climate change, express the need to take decisions responsively as territorial settings last for decades.

The document also includes a section on the system of spatial planning where the different components are described (planning tools, legal framework, decision-making process, spatial strategies, land use regulations, enforcement and environmental and economic assessment). One of these elements pays attention to the evidence and monitoring functions related to planning and territorial development accounting. It has been recognised that the use of data and mapping (geospatial) technologies should be integrated into planning decisions, in addition databases should be established and periodically updated to record the achievement.
of targets set during the planning process, but also to build a knowledge background to build future planning decisions.

In October 2014, the UNECE Committee on Housing and Land Management endorsed the proposal for the preparation the “UNECE Policy Study on Urban Planning” (51. In (ECE/HBP/179, 2014); (ECE/HBP/2014/6, 2014)). The policy study, which preparation is currently on-going, is meant to update the previously issued UNECE guidance document on spatial planning (2008) that happened to be released prior to Rio+20. The current proposal, discussed at the opening meeting of the UNECE Task Group on Urban Planning (in December 2014) considers seven regional priorities (Melchiorri, 2014): a) fundamental services and informal settlements to address the aspects for access to basic services, urban technical infrastructures, the challenges related to slum upgrading and management of informal settlements. b) sustainable accessible and inclusive mobility and transport, to support the design of clean urban transport infrastructure and their operation to improve urban connectivity reducing emissions. c) safe and resilient human settlements, providing guidance on urban planning measures opportunity to reduce deaths, economic losses and affected people as consequence of climate change, urban planning shall play a key role as preventive/precautionary measure to reduce exposure. d) spatial dimension of sustainability, compactness, energy efficiency and climate responsive design, to suggest measures to improve the environmental performance of cities acting on buildings (codes and energy efficiency/performance standards) and on urban forms (urban morphology and design). e) healthy, liveable and inclusive public spaces to promote public space programmes in MS to improve quality of life, outdoor recreation and quality of urban forms (outcome of Vital Public Spaces Workshop, UNECE 2015). f) urban and rural linkages to promote an integrated approach to regional policy capturing transformation and dynamics happening on peri-urban areas and urbanized countryside. g) city governance and regional cooperation, to support intergovernmental exchange of expertise and joint formulation of policy recommendations, foster economic and technical assistance in the field of planning across UNECE MSs.

The policy study complements UNECE Regional Report to HIII conference.

The synthetic review of the activities on sustainable urban development proposed above recaptured some of the guiding and reference document proposed by IGOs to support MSs in national reforms of planning legislation and practices. The objective of these efforts can be resumed into two main families: the first, which targets are developing countries, tends to promote the translation of the operational principles (i.e. allocation of competences, policy design principles, etc.,) into the institutional and planning reforms. These efforts are intended
to set the systemic conditions to develop effective, sound and well functioning territorial
development policy and planning. The second target group is represented by the wide set of
countries in which planning is already institutionalized and part of public policy, but where
efficiency of the system can be improved by promoting improved co-ordination of levels of
power and enhance the institutional capacity of problem setting (Dente, 2014).
In addition, the intergovernmental framework for territorial policy can boost the convergence
of national policies to achieve supra-national targets (i.e. territorial cohesion in the EU, or
sustainable development in a global context).
Furthermore, next to the capacity to support MSs in policy, institutional challenges, and
project implementation, IGOs can host the negotiation of intergovernmental agreements that
set programmatic strategies to which MSs align national policies; this is the case of
UNFCCC, SDGs, Post-2015 framework for DRR and Habitat Agenda.
IV. Programmatic Documents on Sustainable Urban Development

The scope of intergovernmental activities on urban development matters is not limited to the five frameworks presented in the previous sections. Actually other IGOs both promote dialogue and exchange of practices, for example tackling specific themes (i.e. WHO on the health implications in housing cities and human settlements, the UNOCHA on the humanitarian and shelter responses to crisis, etc.,) or support national governments in the implementation of lighthouse projects (i.e. UNDP).

In fact, the domains in which IGOs have mandate are numerous. Just as example the only UN structure includes more than 15 Agencies and Specialized Agencies (i.e. the World Health Organization, the World Bank Group and the Food and Agriculture Organization), and another tenth Department Offices, Subsidiary Bodies, Regional Commissions and related structures.

The polity of International Governmental Organizations as it has been observed already, address national agendas in a wide range of fields; world polity research shows that the effects of the world polity often outweigh the effects of traditional national-level factors and that effects of IGOs on governments grow in power (Beckfield, 2008). The balance of weights between national and intergovernmental bodies is also shifting towards higher levels of decision-making and national governments engagement in intergovernmental polity is growing (Boli & Thomas, 1997).

Beckfield (ibid.) in his 2008 “the Dual World Polity” recognises a number of elements concerning IGOs, their functioning (network analysis) and rituals (procedures) that are indeed relevant as they further explains the underlying principles of intergovernmental guidance on territorial development matters. It is first argued that involvement in world polity affect national policy; second, the predominance of regional organizations (i.e. the EU) strongly shapes the world polity network. Consequently, the patterns of interaction and the ways in which problems are set at the state and political organization levels, shape the actual capacity to build agreement on programmatic documents to be endorsed in multi-party negotiations under the rules of consensus (Raiffa, 2007).

A second point of entry might consider the opportunity to conceive new international policies at intergovernmental level, addressing common good related issues (i.e. environmental and sustainability policy - (Ruggie, 1998)). In these cases especially where sustainability policy is concerned, the shift in perception from external to domestic policy domain should take place.
Sustainable urban development consists of the international construction of a dynamic balance between the different logics of the private, public, social (or civil) and natural economic systems, through new organizational rules (Fusco Girard, 1998). The forms of such constructions include the preparation and agreement on conventions, agendas and global frameworks, within the institutional settings of international authority in intergovernmentalism regimes, where International authority is likely to take the form of specific clusters of obligations and norms of compliance that are incorporated within states and instituted in relations of mutual accountability among states (Garrett & Tsebelis, 2001; Ruggie, 1998).

Between mid 2015 and 2016, at least four global agreements to address sustainable development will be negotiated. These documents, even if prepared according to the rituals of intergovernmental diplomacy, contain thematic debate and references to disciplines principles (i.e. climate change science, etc.). What is more, the documents once approved will be translated into policy-making at national level, and therefore (according to the level of commitment they imply) accompanied by action plans to meet agreed targets. Preparation of these plans will require additional consultation, evidently more place/governance/policy and challenge/priorities specific at national and local level. Therefore, the linkages between the international debate, often considered too far from local and actual processes on ground, becomes more evident, especially when governments are able to transfer effectively framework principles from the international policy debate to local action.

UN SG presented in January 2012 his comprehensive action agenda to build and follow up to the “future we want” (the Secretary General’s Five-Year Action Agenda, 25 January 2012). Among its five key concepts the agenda included sustainable development and resilience to disasters. The SG recalled the momentum in which the SDGs, UNFCCC and two thematic negotiations were coming to results, in the period between spring 2015 and mid 2016, this period was named “Year of Sustainable Development”.

The next sections present the urban development implication in four global processes that will be defined in the coming months: UNFCCC, SDGs, Post-2015 Framework for DRR and the New Urban Agenda. The objective is to point out thematic areas, in the field of planning, which in the coming years will be reflected in national policy responses.
IV. 1 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

The UN framework Convention on Climate Change is an international treaty endorsed in 1992 by 195 Parties to limit the average global temperature increase and to set a basis for a global response to the climate change problems, as a consequence of the increasing scientific evidence of human interference with the climate system, coupled with growing public concern over global environmental issues (IPCC, 2013; WMO, 2013; Symon, 2013). The Convention is strongly related to Kyoto protocol, as this latter was negotiated three years later to set a legally binding commitment introducing (numeric) emission reduction target for countries; the protocol was signed by 192 Parties. UNFCCC is the flagship negotiation process in the field of climate change and formulated the goal to limit anthropogenic emissions and include climate change provisions in national policy; in fact, decisions taken by Parties within the UNFCCC affect actions to address climate change at all levels, from the global to the national and local levels.

Emissions in fact, do not stay within country boundaries and contribute to a changing climate that is felt globally. All countries are affected whether they emit a large amount of GHGs or not, given the atmosphere as a public good with finite resilience capacity.

| Box 3 Climate Change |

Since the late 1980s climate change has emerged in the agenda of intergovernmental and scientific community. On one side researchers and scientists provided studies advocating for climate change evidences or scepticism, while IGOs promoted the discussion to build awareness on the topic and to cooperatively address the conservation of climate as “heritage of mankind” (A/RES/43/53, 1988).

Climate change has been regarded under several perspectives: its science, its anthropogenic drivers, the observed and projected trends and impacts, the sources of scientific data, its mitigation, planning and financing. The most challenging fields related to climate change are at least two: the first related to the scientific analysis of climate and its long-term evolution, the second related to the adaptation of human society to the changes.

In recent years the scientific community has achieved a strong consensus and has recognised evidences for the strong correlation between climate warming and human activities (J. Cook, 2013) (Anderegg, 2010) (Doran & MK. Zimmerman, 2009).

Climate, as defined by (IPCC, 2013), refers to the statistical description in terms of the mean and variability of relevant quantities over a period of time ranging from months to thousands or millions of year. The period that is usually considered to monitor and average the variables (temperature, precipitation and wind) is 30 years (WMO). The processes that occur in the atmosphere, the hydrosphere, the cryosphere, the surface lithosphere and the biosphere concur to shape earth’s climate. Tools to monitor climate and weather phenomena and its changes have developed fast with technological advances. Climate is predicted with three typologies of tools: Emission scenario, the prediction of future releases to the atmosphere of greenhouse
gasses and pollutants, these are based on assumptions concerning future socioeconomic and technological developments, emission scenario data are the input for climate models; climate models are numerical representation of chemical, biological and physical features of the climate and their interaction; emissions scenarios and climate models are used to derive climate projection, simulation of climate response to future emissions and evolutions. Climate models are at the basis of all international agreements on climate. These focuses on greenhouse gases concentration, the Representative Concentration Pathways –RCP, which relate to a temperature increase range, i.e. RCP 2.6 projects an increase of earth average temperature of 0.3 to 1.7 °C; RCP 2.6 is taken as example being the mitigation scenario of the International Panel for Climate Change relative to 1986-2005 data projected to 2081-2100 and the sole to consider a 1.5°C warming relative to pre-industrial condition, stabilization scenario RCP6 and RCP8 consider either a portfolio of GHG concentration stabilization or a very high increase of GHG (IPCC, 2013). RCPs are a key aspect of climate change as most of the stake of COP decision stays on the agreement to keep global warming under 2°C.

Next to temperature, another key field of study is related to the decrease of artic sea ice, sea level rise and acidification. Relevance of sea level rise is not only related to climate change adaptation of coastal zones, but also to the increase of energy storage of earth climate system (60% of which is retained in oceans).

The effects of climate change have impacts on ecosystems (i.e. modifying species’ habitat, harming biodiversity, and changing carbon storage), human systems (i.e. threatening crops, leveraging freshwater scarcity, human lives losses as consequence of natural disasters, and affecting human health –including diseases vectors proliferation), economic systems (i.e. production and energy costs, economic damages due to natural disasters), social systems (i.e. migration, peace and conflicts and equity), but also human settlements (i.e. heat waves/floods, energy demand-supply and water management). These effects relates to the second domain of climate change, the adaptation dimension. This domain relates both to the measures to minimize climate change impacts and damages to societies as well as to the new development models (i.e. low carbon development – models that minimize GHG emission from economic development, or green economy - improved human well-being and social equity, while significantly reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcities” (United Nations Environment Programme, 2011).

Climate change adaptation is based on three pillars: the understanding of the hazard-risk-exposure matrix and require adequate information, the planning of portfolio options for alternative solutions and a managing-implementation-evaluation of the measures taken.

Development issues related to climate change involve mitigation-adaptation but also resilience, that is the capacity of a system to absorb disturbances (i.e. a flood) maintaining its core attributes while minimize the creation of new risk in development and thus fund policy decision on risk and hazard knowledge and data. Within this framework UNISDR is advocating with the new Post-2015 Framework for DRR to prepare a policy input for the development of new resilient societies.

A global regime was needed to regulate and agree a progressive reduction of GHG emissions to safe levels. The approach of the convention takes into account both mitigation and adaptation measures to cope with climate change. The convention signatories, the Parties, are divided into three categories according to the different levels of economic development: Annex I and II Parties (either 43 developed countries, part of OECD in 1992, and with
economies in transition or 23 developed countries but not part of economies in transition subset), and non Annex I countries (mostly developing countries, including Least Developing Countries; these Parties are becoming more and more active given the exposure to climate change and vulnerability to its effects). Article 4 of the Convention lists the general commitments Parties accepted, these include (UNFCCC, 2006 Handbook) reporting to the Conference of the Parties the information and implementation results, promoting education and training on the matter of climate change, co-operating in the exchange of knowledge and research results and a broad promotion of sustainable development.

Kyoto protocol, instead –also thanks to the achievement of the UNFCCC, was able to set legally binding targets too, but in relation to mitigation commitments. In its first commitment period (2008-2012) Annex I Parties agreed to reduce their GHG emissions by an average of at least 5 % below 1990 levels -emissions of the regulated gases included in Annex A are measured in CO₂ equivalent emissions (Research, 2013). In December 2012 in Doha, Qatar, the "Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol" was adopted. The amendment set out a second commitment period from (2013-2020) in which Annex I Parties undertake to reduce GHG emissions by at least 18% below 1990 levels.

Since the adoption of the Convention, Parties convene each year a COP meeting to track progresses and take decisions to further implement the Convention. Among the most important COPs the following should be recalled: COP13 Bali (2007), COP15 Copenhagen (2009), COP16 Cancun (2010), COP17 Durban (2011), COP18 Doha (2012), since COP17, and with more vigour during COP19-20 (2013-2014 in Warsaw and Lima) Parties engaged in the negotiations towards a new agreement on climate to be adopted during COP21 in Paris in 2015. COP19 also set a pathway for governments to work on a draft text for the new agreement, COP20 adopted the Lima Call for Climate Action, that included a text for negotiations, which are currently on-going and a successful agreement is expected at COP21 in December 2015.

10 Adopted the Bali Road Map that included a “two track-approach” for negotiations under both the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, establishing a Long-term Cooperative Action Working Group (UNFCC) to prepare a broad agreement outcome (also including the US and developing countries) to ensure full implementation of the Convention, and an ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under Kyoto protocol –negotiations followed the two track approach till COP18.
11 Which developed a finance scheme (fast-start -2010-2012 USD 30B, and long-term finance USD 100B per year by 2020) gathering public and private resources. In addition Parties noted Copenhagen Accord on the commitment to keep temperature increase below 2°C, to which national voluntary pledge followed.
12 First formalized Annex I Parties pledge made in Copenhagen Accord and established a green climate fund and the Technology Mechanism to facilitate the implementation of enhanced action on technology development and transfer.
13 At COP17 the two tracks negotiation process came to conclusion Parties established the Durban Forum on Capacity-Building to provide a place where representatives from Parties, UN organizations, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, research, academia and the private sector can share ideas, experiences, lessons learned and good practices with regard to capacity-building activities in developing countries (this initiative further implemented decisions taken at COP7 in 2001). What is more COP17 also established National Adaptation Plan process to assist the Parties to reduce their vulnerability to climate change building adaptive capacity and resilience integrating CCA in development planning.
14 The COP adopted the Doha Climate Gateway that paid great attention on long-term finance and improved response capacities to deal with loss and damages caused by climate change –i.e. sea level rise.
Linkages between climate change and urban development are numerous and meaningful. UN-Habitat (2011) reports that cities are accountable for 70% of GHG emissions but covering only 2% of earth surface. According to UNEP cities are responsible for 75% of global CO2 emissions while transport and building sectors are the key drivers of such figure. The opportunity to address urban governance of climate protection involves the relations between levels of the states and new network spheres of authority. These challenge traditional distinctions between local, national and global environmental politics. What is more, where urban planning and policy adequately introduce sustainability principles, cities could reverse the trend and help mitigating against climate change (Bulkeley & Betsill, 2005).

Literature but also technological researches further explain that cities are more resources and energy efficient than rural areas, but still GHG emissions are mostly generated in human settlements (Dodman, 2009). Given this framework, and the upcoming renewal in the commitment on the Framework Convention on Climate Change, cities will be even more than today concerned by public policy to reduce GHG emissions, improve resilience to climate change and be more responsive to the environmental aspects of urbanization.

One of the first negotiated versions of the proposed agreement text (FCCC/ADP/2015/1, 2015) circulated and discussed during the second session of the ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action in Geneva in February 2014, surfaces some uncertainties, these include: first) along the 86 pages of the draft text there are more than 1200 brackets of alternatives (either representing ambitious, moderate or conservative scenarios); second) provisions regarding fossil fuels (preservation of 80% of current underground asset15) are limited to cut in subsidies but no commitment is related to the phase-out of these fuels; third) commitments tend to be far in future (even if current agreements are still on duty, commitments till 2030 tend to be focused mostly on mitigation rather than on actual emission cuts) and the few references in terms of percentages limit to suggest Parties to be more ambitious than in this decade (Post-2020 Climate Change Regime); fourth) as it was perceived much of the debate will be bound to the responsibilities and obligations of developed and developing countries, where the first should commit to absolute emission reduction targets, where the latter on diversified enhanced mitigation actions –thus demonstrating that a trade-off between development and environment is perceived, and that nearly two decades of efforts in sustainable development have not convinced governments and businesses to the profitability of green economy (Krugman), China, Coal, Climate, The New York Times, November 13, 2014); fifth).

Commitments also reflect tension between governments, as example the behaviours of the United States, China and the EU. The US and China held in 2014 a separate negotiation
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15 80% of preservation of fossil fuels reserves are needed to keep temperature increase below 2°C (UNEP)
(“Emission Deal” according to the Wall Street Journal, (Mauldin & Harder), November 12, 2014) in which the US commit (to China) to reduce by 26-28% GHG emissions by 2025 (around 15% of US emissions compared with 1990 levels), and China to peak its emissions in 2030 and maintaining its status of developing country (Office of the Press Secretary, the White House, (2014)). EU instead is committed within Kyoto protocol to cut its MSs emissions by 40% by 2030 compared to 1990 levels. These considerations actually attain more a politics-polity debate in the context of international diplomacy and political study analysis, but indeed, such positions by consequence impact on the way in which territorial development policy are designed. Some of the implications on urban settings include: building, transport, energy sectors and others.

Similarly to the negotiations of the UNFCCC a two paths approach is followed also to address territorial aspects of climate change. On one side governments and cities are adopting plans to address the reduction of human generated impacts on climate, on the other, the rapid, costly and deadly experiences of climate change effects on human activities (i.e. climate related disasters) induce authorities to adopt measures to build the resilience of society to climate change. Climate responsive planning requires a high degree of coordination among national, sectorial and sub-national institutions, and the formulation of integrated responses (i.e. National Adaptation Plans) to engage various sectors such as agriculture, forestry, water, planning, finance, and education. These responses, as noted earlier, might pose serious institutional challenges given the traditional fragmentation of competences and responsibilities of public authorities. UNFCCC in its implementation guides has formulated a number of entry points from which climate change planning shall be integrated in the planning process. Planning for climate change, in this perspective is seen as an additional theme that public policy should include, aiming at building coordination of sectorial activities trough it. Given this framework National government and cross-sector ministries should develop national development plan (i.e. to pursue the general goal of balanced territorial development) including principles related to sustainable urban development, sector ministries then adapt to their tools (i.e. shaping tools, regulatory and stimulus instruments, financial measures and capacity building, informational and communication tools – (Healey p., 2003); (Tiesdell & Adams, 2011); (Ben-Joseph & Szodt, 2005)) and translate the principles into programmes of action; sub-national authorities link upstream planning and downstream implementation providing political leadership to the planning process and supervise the implementation of development plans agreed in line with the principle of multi-level governance (UN-Habitat, 2015). With reference to the two tracks mentioned above –climate responsive planning and planning for climate change, apparently the quite conspicuous debate originated in the 1990s and early 2000s on urban sustainability (i.e. (Camagni & al., 1996), (Wheeler, 1996); (Shaw, 1993); (Faucheux & Froger, 1995), and others) is currently
diverging from some other literature that since the mid 2000s has flourished mostly addressing climate change mitigation (Kreimer, Arnold, & Carlin, 2003; Eraydin & Tasan-Kok, 2013), (The World Bank, 2013); (Jha, Miner, & Stanton-Geddes, 2013); (European Environment Agency, 2/2012); (Shah & Ranghieri, 2012); (Menoni & Margottini, 2012)) as if the short-term response to the effects of climate change were taken more care of. Indeed the last two decades of efforts in the field of sustainable urban development have had positive payoffs worldwide.

From an aggregate urban scale perspective it can be observed that an increasing number of cities are deploying measures to reduce the footprint of there key urban sectors: a) building (zero-emission buildings and neighbourhoods, energy efficiency, user-behaviour), for which national regulations are increasingly introducing environmental performances for new and existing buildings (i.e. (2010/31/EU, 2010), (2012/27/EU, 2012) and related) and IGOS have developed several policy frameworks (i.e. (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, 2012), and (2013); (United Nations Environment Programme Sustainable Buildings initiative, 2009)), local authorities, also are developing climate responsive action plans (see UNECE, 2012); b) transport (in relation to land-use and city form, to fuels and efficiency of vehicles, supply of sustainable mobility –electricity and slow means) under the guidance of programmatic frameworks (Directorate-General for Energy and Transport, 2009); (United Nations Human Settlement Programme, 2013); and c) energy (fuels substitution, local renewable generation, smart grid) with the support of regional directives (2009/28/EC, 2009)) and worldwide intergovernmental initiatives (i.e. SE4ALL). Most of the above measures act on two main dimensions, the substitution of inefficient assets (either out-dated building materials –single glaze windows, poor insulation covers etc.; past generation vehicles; and low efficiency energy plants –i.e. turbines and burners) and the phasing out of past technologies and design approaches (i.e. introduction of passive design criteria for building heating and cooling; electricity powered buses; conversion of coal turbines to natural gas and bio-gas and increase of renewable energy installed capacity). The International Energy Agency has recently released a note in which it was reported that in 2014 for the first time in the last 40 years energy related emissions (CO2) decreased in a situation of economic growth –GDP, March, 2015).

In conclusion, UNFCCC Parties are moving ahead towards COP21 in Paris in December 2015. It is evident that at this level of decision-making and given the stake of the decision a multiplicity of patterns of scientific, diplomatic and citizens’ interest is concerned. Parties are clearing preparatory agreements to manipulate the decisional network prior to the official days of negotiations (i.e. USA-China “Emission Deal”, the G7 agreement in early June 2015
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16 IEA Press Release, 13 March 2015: Global energy-related emissions of carbon dioxide stalled in 2014
–The Economist, International, June 10, 2015) even if the most sustainability enthusiast might be sad already by reviewing the mainstreams of such agreements, in which ambitious positions on fossil fuel phase out are rather far.

Within this intersection of actors, government interests’, business’ advocacy and scepticism and citizens’, the future of territorial development policies is concerned. The global tendency, also in developing countries (i.e. BRICS) is for an integration of environmental responsiveness in urban development. The global dispute, that to some extent gathers the attention of the media, on the 2°C or so temperature increase, will demonstrate the global commitment for a coordinated long term action; however, the sustainable urban development deal will remain to national action plans, their implementation, monitoring and financing.

IV. II Sustainable Development Goals

The Sustainable Development Goals negotiations represent at present probably the flagship negotiation effort under the auspices of the United Nations (to remind, the UN system is currently engaged into three main negotiations: the UNFCCC, SDGs and the Funding for Development process). The SDGs represent a set of 17 goals and 169 targets to guide the future of international development (horizon 2030), to be agreed during the United Nations Summit in September 2015.

2015 is the expiry horizon of the Millennium Development Goals –MDGs, which were agreed on the basis of UN GA the resolution (A/RES/55/2, 2000) -United Nations Millennium Declaration) of September 2000. MDGs represented a global attempt to promote and accelerate human well-being; the ambitious endeavour however achieved some of its 21 targets, some even in advance to 2015. Instead the experience of MDGs surfaced at least two great issues: first that data and development goes together; second, sub-regional and national gaps in target achievement can be macroscopic ( (United Nations, 2014)). In addition, MDGs were mostly targeted to developing countries and least developed states, while developed countries would have transferred funds (0.7% of GNI) to intergovernmental financial institutions (WB, IMF and ADB) to finance the implementation, not all countries were compliant to such provision.

MDGs consist of a set of 8 goals 21 targets an 60 indicators addressing poverty, hunger, maternal and child mortality, communicable disease, education, gender inequality, environmental damage and the global partnership. MDGs monitoring was demanded since 2002 to UNDESA and UNSD, and since 2005 the latter Organizations prepared annual reports. MDGs achievement have been put into question by governments, scholars and civil society, as the possibility to evaluate the impact has been limited or sectorial (apart from UN year reports), objectives were rather ambitious and means for implementation were often not consistent, the evident inequalities still affecting several regions of the world and a widespread sense of lack of legitimation for goals setting. Several IGOs (UN MDG, 2013; WB, 2013; UNDP, 2013) however report target achievement as follows: a) the poverty reduction target was reached five years ahead of schedule, people living under $1.25 a day fell from 47% in 1990 to 22% in 2010; b) drinking water target was met in 2010 too, and global population with access to improved water sources reached 86% (was 76% in 1990); c) malaria and tuberculosis at the global level and in several regions should be halved by 2010; d) slum improvement target was met and exceeded, 200M slum dweller are reported to have access to improved water sources, sanitation facilities, durable housing or sufficient living spaces. Most significant gaps, by contrast, include: a) environmental sustainability, where global CO2 emissions are growing and are 46% higher than in 1990 (hence before the climate agreements); b) child mortality, still remains high in poorer regions, c) average income inequality in developing countries increased by 11% in 2010 compared to 1990.

What is more the World Bank in its Global Monitoring Report 2013 points out the considerable disparity in regional performances: for example with respects to MDG1.a (extreme poverty, % of population living under $1.25 a day) while four out of the six global regions have exceeded already in 2010 the target, the gap South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa pay is evident for the first (85% achievement) and macroscopic for the second (28%). What is more, out of the 143 countries surveyed by the Bank (ibid.) nearly 1/3rd of them is seriously off-target (to targets: 1.a, 1.c, 2.a, 3.a, 4.a, 5.a, 7.c).
However MDGs served also to set national priorities, in particularly disadvantaged countries, surfaced the need of statistics and data collection for monitoring purposes, and have
contributed to a modest increase in foreign aid and some debt relief. MDGs also presented some thematic gaps and overlaps, Goals 1 and 3 were both related to health, while 2 and 3 were overlapping in the sense of universal education complies already (in part) with gender equality; sustainable development, instead probably lacked on emphasis. The new development agenda and the set of goals, the SDGs to be agreed in 2015, could very much benefit from the experiences built in the preparation and monitoring of MDGs, and consequently be more effective in setting the future international development path.

The SDGs process begins in 2010 with the mandate from the 2010 MDG Summit, when it was decided to organize a special event in 2013 (one year after Rio+20 conference) to follow-up efforts made towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals, and requested UN SG to report, as appropriate, for further steps to advance the United Nations Development Agenda beyond 2015 (A/RES/65/1, 2010). UN SG has consequently established a multi-layered process to advance consultation, the process has been open and inclusive and six different entities were established: a UN Task-Team on Post-2015 (composed of representatives of over 60 UN entities and international organizations, chaired by UNDESA and UNDP), a High-level panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 DA, regional consultations organized by Regional Commissions, the UN Global Compact (that included a programme on cities), and an academic and science community, UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network. In 2012, Rio+20 Conference gave provision to establish a Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals and an Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing. Results of MS special meeting in 2013 surfaced the opportunity to root the SDGs on the past MDGs experience, but opening to five emerging issues: a) sustainable development, to overcome institutional constraints at international and national level to integrate the three dimensions of sustainability, and to reconsider the balance between poverty eradication and economic growth versus environmental agenda; b) climate change, calling for SDGs and targets alignment according to UNFCCC negotiation outcomes; c) universality, paying equal attention to LDCs, LLDCs, and developed counties, d) means of implementation and stakeholder involvement, methodologies to mobilize resources, also promoting private sector engagement (UN Global Compact) and civil society mobilization; e) strengthening of international and national institutions to meet the challenges of the Post-2015 DA. In complement to MSs input UN SG proposed to UN GA the “Life and Dignity for All” report that included four main pillars: first) it was pointed out a paradigm shift from a set of goals and the Development Agenda (rather methodological and procedural element, but quite important in international diplomacy). An agenda in fact is much more than a set of goals –
that are tools to promote the implementation of a much broader concept made of vision, values and narrative, as well as it was not the intention of MDGs to be a global agenda for development; second) the key six elements of the agenda, in line with MSs position; third) a list of transformative action, that explicitly included an action on challenges of urbanization; fourth) building on a critical review of MDGs experience SG called for goals to be: limited in number, easy to communicate, measurable and adaptable to global and local settings, and most of all to be integrated in a monitoring framework and accountability mechanism.

In spring 2014 the Co-chairs of the OWG proposed eight clusters for potential goals (the initial proposal contained 19, reduced to 16 at the 11th session of the OWG)

Figure 11 Focus Areas considered at 11th Session of the OWG on SDGs

Cluster 5 focused on sustainable cities and human settlements, promotion of sustainable consumption, and climate. Negotiations on the core document of SDGs begun in January 2015 on the basis of the draft formulated during the 13th session of the OWG, it includes 17 goals. SDGs propose a renewed declination of the integrated approach to sustainable development also supporting common but differentiated responsibilities between developed and developing countries. This last element comes in response to the partial results of MDGs with regards to global mobilization. For the SDGs round, developing countries’ primary responsibility will be to maximize well-being of people while minimizing environmental
impacts; developed countries, instead, should engage in the reduction of their global environmental impact and promote equity and inclusion by reducing and eliminating unsustainable patterns of consumption and production.

The SDGs can be broken down into five main domains: social inclusion, sustained; inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and equality; environmental sustainability; peaceful and inclusive societies, rule of law and capable institutions; global partnership.

Another innovation included in the draft set of SDGs is the inclusion of a specific goal (Goal 11) to entirely focus on cities and human settlements. The roots of such an attention paid to cities is not only limited in the urbanization trend facts (majority of world population living in cities and 60% of it, around 5B people will settle in cities by 2030, 90% of population growth will take place in developing countries –UN-Habitat, 2014), but is coupled with a growing phenomena of a true Urban Diplomacy by Cities, explaining how the mix of influence, reputation and collective efforts of mayors, advisors, private companies and individuals are pushing for the opening of an international Urban Agenda (Sanchez Chillon, 2014). The SDG 11, the urban goal, aims at making cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable. The introduction of a global goal on human settlements demonstrate the effectiveness of the efforts of IGOs and other organizations including UCLG, ICLEI, City Alliance and others to campaign to include in the global commitment for sustainable development coordinated actions on cities. The goal further gathers governments’ attention on urban challenges and related opportunities, mobilizes and empowers urban actors around action-oriented poverty eradication, supports green economic development, promotes better planning and put spatial strategies at the core of governments’ priorities (Deikun, 2014).

The content of SDG 11 can be further understood by considering the goals targets and some of the related indicators following the work done by (UNSDSN, 2015) (the ad Hoc body constituted by UN SG to gather the academic and scientific community in the SDG process).

The urban goal has seven targets that aim by 2030 to: 1) ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services, and upgrade slums; 2) provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons; 3) enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacities for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries; 4) strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage; 5) significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of affected people and decrease by y% the economic losses relative to GDP caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with the focus on
protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations; 6) reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality, municipal and other waste management; 7) provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, particularly for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities.

Aside the diplomatic negotiations to build unanimity consensus around the goals and related targets, a more interesting initiative is taking place in parallel. UNSDSN in fact has guided a comprehensive process\textsuperscript{17} to propose indicators to monitor the achievement of goals targets. The report has just been released (mid June 2015) and it contains 100 global monitoring indicators and complementary national indicators. Several statistical authorities, including OECD and Eurostat, have blessed the report; the UN Statistical Commission and the Expert Group on SDG indicators endorsed also it in March 2015. To have an advanced framework of indicators being agreed in parallel to targets and goals remedies to MDGs shortfalls. Another major improvement is the upcoming establishment of a Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data, to trigger the Data Revolution. The Millennium Development Goals Report 2014 to demonstrate the absolute priority of data collection/quality, analysis, and exchange, presented in its first pages a section on “Data for Development”. The report has highlighted the strong and necessary link between data, policy design and implementation monitoring. The MDGs surfaced the difficulty of many states to collect adequate and reliable data, or to produce them according to standards. As consequence it was MDGs have also surfaced several data-gaps (i.e. demographic data), lack of disaggregate data, time-series and spatial references; these limitations not only make the monitoring of achievements difficult, but actually it hampers the possibility to devise appropriate policy responses. The data for development currently represents a IGOs mainstream.

\textit{Annex 3 MDGs achievement report}

The relevance of SDGs, in conclusion, is related to at least three aspects: first, sustainable development is not just addressed by goals, but it is framed in a wider strategy that is actively involving developing and developed country simultaneously; second, the urban dimension is taken to the fore with a specific goal, targets and indicators for cities and human settlements; third, the monitoring framework has been developed in parallel to targets, and rooted in a data revolution to allow the assessment of results. What is more, SDG 11 plays a key role in determining priorities for governments’ policies. The programmatic dimension of the goals and targets, however, need to be reflected into national and regional action plans that are under states’ competences. Another specificity of Goal 11 (shared with environmental goals

\textsuperscript{17} an 18 months process with more than 500 Organizations responding to the public consultation
with respect to UNFCCC) is the opportunity presented by the negotiation of the New Urban Agenda (H III) and the Post-2015 Framework for DRR. These two thematic agreements have the possibility to set intermediate targets and complement the rather wide Goal 11 with more specific indicators and provisions. This opportunity passed in the intergovernmental negotiations under the label of “mutual reinforcement and alignment”.

IV. III Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction is the guidance document to address climate change adaptation and improve societal resilience to natural and man-made disasters. The framework has been adopted during the Third UN Conference on DRR in Sendai, in March 2015 (see I. I. III for preparatory process information). UNISDR Global Assessment Reports (2013 and 2015) show that human life losses in the period 1980-2012 amounted to 42M people and economic losses reach an average of US$250-300M per year globally. The international community engaged in the field of DRR since 1971, with the establishment of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator. The body was mostly focusing on international cooperation in early warning and on disaster relief and response. It is possible to identify three main cycles of the international cooperation on DRR (UNISDR, 2013): the first till the 1970s when the cooperation was mostly addressing the aftermath of disaster situations; a second cycle, 1970-1999 when the first policy framework were agreed, and two new dimensions (disaster preparedness and mitigation) were introduced, this cycle has been marked by the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDRN 1990-2000) with the adoption of two frameworks (preparedness and response) and the first World Conference on Disaster Risk, held in Yokohama (Japan) in 1994 in which the question of resilience was spelled out for the first time. The year 1999 brings the birth of contemporary season of DRR. At the end of the IDRN, a new UN structure, UNISDR, was established to provide secretariat to the International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction, while UN GA adopted the strategy with a resolution (A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disasters and Risk Reduction). The strategy built on IDRN experience and Yokohama principles, and introduced two main directions, the emphasis on reduction and the need to focus on risk management. The third cycle, 2000s to present, is marked by stronger governments’ concerns as consequence of growing evidences of climate change impacts on the society (either damages to infrastructures and buildings, to economies or people), and it represents contemporary when prevention/resilience become a mainstream. This cycle is marked by one of the DRR
milestones, the Second World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, held in Hyogo (Japan) in 2005 that has adopted the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015, also known as HFA. The HFA put much emphasis on building resilience, and the main goal was to reduce human economic and asset losses globally. Institutional research on DRR has reported that all countries worldwide are heavily impacted by disasters: considering global data, high-income countries are hit by 47% of disasters causing 64% of economic losses and 7% of human life losses, while lower-middle income countries are experiencing 1/4th of world disasters and suffering 1/4th of economic losses and more than 40% of life casualties (UNISDR, GFDRR, OXFAM). Consequently, human life losses are concentrated in low and middle-income countries (81% aggregate), while economic losses mostly affect upper-middle and high-income countries (72%).

Figure 12 Timeline of UN commitment on DRR

These figures, however, have been recently reinterpreted to overcome the traditional interpretation that used to link countries’ GDP to its exposure to economic losses\(^\text{18}\), have been flanked by the concept of economic resilience and marginal impact on state economy. Economic resilience represents the capacity of a country to recover after a disaster, and such capacity is proportional to national GDP (and the intertwined capacity to quickly mobilize resources), second the disaster impact on economies recalls some principles of marginality, in

---

\(^\text{18}\) an hypothetically equal damage in a developed or in a low-income country would result in higher economic losses in the first – i.e. a bridge collapse
which the costs of adding a disaster recovery scenario in a country already facing serious and deep economic/social difficulties may strongly limit the capacity to respond to the emergency, and seriously hampers the redevelopment path afterwards. To further express the need to improve resilience to disasters it can be noted how Tajikistan suffered economic losses equivalent to 60% of foreign aid the country received over the same period (UNECE, 2015).

With respect to the linkages between development and disaster risk, UNISDR advocates since

---

**Box 5 The Hyogo Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2005-2015**

Building on the basis of the UN GA resolution “A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disasters and Risk Reduction” and the establishment of UNISDR in 1999, the Second World Conference on DRR was convened in Hyogo in 2005. The conference was called to adopt the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) to address DRR in MSs. The HFA was a 10 years framework to enhance resilience improving the co-operation in the field of disaster prevention, response and climate change mitigation. The primary goal of the HFA has been focused on the reduction of disaster impacts (long-term effects of disasters i.e. macro-economic effects) and losses (short-term consequences i.e. direct physical losses) of economical social and ecological assets of societies. The HFA proposed three strategic goals: a) The integration of disaster risk reduction into sustainable development policies and planning; b) Development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities to build resilience to hazards; c) The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes. These three goals have been translated into five priority areas and four additional cross cutting issues. The first priority area aimed at establishing institutional capacity to address DRR by promoting the establishment of institutional arrangements and laws for DRR, include DRR into development planning (see “resilience thinking in urban planning” Eraydin, 2013) and bring to political commitment and programs action on disaster risk reduction-management and climate change adaptation. Priority area two addressed the identification and assessment of disaster risk and the enhancement of early warning systems. This second priority has been the origin of a great technological and scientific research to build knowledge and information of disaster related matters, to produce risk, vulnerability and hazard maps, early warning systems -i.e. in the fields of natural science, mapping technologies, data acquisition and validation, communication infrastructures etc. the third priority concentrated on the promotion of knowledge and education to introduce a model of risk-informed/sensitive and knowledge driven decision making at all governmental levels. Pilot actions included university and high-level education for decision makers on DRR, improved research and related funding to hazard mapping and research and the establishment of global platform of knowledge exchange. The fourth priority area was targeted at reducing the degree of risk embodied in development planning, calling to pay particular attention to the planning stage so to include risk modelling in decision-making. UNISDR explicitly recommended adequate measures to protect critical infrastructure, and the preparation of ad Hoc measures (i.e. building codes) to improve the resilience of new assets and when possible improve the adaptive capacity of existing ones. The fifth priority area, in line with the traditional approach, considered the necessity to strengthen the preparedness and response to catastrophic events. This area mostly attains the disaster management (and response) domain rather the reduction or resilience.
UNISDR has released yearly reviews of implementation of the HFA, also supported by national reports, GAR15 reports 70% achievements of HFA priorities, but the general picture that emerges is that while loss of human life has been declining, economic losses are growing fast.

the HFA to minimize the creation of new risks through development. Therefore the conclusion of the HFA cycle has demonstrated that the increased attention to disaster risk management and prevention has reduced deaths, but has also showed that economic losses have increased (UNISDR, 2015).

While the DRR are rather broad policy frameworks, the role of reducing the vulnerability of and in cities is evident. As urbanization phenomena drive the development in several countries, it is also understood that cities laying on coastal zones, river basins (40% of global population to live in river basins by 2050 –GAR15), or on areas prone to earthquakes are a reality. UNISDR also advocated prevention as cost effective measure to reduce losses and has identified in planning one of the most powerful tools to be deployed since the rehabilitation and in the preparedness phases of the disaster management cycle.

Figure 13 DRR Cycle

UNISDR GAR15 Report
The Sendai Framework for DRR adopted in March 2015 introduces specific provisions to improve the resilience of human settlements. It has been noted how the paradigm in the field of DRR has been evolving over the last three decades; while the first concerns were mostly rising from the need to adequately respond to catastrophes, it is now understood that the deal of the discipline stays with prevention and resilience. The concept of resilience refers to the ability of a system to absorb or buffer disturbances maintaining its core attributes, to self-organise, and to the capacity of learning and adapting in the context of change (Bekers, 2003). Accordingly, all the tools, measures and provisions to prevent disasters to take place, or to reduce their impacts are taken care of. Sustainable urban development, either considering its spatial, policy and governance dimensions, plays a substantial role in addressing DRR. The Sendai Framework reaffirmed the HFA goal to (substantially) reduce in the next 15 years the losses in lives and assets (including social, economical and cultural). The final decision on the seven global targets has partially taken into account the content of preparatory negotiations, when some attempt to set ambitious and “numeric” targets was put forward. Out of seven targets only target one (global disaster mortality reduction) and two (number of affected people reduction) have numeric thresholds (lower the average per 100,000 of deaths and affected people). Probably the most evident misalignment between negotiations and decision is expressed by target three (reduction of disaster economic losses in relation to GDP –issue that mostly affect mid to high-income countries) where the Framework just makes reference to a “reduction”, while in negotiations there have been progressive attempts to build consensus first on 20% (ambitious scenario), later on 5% reduction (moderate scenario), and finally on a conservative scenario to stabilize loss relative to GDP. Targets four to seven only make reference to a “substantial decrease” of: four, damages to critical infrastructure (ambitious scenario was 30%, moderate 10%, conservative no increase); five –substantial increase, number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies (ambitious 100%, conservative 95%, conservative 90%); six, enhance international cooperation; seven, increase the availability of and access to multi-hazard early warning systems and disaster risk information. The Framework also contains a set of eleven guiding principles. These are, in substance, acknowledgments and the fundamentals of DRR as learned during the last decades of the UNDRC, IDRN, ISDR and HFA. It is reaffirmed that each state has primary responsibility to prevent and reduce disaster risk (i.e. ad Hoc legislation, allocation of financial resources to respond to catastrophes, national civil protection authorities, etc., but shall count on international, regional and trans-boundary co-operation at all levels) protecting persons and their property, health and assets. It is requested that all levels of government are engaged in DRR promoting the co-ordination of these levels, when needed also trough ad hoc bodies, and especially the local level, where adequate resources and knowledge should be destined to perform risk assessment for planning and investments.
The Sendai Framework contains four priorities for action and for each a set of recommendations targeted to the global and regional (world regions’), and to national and regional levels. The four priorities of the Framework are: 1) improve the understanding of disaster risk in all its dimensions (vulnerability, exposure, hazard), building useful knowledge to improve decisions; 2) strengthen disaster risk governance capacities, integrating DRR across all sectors promoting coherence and especially in policies, laws and regulations; 3) investment in DRR for resilience, minimizing the accumulation of risk in new development and promoting sustainable development (also as opportunity for innovation and new jobs); 4) enhance disaster preparedness and response also taking long-term oriented decisions during recovery (“Build Back Better”).

Among the principles recommendations there are several references to the challenges of urbanization and urban development. It is first acknowledged (priority area 1) that the collection of data, its analysis and systematic monitoring is a key step towards risk informed decision-making. The support of technology and the interface between policy-makers and the scientific community should be taken into account to build knowledge frameworks, information (i.e. risk maps) and guide the preparation of materials to provide evidences of risk-exposure-vulnerability interplay during the planning process. A stronger reference to the role of urban planning is made in priority area 2 (risk governance) and 3 (resilience), where urban planning is called to set the conditions for safe and resilient urban development. Planning tools, in fact, provide fundamental support in building resilience and enhancing preparedness to disasters. When DRR is carefully included in planning decisions, land-use and building codes, and a combination of both, improve the adaptive capacity of human settlements. The Sendai Framework for DRR, while promoting the use of urban development portfolio of tools, also put emphasis on the need to establish the necessary mechanisms and incentives to assure high level compliance with the existing safety-enhancing provisions (27.d (A/69/L.67, 2015).

The new cycle of the UN Framework for DRR is also supported by a related initiative, the “Making Cities Resilient Campaign”. The campaign is co-ordinated by UNISDR and is based on a toolkit that assess the resilience of the analysed city on the basis of the performance recorded against the 10 “essential” principles of the campaign.

The Post-2015 Framework for DRR set a renewed commitment at intergovernmental level to reduce human and economic losses but also to include more than before risk analysis into decision-making; it has been observed that a true sustainable development is not just the one that limits emissions and is socially inclusive, but the one that in the making minimize the environmental impacts generated by the climate that development itself changes. The fundamentals of intergovernmental cooperation in the field of DRR have finally moved from
response to resilience and prevention, thus grounded on the promotion of knowledge and technology exchange in support of least developing countries, still the most affected by human casualties. In developed countries, instead, the opportunity is to engage (also with the support of private sector) to reduce economic losses.

Indeed public guidance, especially in the field of territorial planning is needed. Spatial dimensions of DRR might be strategic, especially considering that the spatial distribution of activities is set through planning (and therefore risk areas can be prevented from development or charged by specific building codes provisions). For this purpose hazard mapping has been identified by several IGOs (WB, UNECE, JRC, UNDP, UNISDR) as a key decision making resource to identify areas suitable for development, those that should be evacuated, and those in which development has taken place already to protect. The approach to resilient planning shall integrate natural sciences as key step in the planning process and limit engineering remedy measures and favour ecosystem-based adaptation. What is more human settlement development decisions shall be taken on the basis of natural sciences reports (i.e. geological studies to determine earthquake or landslide risk) to design appropriate land-use provisions, and specific requirements in building codes; then, on the basis of the risk taken and measures deployed, a careful campaign of compliance monitoring should be put in place.

National legislations on the matter of DRR in urban planning, when existing, are very diverse, and while standard procedures for disaster risk management are being endorsed and implemented (UNECE, 2012), a common and systemic approach to “resilience thinking in urban planning” is not yet transferred from best practices to a widespread approach.
V. Urban Intergovernmentalism and Cities Diplomacy, a synthesis

The review of agendas and intergovernmental agreements provided in the previous sections of this study completes the implementation of research questions. It has been identified that the intergovernmental agenda committed nations to actual sustainable development models also with strong agreements and binding documents to address climate change and its impacts on societies.

In the context of sustainable development, the activities of IGO do pay a great attention to urban development given the concentration of population and economic activities. The unmanaged urbanization occurred in several developing countries over the last half century has posed serious challenges to social equity prior to the ones related to unsustainable settlement environmental footprints. This fundamental element has given the mandate to the international polity to consider the urban implications of sustainable development. Much of the IGO debate on cities however remains at policy input level and at international development assistance, this latter often put into question for being rather far to real problems on ground and providing some aids in the field of finance (i.e. debt relief) instead to act on local capacity to coordinate and manage the development process itself.

The second step of the argumentation considered the international momentum we are currently living in, the year of sustainability. The context information provided showed the relevance and extent of current consultation/preparation of documents and negotiation agreement and decisions that are taking place. The section also pointed out some of the “pathologies” of the intergovernmental polity and the difficulty for external players to get oriented in the negotiations. Another element concerning negotiations emerged in the last section dealing with the agreements of the intergovernmental polity, where it has been reported a relevant gap between outcome document of negotiations and the final agreement endorsed by MS delegations.

The third step focused on the disciplinary involvement of planning studies in the analysis and participation to the intergovernmental debate and agreement on cities and sustainable development. The findings highlighted that planning debate is almost entirely related to the content of sustainable urban development debate, mostly within disciplinary settings. In particular the debate and research on the implication of cities in sustainable development is
one of the research mainstreams within planning culture, but very little attention is paid to the processes IGOs provide for the preparation of documents, new policy frameworks and agreements. This can be seen as limitation especially considering that much of the content of IGO agreements tend to give provisions regarding cities and planning appear to remain either silent on the matter, or explicitly not interested in the content of these agreements. Even if the proceedings, report and lists of participants of the thousands meetings organized in these years were obviously not reviewed, the planning discipline does not seem to be concerned by IGO agreements in their formulation or it does not reach the journals’ debate.

This positions, while the reflection on the themes proposed by IGOs is obviously regarded by planning literature, considerably limit the possibilities to overcome some of the limitations of past agreements on cities that were conceived within international relations mind frames with some, few times more than marginal, domain input.

Within the planning discipline it is argued that relevant changes occurred in the last two decades. These changes, especially in the governance, decision-making, policy and spatial strategy fields have set strong point of convergence between the implementation needs of IGOs policy framework and some ineffectiveness of planning processes and practices.

The fourth step built a panorama of Organization and Agency policy frameworks and provisions on planning related matters. It emerged that regional institutions are able to strongly shape the nature, content and impact of these documents and agreements. Furthermore a clear organizational mandate characterization emerges in the documents, some more related to development, other to coordination. The role of IGO emerges other than to agenda setting also in the capacity to facilitate policy transfer and renewed problem-setting patterns.

The last section has reviewed the new cycle of intergovernmental agreement, the so-called Post-2015 set of documents. It is understood that the role of cities become very relevant, not only for the formal inclusion of city networks in the debate, but also for the specific goals, targets and indicators regarding or meant to be achieved in cities. The phenomena of city diplomacy and actual role of the local level is therefore established as key step for sustainable development.

These two last sections strengthened two dimensions entering in the debate over the last two decades that can be synthetized into two concepts: on one side the consolidation of the urban intergovernmentalism, on the other the emergence of the phenomena of city diplomacy.
IGOs have in fact increasingly addressed the matters of sustainable urban development with measures targeted at city level or dealing with cities, shifting from policy integration to some degrees of spatial focus. On the other being the stake of decisions increasingly concerned with cities, cities themselves become part of agreements and programmes, elevating the local level to some aspects of intergovernmental diplomacy.

This is particularly evident when the global politics of sustainability in the urban age is concerned. City diplomacy refers to the “institutions and processes by which cities, or local government in general, engage in relations with actors on an international political stage with the aim of representing themselves and their interests to one another” (Pluijm, 2007). The transformations in the contemporary diplomacy are mostly due to globalization processes and their clearly distinctive urban implications, which have led to the fading of national boundaries and to a redistribution of responsibilities between states and non-state diplomatic actors. Patterns of interaction and actors of the urban intergovernmentalism have consequently changed, however with the difficulty of several IGOs – UN-Habitat and UNDP first and a set of other IGOs given limitations in the IO mandate, to engage and get into cooperative relations with cities. Some forms of cities coordination networks, i.e. UCLG, ICLEI and C40 have supported the consolidation of new forms of decentralization of international relations towards the city level.

Another result of the study identified a certain distance between the planning community and the intergovernmental agreements on sustainable urban development in the making. It is actually recognised that within the selected set of journals no debate has been proposed on the new Post-2015 development agenda, which will provide policy inputs for development till 2030, while on the contrary cities are addressed, involved and recognised as institutional partner more than ever before. In relation to the absence of the planning community in the preparation of these documents it has been found that very few planning associations (i.e. La Fédération Nationale des Agences d'Urbanisme or ISOCARP) do hold the consultative status at ECOSOC, that is the special status of NGOs and associations to participate ad advise UN bodies in their work. These latter aspects further validates the distance that occurs between IGOs and planning that also may stay in a governance scale gap (considering that planning by tradition address the urban, regional and some national scale) and into a perceived closure of IGO rituals and procedures.

Next to these two tendencies of IGOs, it also emerges a strong emphasis on a comprehensive and integrated approach to spatial planning both supported by organizations’ studies on policy coordination and cooperation and by some other reflections within the planning theory. These converging positions match to sectorial forms of coordination, i.e. on sustainable urban
development, by setting common goals and intermediate targets and establishing formal forms of partial coordination (where countries commit to cooperate in achieving certain targets but may aim at other targets uncooperatively). Spatial planning therefore emerges as a public tool to put into coherence sectorial policies with a clear spatial focus, with this tool development agendas are translated into a spatial dimension and into actions at local level. Given this framework planning is strongly concerned in the adaptation and translation of policy goals defined at international level to a more manageable dimension of action, the city.

A second element can be observed, this time from the side of planning. It is important to note the distance that has been observed in the way the issue of MDG achievement has been tackled by the international polity literature versus the disciplinary one. The first by Cohen paid most attention to high-level forms of financial development assistance, the second by Satterthwaite instead focused on the dysfunctions in the implementation of IGO programmes at local level, the one closer to citizens. The two contributions point out that the implementation bottlenecks do not attain the domain of resource mobilization (if not just marginally) but instead the implementation chains and the capacity to replicate successful pilot projects locally.

Within this framework the experience of planners is of great importance, it is acknowledged that much of planning practices stays at local level, it is targeted to spatial and physical impacts and it is provided with a tight relationship with institutions. It is in fact noted that the most recurrent failures in the implementation of development assistance programmes is due to the lack of improvement in administrative and institutional capacities at the local level. This component is a structural element of development processes especially when financial resources and political commitment are provided (that is usually the case for example during a developing assistance programme under the auspices of an IO –that usually steams from joint effort of the organization and government and its levels). Institutional and administrative capacities both refer to individual (skills and aptitudes of civil servants/employees) and organizational ones (institutional environment and policy framework) which both concur to an effective management and coordination of territorial development policies and projects. The importance of institutional capacities has two main implications: the first related to the actual management, performance, efficiency and effectiveness of administrative procedures in projects and services delivery; the second related to the capacity to access to development funds (especially the ones related to performance review) and to mainstream international policy input into local programmes.

Another element of institutional capacity might be faced from the side of city diplomacy phenomena. It is possible to link this phenomenon to salience. According to the principle of salience of international norms, it is recognized that institutionalization (i.e. ad hoc administrative bodies) improve the capacity to adapt international policy input to local action plans. A typical example is the one of environmental plan commitment proposed by city networks and majors associations that endorsed emission schemes reduction stricter than the ones discussed at national (in international negotiations) level. Furthermore it is important to point out that the issue of institutional capacity is cross-cutting to all development stage of countries and cities. Institutional capacity to coordinate programmes, stakeholders and sectorial
policies is important to meet MDGs in urban areas (therefore to address poverty, social exclusion, slums etc.) but also to improve efficiency and performance in advanced urban areas and metropolitan regions in the global north. Concerning developing countries the studies of the WB and UN-Habitat goes in this direction, but also OECD put much emphasis on governance and metropolitan institutions to promote reforms in its countries.

In conclusion, the wide range of agendas, policy input, agreements and conventions to sustainable develop human settlement comes to a great synthesis in this year. Much of the impact of these agreements is achieved when these documents are convergent and mutually reinforcing.

It is of outmost importance to note that cities have officially entered in the development concerns of the intergovernmental polity, in its highest expression, in SDG 11. This recognition gives much emphasis to more sectorial documents, as the New Urban Agenda (HIII) and the Post-2015 Framework for DRR. Indeed the juncture is strongly positioning high on the political agenda the role of cities.

Against what has happened in the past season of global agreement there is widespread agreement on the development of specific indicators to monitor form year 0 the progresses.

The new season of sustainability research will inevitably deal with sustainability reporting and indicator setting/monitoring. Already a fairly wide set of examples and research has faced the issue but not necessarily convergent methodologies have been prepared to date (James, 2014; Maclaren 1996). Given the new accountability of cities and the changes occurred in the planning tools and process, the opportunity to address at local level sustainability of settlement appear to be improved and have more room for advances.
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Annex 2 UNSDSN SDG Goal 11 Proposed Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable</th>
<th>4. Percentage of eligible population covered by national social protection programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1 by 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services, and upgrade slums</td>
<td>26. [Consultations with a licensed provider in a health facility or the community per person, per year] – to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Percentage of population using safely managed water services, by urban/rural (modified MDG Indicator)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Percentage of population using basic sanitation services, by urban/rural (modified MDG Indicator)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Share of the population using modern cooking solutions, by urban/rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Share of the population using reliable electricity, by urban/rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Percentage of urban population living in slums or informal settlements (MDG Indicator)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2 by 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons</td>
<td>25. Road traffic deaths per 100,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Access to all-weather road (% access within [x] km distance to road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Percentage of people within 0.5km of public transit running at least every 20 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3 by 2030 enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacities for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries</td>
<td>68. [Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate, at comparable scale] – to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Domestic revenues allocated to sustainable development as percent of GNI, by sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1. Number of street intersections per square kilometer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2. Existence and implementation of a national urban and settlements policy framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4 strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage</td>
<td>11.3. Percentage of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies informed by international frameworks (such as forthcoming Hyogo-2 Framework)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Red List Index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Protected areas overlay with biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 by 2030 significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of affected people and decrease by y% the economic losses relative to GDP caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with the focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations</td>
<td>6. Losses from natural disasters, by climate and non-climate-related events (in US$ and lives lost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3. Percentage of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies informed by accepted international frameworks (such as forthcoming Hyogo-2 Framework)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6 by 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality, municipal and other waste management</td>
<td>47. Percentage of wastewater flows treated to national standards [and reused] – to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68. [Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate, at comparable scale] – to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69. Mean urban air pollution of particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71. Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and well managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7 by 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, particularly for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities</td>
<td>68. [Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate, at comparable scale] – to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70. Area of public space as a proportion of total city space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1. Number of street intersections per square kilometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.2. Existence and implementation of a national urban and settlements policy framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.6. Percentage of consumption of food and raw materials within urban areas that are produced and delivered in/from rural areas within the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.a support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning</td>
<td>95. Domestic revenues allocated to sustainable development as percent of GNI, by sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.2. Existence and implementation of a national urban and settlements policy framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.6. Percentage of consumption of food and raw materials within urban areas that are produced and delivered in/from rural areas within the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.b by 2020, increase by x% the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, develop and implement in line with the forthcoming Hyogo Framework holistic disaster risk management at all levels</td>
<td>11.3. Percentage of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies informed by international frameworks (such as forthcoming Hyogo-2 framework)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.c support least developed countries, including through financial and technical assistance, for sustainable and resilient buildings utilizing local materials</td>
<td>11.4. Presence of urban building codes stipulating either the use of local materials and/or new energy efficient technologies or with incentives for the same.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 3 MDGs Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1: Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Population below $1 (PPP) per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Poverty gap ratio at $1 a day (PPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Poorest quintile’s share in national income or consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Growth rate of GDP per person employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Employment-population ratio, both sexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Proportion of employed people living below $1 (PPP) per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Proportion of costo account and contributing family workers in total employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Children under 5 moderately or severely underweight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 Population undernourished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2: Achieving primary school education and literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Net enrolment ratio in primary education, both sexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Percentage of pupils starting grade 1 who reach last grade of primary, both sexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Literacy rates of 15–24 year olds, both sexes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 3: Promoting gender equality and empowering women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Gender Parity Index in primary level enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Share of women in secondary level enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Share of women in tertiary level enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Share of women in science, engineering, technology, and mathematics enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Seats held by women in national parliament</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 4: Reducing child mortality and improving child health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Under five mortality rate per 1,000 live births</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Infant mortality rate 0-1 year per 1,000 live births</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Under 5 mortality rate per 1,000 live births</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 5: Improving maternal health and reproductive health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Maternal mortality rate per 100,000 live births</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Babies attended by skilled health personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Current contraceptive use among married women 15-49 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Adolescent birth rate, per 1,000 women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Antenatal care coverage, at least 4 visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Antenatal care coverage, at least one visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Contraception prevalence, at least one visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 Contraception prevalence, at least one visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 6: Combating HIV, malaria, and other diseases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 People living with HIV, 15–49 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Condom use at last high-risk sex, 15–24 years old, men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Men 15–24 years old with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Women 15–24 years old with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Antiretroviral therapy coverage among people with advanced HIV infection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Malaria death rate per 100,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7 Neonatal deaths per 100,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8 Children under 5 with fever being treated with anti-malarial drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9 Malaria death rate per year per 100,000 population (mid-point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10 Malaria incidence rate per year per 100,000 population (mid-point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.11 Malaria prevalence rate per 100,000 population (mid-point)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 7: Ensuring environmental sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Proportion of land area covered by forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Carbon dioxide emissions (CO2), kg CO2 per $1 GDP (PPP) (C20C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Carbon dioxide emissions (CO2), thousand metric tons of CO2 per capita (C20C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Carbon dioxide emissions (CO2), thousand metric tons of CO2 per capita (C20C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Proportion of total water requirements used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 Terrestrial and marine areas protected in total terrestrial area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 Proportion of the population using improved drinking water sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 Proportion of the population using improved sanitation facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 8: Development for sustainable development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1.2 Proportion of the population using improved sanitation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.3 Population with access to clean drinking water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.4 Fixed telephone lines per 100 inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.5 Mobile cellular subscriptions per 100 inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.6 Internet users per 100 inhabitants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The bibliography of this study has been divided into five categories of sources to simplify the access to the resources. The categories recall the features of the study: a) the first category includes all the disciplinary literature related to the planning theory (including urban sustainability and sustainable urban development), b) the second the sources related to general sustainability and climate change analysis; c) the third the ones related to institutions, international, political, international and public administrations affairs (named international literature); d) the fourth instead includes documents produced by IGOs (named IGO literature); a subcategory, d.1) IGO Resolution Decisions and Reports includes the procedural documents of IGO works; e) A final section includes newspaper and institutional press releases.

a) Disciplinary literature


b) **Sustainability and Climate Change literature**

- Doran, PT., and MK. Zimmerman. “Examining the Scientific Consensus on Climate Change.” *Eos Transactions American Geophysical Union* 90, no. 3 (2009).

**c) International Polity literature**


d) **IGO literature**


d.1) IGO Resolution, Decisions and Reports

e) News and Press Releases sources