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The City-to-City Knowledge Exchange (C2CKE) programme forms part of the Strategic Capacity Development Component being delivered by the UK Built Environment Advisory Group (UKBEAG) in collaboration with UN Habitat, in support of the FCDO Global Future Cities Programme.

The C2CKE programme has been developed to respond to the interest that has been shown in the work of other cities by the respondents to the Capacity Needs Assessment that was circulated earlier in the year. The programme comprises four events, each of which features four cities that have been selected based on the level of interest shown. The aim of the programme is to enable cities to share their experiences, to learn from one another, to help build relationships with one another and to promote engagement among a wider group of stakeholders.

Each session is being supported by a range of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) who bring their knowledge and expertise to bear in the capacity of ‘critical friends’. The role of the SMEs is to provide constructive observations on the presentations, helping to identify issues which might not have been adequately recognised, suggesting solutions for challenges which may have been identified and exploring synergies between projects in the cities. They will also explore links with the topics that formed part of the Thematic Programme, namely:

1. Integrated & Inclusive Planning
2. Governance & Collaboration
3. Evidence-based Design & the Effective use of Data
4. Project Finance & Procurement
5. Implementation & Enforcement, Monitoring & Evaluation
6. Leadership & Change Management

The purpose of this document is to serve as a record of the main contributors and the principal matters discussed.
The following cities presented their projects during the course of Session 2 which took place on 14 October 2021:

**Bandung, Indonesia**
- Development of an Integrated Public Transport System in Bandung.
  - Presented by Dr Riela Fiqrina
  - Head of Section III, Infrastructure and Regional Development Planning, BAPPELITBANG

**Bangkok, Thailand**
- Integrated Data Hub for Bangkok Metropolitan Administration.
  - Presented by Dr Nutchuda Mongkolchart
  - Computer Technical Officer, Bangkok Metropolitan Administration
- Flood Management Decision Support System
  - Presented by Mr Arsa Sukkhang
  - Director of Drainage Information System Division at Drainage and Sewerage Department, Bangkok Metropolitan Administration
- Transit-oriented Development Plan for Khlong Bang Luang Area
  - Presented by Ms. Piyanud Siril
  - Director of Urban Design and Development Division, Bangkok Metropolitan Administration

**Subject Matter Experts**
The following Subject Matter Experts contributed to the session:
- Ms Victoria Delbridge, Head of Cities That Work, International Growth Centre
- Mr Oliver Harman, Cities Economist, International Growth Centre
- Mr Roland Chanin-Morris, Urban Planner, UK Built Environment Group
- Mr Nathan Pierce, Head of Smart London, Greater London Authority
- Mr Ryan Sequeira, Mobility Specialist, UN Habitat
After a short presentation from each city, a discussion took place between the presenters, the subject matter experts and the audience. The following are among the main topics discussed:

**Main Points covered during the Session**

**How incentives can be used to encourage people to use sustainable forms of transport.**

The following provides a summary of the key matters discussed during GFCP’s Bandung and Bangkok city level event:

The ongoing interventions in these cities were presented and showed great vision, yet for some, particularly the transport related interventions, difficulties were faced on implementation & enforcement - and particularly - in turning plans into action for project finance. For example, with Bandung, the local budget is currently prioritised for economic recovery and in addition, financial institutions were not readily available step in. Those cities still at planning and design stage would benefit from further detail on:

- a) who pays for the intervention (private, public, local government, state government),
- b) how do they pay for it and
- c) is this realistic in the time frame.

Thinking critically about project prioritisation may be useful, specifically what is achievable within the city government (or city governance’s) sphere of control.

This ties to a second point on legislation under the theme of collaboration and governance. Some of the projects required legal changes in order to unlock certain aspects of the intervention – in many cases causing delays. For example, in the Transit Orientated Development Plan (TODP) for the Khlong Bang Luang Area, land use regulation reform is needed to ensure that the city benefits from increasing land values. Currently much of the city has fragmented land ownership, and there is no tax structure around land value and no land tax code. With the considerable number of options available for land value capture, the major political economy issues around land, and in Bangkok’s case specifically, the consolidation of small plots, is unlikely to be a quick reform. While experts can provide options on how to rectify such legal issues, such major reform requires embedding in local context.

In both land and other aspects, there is a question on what can be done and what cannot be achieved under the legal institutional structure of Bangkok and more broadly Thailand. Cross-country learning, while useful, cannot comment on highly specific and unique cases. Therefore, those interventions building upon legislation or acts already in place will likely see faster implementation.

These governance and collaboration matters discussed throughout also were relevant to the effective use of data and the sharing of information between different levels of government. This mattered for both Bangkok’s flooding decision support system and integrated data hub. While the provision of data is an important first step, focussing on the opportunities to link it through to decisions and action is where cities will see tangible results. For example, in BMA, linking flooding data to urban planning is a key opportunity to drive sustainable development – going beyond being reactive to flooding shocks and rather proactive to future flooding change. With such an issue, such as extreme weather, which traverses governance boundaries and is expected to increase in frequency, the intervention should do more on understanding whose role it is to act.

Useful recognition was also given to how cities can expand the effective use of data outside of government decision makers to wider researchers or analysts. While information must be able to be shared, it must also be able to be understood.

**Data sharing also brings opportunities for cities to engage better with citizens.** For example, with tracking people in transit, data can enable adaptive learning, tweaking policies as they understand their effect. This is useful for planning and monitoring.

In addition to hard legislation, the matter of behavioural change was discussed, namely - how to get incentives in place for different actors to change their business-as-usual approach. For example, data sharing, which is often not the norm in governments departments, and is unlikely to happen naturally without a behavioural shift. For BMA, while there is good institutional structure, more thought is needed on the incentives behind curating data in a more sharable manner – both for local and central government as well as private partners part of the wider city’s governance.
Key Takeaways

- There is opportunity to link Bangkok’s multiple interventions more explicitly. There are clear synergies to leverage in data and urban planning with potential to overlap the uses cases for data across interventions, and have them contribute more than the sum of their parts.

- Maintaining focus on how these interventions will drive impact and outcomes, and ultimately contribute to prosperity, is important. Particularly in this later stage of their development.

- With the more developed interventions there is an option for scalability, both across the city spatially, and within government with respect to its reach. Interventions do not have to be constrained by their initial mandate.

- Cross city learning, both within the programme and outside of the programme, can provide useful input. But this needs to be framed within the local legislature and context.

- Prioritisation and sequencing of work is crucial. If the intervention tries to do everything, it has a higher chance of achieving little or nothing.

The aim of the strategic capacity development component is to complement the other elements of the Global Future Cities Programme, to consider some of the barriers and enablers to sustainable urbanisation and to help achieve the programme’s long-term impact.
Links to Further Information

IGC, Policy decisions for enhancing urban mobility:

IGC, Data oriented urban transport reform in middle income and developing cities:

IGC, Informal transport reform in Kampala city:

IGC, The BRT and the Danfo: a case study of Lagos transport reforms from 1999-2019:

Link To The Online Recording
Copies of the presentations and a recording of Session 3 can be found on the Global Future Cites website at:
https://www.globalfuturecities.org/city-to-city/14-october-2021-session-3
For further information about the programme, please contact Adrian Malleson at adrian.malleson@riba.org

The Global Future Cities Programme of the UK Government’s Prosperity Fund supports sustainable urban development, while achieving inclusive prosperity and alleviating high levels of urban poverty.