

SIDS workshop

The Pacific Urban Forum (PUF): Challenges and
Lessons for Land Governance

Luke Kiddle

Outline

- 4 thematic areas of the PUF resolution
- Key recognitions of the PUF
- Linkages to the 6 guiding questions for the workshop
- The big challenge, and opportunities

2015 Pacific Urban Forum

- Held in Nadi, Fiji. Built from earlier forums in 2003, 2007, and 2011
- Aimed for a 'new urban agenda' which:
 - accepted the reality of continued urbanisation in the Pacific
 - and would encourage attention and action
- The official resolution endorsed 4 key messages/recommendations:
 1. The importance of housing and settlement upgrading programmes and improving access to land
 2. Addressing climate change through vulnerability assessments and planning
 3. Recognising the importance of urban economies
 4. Improving urban governance through policy development, supportive legislative frameworks, and capacity building

Importantly:

- The PUF overtly recognised the unique vulnerability of PICs to climate change
- The PUF recognised the reality of continued urbanisation
 - for example, highlighting the growth of informal settlements and accepting their permanence
- And also recognised that climate change and urbanisation intersecting creates particular vulnerabilities for PIC urban areas – e.g. informal settlements on environmentally-marginal land. Calling for:
 - Starting and intensifying climate change vulnerability assessments
 - Developing climate change action plans
 - Integrating these plans into specific urban policies and plans

Importantly

- The PUF recognised the importance of urban economies
 - for example, highlighting the strong links between *well managed* urbanisation and improved economic growth
 - for example, highlighting the importance of improving urban-rural linkages for harnessing the strength of urban economies
- And was clear that well managed urban growth must be “enabled through strategic policies and legislative frameworks and suitably capacitated institutions, leaders, and professionals”

Linkages to the 6 guiding questions

Question	PUF
1. Key vulnerabilities & challenges for SIDS in relation to climate change	Highlighted these very well by identifying the unique situation of PICs, as well as the key role of land sector agencies/professionals
2. Key vulnerabilities & challenges for SIDS in relation to urbanisation	Highlighted these very well, and also focused on key strategies for responding to urbanisation: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• e.g. in-situ upgrading and enhanced WASH services
3. Key constraints in improving land governance	Highlighted these very well. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• e.g. PIC capacity constraints and nature of land tenure

Linkages....

Question	PUF
4. Addressing land governance constraints	Called for: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Further work to fill policy & legislative caps• Ongoing capacity building• Multi-stakeholder partnerships But silent on possible role of Voluntary Guidelines for Responsible Governance of Tenure
5. Capacity building requirements	Identified key role of capacity building but relatively silent on exact requirements
6. Professional and organisation collaboration	Championed importance of partnerships but generally silent on exact roles and responsibilities of various agencies

The big challenge, and opportunities

Overcoming 'anti-urbanism'

- How?

- Accepting reality of continued urbanisation, and adequately planning for this
- Advocacy and awareness raising
- Political will
- Biggest opportunity: recognising and reinforcing that Pacific cities and towns are engines of growth

The twin, and intersecting, challenges of urbanisation and climate change present the opportunity for a renewed urban focus

Thank you!

lukekiddle@gmail.com