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The challenges of sustainable development have never been as acute as now, with high risks of severe fractures: environmental and energy transitions, brutal and massive migrations, social and territorial inequalities, shortages of public funding for urban development...

Between the recent conferences on the Millennium Development Goals in New York, the Climate Conference in Paris and Habitat 3 planned in Quito in 2016, INTA intends to play its role as a provider of additional insights into the key issues that shape how the city of tomorrow will be like.

Furthermore, a consultation carried out by the Scientific Committee of INTA showed that, in this increasingly digital age, one can witness both the introduction of a higher margin of autonomy for local authorities in relation to the State, as well as the desire for greater involvement of citizens at the neighborhood level.

By contrast, with the wide diffusion of ICT, increasing numbers cases of information networks or civic expression and engagement favour a multiplicity of experiences, leading to the evolution of the government patterns in order to allow greater participation of the inhabitants in the management of their living spaces.

These trends place us within a participatory democracy framework that reinvents itself through new experiences and new concepts of urban development – i.e. through territorial, social and technological innovation. However, the existence of several levels of responsibility in the conduct of public policies may lead citizens into behaviours like passive or of selfish consumerism.

The last World Urban Development Congress of INTA, “INTA39”, in Paris (France) welcomed around 80 participants of 19 nationalities. 38 speakers addressed various current urban issues, trying to define how public and private urban stakeholders can adapt their own practice, in order to allow inhabitants to take part of the making of the city. Ministers, public officials and representatives, private practitioners and academic members animated three exciting and fruitful days.

The Congress was also the occasion to discuss the initiative of INTA for Habitat III.

Our 39th Congress received support from the Caisse des Dépôts Group, the RATP, the Eiffage Group, the Carrefour Group, the Indonesian Ciputra Residence Group and the newspaper La Tribune.

Speakers’ profiles & presentations are available clicking on:

- Profil
- Presentation
We open our 39th INTA Congress within a painful context for Paris and France, after the terrorist attacks. This brings to mind the risks of fragmentation of the city, which can be territorial, social and cultural conducting to inequality, segregation, exclusion and intolerance toward differences. The City thus becomes synonymous to complexity: a shared space in which its uses are constantly negotiated according to social and cultural tendencies. It is a space where diversity and sharing of universal humanistic values are expressed. A questioning calling on a spirit of innovation [...] in order to imagine the city and the sustainable territorial and human developments of tomorrow.” (M. Charrier)

“(...) The theme that brings us together today is a tough one, because to reflect on how to give the city back to its inhabitants, we need to highlight how they were dispossessed of it in the first place. [...] Our conception of the public debate is cracking. Many attempts are made to retrieve the initial inspiration, particularly through digital tools, [...] but we have to think about this new approach, because technical tools do not produce policies. [...] Inhabitants do not necessarily feel they are stakeholders in their daily lives. [...] Elements that make up their daily lives are: housing, public space, school, markets and workplace. In order to give the city back to its inhabitants, we need to act on these different elements. [...] We should not ask people to come to live in an environment they have not defined nor designed.” (M. Baietto)

“We need to work with the inhabitants because the city expresses their lifestyles and thus the evolution of the society. We need to understand people first. [...] There must be a meeting between this uncertain person and the others, between concern of the self and caring for others. [...] We currently are in a confused world with confuse people. This is the current situation. [...] Managing both self-concern and caring for others is not easy. That is why we must pay attention to “the almost obligation” of consultation processes asked by those elected officials. [...] It is important to know and understand social needs but it is also important to let people express themselves and make them feel involved in the project. We need a narrative democracy. The city is first of all made by social relationships and so we need to be efficient in making social relationships.” (J-Y. Chapuis)
Re-formulate the urban equation is reconsidered sustainable development with other terms and new representation tools and therefore the management of the city of tomorrow.

Give, or rather return, the city to its inhabitants is to wish firstly to end with the confiscation of the city by all those who have taken advantage of the financialization of the space and secondly to reinvigorate democracy that is questioned today by the rise of digitalization and individualism.

“Technological objects, communication tools, politic and institutional actions can be wrongly used. They can switch from information and participation to share and co-production handling practices. This is the issue of the “planning committee”: to respect inhabitants participation and contribution in the City-making.” (H. Chabert)

“We focused on videogame technologies because they allow an immersive experience in a virtual reality where it is possible to experience as much as we want, at different scales. This immersion as a walker allows inhabitants to discover feasible changes in their environnement and to make them discover potential technological and industrial solutions which can be useful in their City. It is important to offer solutions to the inhabitants which make sense according to their needs and uses. [...] We have used technology to try to integrate social aspects and to make the inhabitants participate in the project.” (V. David)

“The experiences which have worked in Lisbon are the ones where policy-makers have been very close to the inhabitants, and where specific spaces were created to allow discussions, debates to between politicians and inhabitants: neighbours associations, citizen leaders, NGO, social associations, religious associations, etc. [...] The participation of inhabitants is a dialectic process where a solution is created collaboratively. We need to find what are the issues and priorities and only then try to find a compromise.” (F. Nunes da Silva)

“The people who are present here in this room have different approaches, backgrounds and origins and this is how the current world is. We have to think these differences by adopting a dynamic reflection strategy. [...] The citizen must be in the core in all of our reflections.” (M. Armanet)
“People are a great asset, it is important to keep this in our minds. [...] There is a huge potential of networks and knowledge. [...] Can architecture and urban planning give back the city to its inhabitants? Of course they can! [...] Creating and managing environments of quality; this is the issue; this is the key to success.”
(K. Skog)

“Given the scarcity or lack of land in the metropolitan cores, can real mix use constitute a new frontier of development? What are the financial and development options that would deliver a step change in mobilising capital towards a more innovative and inclusive city?"

“To create citizenship we need the following things:
1) To continue to educate and train inhabitants;
2) To have conscience and ethics as fundamental values;
3) To guarantee transparency and respect of the legislation;
4) To reinforce democracy.
We need smart citizens, but not only; we also need a smart government.” (Z. Bolivar)

“I do not believe that there is a crisis in urban development but instead a crisis in urban narratives. We need to believe that the economic discourse could act as a relay to the lack of political discourse. Nevertheless, we cannot build a neighbourhood by looking at growth of unemployment. It is not by putting a bench on a public square that we create a social dynamic. We are missing an “urban tale”. There is a necessity to find a common driver.” (R. Feredj)
This digital age, one can witness both the introduction of a higher margin of autonomy for local authorities in relation to the State, as well as the desire for greater involvement of citizens at the neighborhood level.

“The process starts from the bottom. It’s a bottom-up approach. The city council put its trust in the capacity of people to achieve the necessary improvements, starting from reflection, and all the way to the application. Each neighborhood has a legally recognized association to ensure its empowerment and maintain their competency. The outcomes are very satisfactory. Beyond physical improvement, there is also a mindset change in these spaces. It went from no-go areas to areas where residents are proud to live.” (P. Marques)

“Being a welfare state, in which the government does a lot for its citizen is kind of a paradox. On the one hand, it is an asset to be a well-organized society, but on the other hand it is a problem to be well-organized. [...] This way of governing is currently getting more selective in its priorities and thus the society becomes more active. The Swedish people need new paradigms of urban planning. In this new approach, we should make sure to build more places where citizens can take initiatives, and organise more workshops to ensure citizen participation. [...] Old approaches no longer work. Citizens must be able to influence the ways of doing.” (C. Larsson)

“Montreal has a consultation office, so all projects go through this office. Everyone is able to say what he wants. We try to involve more and more inhabitants. In the suburbs, there are even cities that regularly make referendums, but there is nothing like that existing at the regional level. Commissions are organized, but people do not know where they are held. [...] Inhabitants need to know who is responsible.” (R. Olivier)

“Montreal makes efforts to enlarge the scale of government but there is the need to stay close to people’s perception and the need to maintain a democratic legitimization at this new regional scale.” (J. Modder)
“To reach the population, several tools are used: we have bought pages in the daily newspaper, made radio interventions to mobilize people, created leaflet available in town halls, set up public meetings and used internet for making available all studies, reports, etc. But in 8 years, only 11 people have sent us an email. [...] We have realized that we spent a lot of energy, but the elaboration of a strategic planning document across 43 communes seems to be too far from the people's lives to get them interested in.” (M. Juillet)

“Sylvain Guillot’s practice is in Lyon and he is using artist designs as mediators in participatory processes helping people to shape their own environments.” (J. Modder)

“In these approaches, the place of the artist, who can be an architect, a designer, a landscaper, etc. is the one of a facilitator. His materials include primarily the inhabitant, based on his creative ability and the territory, based on its history, characteristics and heritage. The artist allows the creation of a narrative with the inhabitants. [...] It is important to preserve free spaces, because they are spaces of “possibility” [...] The inhabitants move from “nothing is possible” to “everything is possible”.” (S. Guillot)

“We must believe in citizen creativity, in people, in their ideas and ability to do things and to see the city as a playground. [...] People can generate ideas and implement initiatives, even on complicated subjects such as mobility, disability, integration, etc. [...] The strength of collective innovation is to make people work together, make them think together. It often helps to generate ideas that would not have emerged within groups of experts. [...] It is at local level that we can involve people and create collective adventures. These are the keys to the city of tomorrow.” (N. Le Berre)

“Nicolas Le Berre gave us a lively review of new ways to produce urban environments around the world. But can we still call it an urban planning approach? [...] According to me, yes we can, because through exchange of innovation and creative approaches, people anywhere in the world are able to apply the inspirational ideas of others.” (J. Modder)
"The metropolis must become a driver to support the projects of people and not only those of the elected representatives. [...] This is how we have chosen to see the future: reducing inequalities that prevent a part of our citizens to consider the metropolitan territory as their own, instead of letting them see it as the territory where they are condemned to live. [...]"

"By continually failing to view public space as a space for innovation, the public space can sometimes become the private space of young people; not by choice but by a form of directive to be there, without choice. How can we be reunited if nothing happens on public spaces? [...] How can we strengthen solidarity between territories? How can we answer this issue? How can we respond when territories are well described, but badly understood. [...] Territories are not at the cutting edge of what they could do and, worse, they do not exchange enough with their inhabitants. [...] We do not want metropolises of competition, but rather metropolises of cooperation between territories. [...]"

We have taken up the challenge of “doing-together”. Public services issues are probably related to issues posed by urban planning in general.”

(M. Lebranchu)
Those who act in the city face not only their daily routines; they must confront transformations, ruptures and innovation carried by the world that is emerging before our eyes. The digital world, the energy crisis, and the knowledge society require a fundamental change in our lifestyles, our ways of thinking, our social relations. Can the answers really be only technical?

“Whether politics wants it or not, there is a development of the uses and technologies where wealth and resources are located. This has been understood by cities that have worked to develop their attractivity.” (P. Menissier)

“Design has the role of beginning to enable people to approach problems of uncertainty. We have to research on bases that cultivate trust in future patterns. This cultivation of trust in future patterns means that politicians and designers must work together to offer a shared vision, and then to seek responses.” (L. Barth)

“We must admit that digital technology is not the solution, but it is an opportunity for experimentation to reinvent citizen involvement.” (P. Menissier)

“A very important calling that will always be essential is toward social encounters: during leisure activities, at work, etc. If you look at cities that are successful, they are cities that are very attractive to go and to meet people. [...] If we accept this purpose, it means that we must change the way we do our planning.” (L. Valadares Tavares)
Cities and Territories of Tomorrow: digital, energetical and social innovation, transformation and breakthrough - Session 7

The making of the city is now primarily done around a technical, social or environmental logic. It focuses on excellence in sustainability, accessibility, diversity and functionality.

Is it enough to enable citizens to project themselves positively in the future of their neighborhood, their city and their country?

But how can we create a desirable metropolis agglomeration? What kind of urban forms to respond to changing lifestyles?

“Private investors will pay a phenomenal amount of money for proximity to footfalls, places where people transit or transfert. This is what a supermarket or retailer want more than anything else. So one of the smart things that public sector operators are doing is moneythizing these transit spaces to help meet the operational financing requirements. [...] There is a very powerful thing and potential area for innovation: the public sector isn’t allowed to speculate the market. But in the US, and increasingly in the UK, public bodies do use this mechanism. They are starting to innovate financially through the securisation of income streams in the market, issuing bonds and using new borrowing and financing techniques. It’s interesting to see how we can all learn from each others’ techniques. [...] The interesting thing that Florian Bercault described wasn’t only the innovative financial mechanisms, he discussed quite wisely the issue of how one manager can take risks in a context of innovation.” (J. Montgomery)
Presentations of the cities of Quito, Ecuador, and Phoenix, United-States.

“We have here two similar issues, but totally different contexts.” (J. Montgomery)

“A city that has doubled its population but which does not even have half of the financial resources required in order to deal with this demographic growth. [...] A polycentric urban configuration of Quito is developed to address the problems of congestion and imbalance that have produced urban sprawl.” (A. Barrera)

“Phoenix is a city which attracts people from its hinterland, which has a well-established governance, but which is against taxation; however, as far as we can make out, the city has a great economic development. [...] It is a city which both enormously spreads as well as gathers many people who live in the city and work there.” (D. Trozzi)

“We must invest in human and social capital as well as technological innovations without neglecting governance and economic models. Rural areas as much as urban areas.” (J. R. Candia Jorquera)

“Cotonou is saturated and the urban sprawl is increasing. [...] It is due to the numerous individual transports and the lack of transports policies for the benefit of public transports. Cotonou has engaged a transportation plan to reduce congestion. [...] At the urban scale, African cities must go from micro-projects engineering to macro-projects engineering.” (S. Nsia)
This initiative is conceived in order to share experiences, practices and difficulties in the implementation of local, regional or national policies on territorial, technological and social innovation, for a sustainable urban development.

The INTA project is built around a series of regional initiatives in Asia, North and South America, Africa, and Europe and linked to the preparation of the UN conference Habitat III. The discussions during INTA39 are part of this preparatory work. The same general question (innovation in sustainable urban development) serves as guidance of the various themed meetings (housing, mobility and transport, digital services, natural hazards and urbanization, economic development, knowledge economy, etc.), and served to enrich specific realities and issues of the different regional contexts.

The novelty of this approach is that the vision of a desirable future society is no longer “above ground”, it is linked to reality by the possibilities offered by technological, social and territorial innovation. The goal is to mobilize both interdisciplinary approaches and a project logic, because the aim to “create a pathway”, even uncertain, to a desired situation. This is not about finding the “one best way” but rather opening new possibilities and being aware of the plurality of ways to reach the desired situation. From an urban development standpoint, the creation of a strong relationship between city and territory requires instruments of inter-territorial solidarity; from an architectural point of view, this requires adaptations of constructions by increasing the energy efficiency of housing, developing co-housing, using local and natural materials or recycling, etc.

The objective of INTA is to come to Quito in 2016 with a summary document including proposals which are both prospective and operational.
What roads can we take to meet the challenges of the world to come? It is by raising the question of urban design, public space, and new tools of representation of the city that one can hope to overcome the existing contradictions.

“Both speakers address the problem using two opposite point of views: Didier Drummond proposes to look for loopholes within the structure, while Christer Larsson wants to reform the structure itself.

But there is a common point between their proposals: both put forward solutions from a systemic approach.” (P. Serizier)

“The tools are monopolized by professionals, by regulations, [...] the making of the City is not in the hands of those who use it. [...] The city is the last place where democracy is formulated. You do not have to count on on architects or policies that produce watched spaces in which insurance is required. [...] We need to shake up the established system. It is necessary that elected representatives put themselves the middle of exchanges and share with the inhabitants. We must reinvent the agora. The issue of trust is essential. There is confidence when there is vision.” (D. Drummond)

“I was asked to design a national development policy. [...] I believe in the role of architecture. I think that it can change the world, but we have to work differently. Architecture and urban planning are becoming more and more complex. There is a need of an integrated approach. [...] We must start from the human, and long-term values. We must face new challenges. [...] We can no longer let housing be governed by the market, we need a more proactive approach. We propose to create a fund dedicated to urban development. We need to try to have a systemic approach, and capitalize on new knowledge. [...] Policies have to hand over the power. We must create sharing systems. I have not been so far as to propose new laws because it is useless. Rather, we have to change processes. [...] We need inhabitants and markets actors be informed on what must be done or inhabitants will be driven by short-term concerns.” (C. Larsson)
Is the city, that would at the same time meet the requirements of good living and the challenges of its transformation, an utopia? Does it not begin to take shape through the tools of its own production or through approaches that change our ways of seeing, and therefore to act and live together? Innovation cannot be decreed: it appears when an idea meets a need.

“We must set up human investment in total investment. We need to work on that for big investments.”  
(P. Serizier)

“Chers Voisins organizes its work using “economy of living together” as a principle. It works on activities which are demanded by the inhabitants. […] We pretend that we need to “reintroduce human value” for reaching a “living together”. So far human capital is not considered as an investment but as an expense.”  
(P. Le Boulch)

“BSHF promotes innovation in housing, in a context of global crisis in housing access. […] Cities attract people, often “pushed away” from the rural areas, notably due to climatic hazards. There is insufficient space to handle the influx. The formal housing market only satisfies 25% of demand. We need more resilience. […] Who is allowed to go to the city? The slums are also the city! A totally planned city is a myth. […] The smart city is based on collective intelligence.”  
(L. Algoed)

“Circle Housing Group is a non-profit social landlord which provides advices to people in order finance their housing, and help for payment delays. We have also set up a mutual exchange of housing, about 1.4 million tenants across England. […] In London, it is difficult to access property ownership with an average income lower than 100 000 pounds/year; and rentals are also very expensive. Public grants are devoted to private housing, while we have observed that the privatization of housing does not work.”  
(K. Farmsworth)

“NAHRO is expert in dialoguing with decision makers. […] The objective of NAHRO is to include inhabitants in the projects. Even if inhabitants are principally concerned by housing, their involvement should not only be limited to that. […] The approach should be flexible, allowing the evolution of the project and providing conditions for its sustainability.”  
(H. Sause)
“We need to do things differently, we need to think differently. We have instruments, but we need to rethink our approach.
I have noticed we should start by culture. Cultural networks allow integration and empowerment.
Furthermore, the concept of tension and dynamics, as well as technology and the social aspect: how can we combine them?” (C. Larsson)

“We must not underestimate the importance of political representation and commitment.” (M. Sudarskis)
Live tweets during #INTA39

World Habitat Awards @bashf_WHA - 26 nov.
#communityledhousing - our presentation today in Paris #INTA39 @bashf

INTA urban dev asso @intalvn
@lineagood @bashf presenting innovation in housing with community-led approaches #INTA39

Thomas Brunk @ThomasBrunk - 26 nov.
Smart city is about “collective intelligence” - the participation of citizens, public admin., business, non-profit org. #INTA39

Jaap Modder @jaapmodder - 26 nov.
@lineagood at #INTA39 - world wide the formal housing market only responds to 25% of the demand. @intalvn

Keywords: collective intelligence, participation, housing innovation.

Keri Fansworth @KeriFansworth - 26 nov.
Chris Larsson @lineagood - what urbanism DOES to citizens' lives is more important than the theory #INTA39

Jaap Modder @jaapmodder - 26 nov.
@lineagood at #INTA39 - world wide the formal housing market only responds to 25% of the demand. @intalvn

(intelligence, participation, urbanism)

Delaremtpool @Deltametropool - 25 nov.
Seeking New Concepts In Urban Centres > Actor Oriented Approaches Needed,
Seen At #INTA39 bit.ly/1TfhhJG @intalvn @v2015

(urban concepts, actor-oriented approaches)

Benoit Vicaigne @B.Ben_Vic - 26 nov.
@intalvn - Christer Larsson concluding the Congress with some remarks

Luis Baeza @luisbaheza - 26 nov.
@intalvn Maurice Chanier, Presidente de @intalvn evoca los problemas de la fragmentación de la ciudad

GreenChannel @greenchannelfr - 25 nov.
@FlorianBercot à #INTA39 pour présenter le crowdfunding comme une innovation financière au service du territoire.

(intelligence, participation, urbanism)
The members of INTA

More information on members and activities at:

www.inta-aivn.org