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Executive Summary

The purpose of the present document is to provide a broad overview of the possible challenges that might be faced when implementing the Urban Reform (UR) elaborated by the Mario Molina Center, CTS Embarq, and IMCO. In order to focus the scope of the work, we centered our analysis on two of the seven pillars of the reform: revitalization of the neighborhood and sustainable public transportation. Moreover, we selected two cities, Mérida and México City, which allow us to inform our recommendations with contrasting experiences.

The research methodology was based primarily on literature review (both primary and secondary sources), study of international best practices, and semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders of the sector. We started by developing a compatibility analysis between the Urban Reform and the Sectorial Program of Agrarian, Territorial, and Urban Development (PSDATU). We evaluated the proportion of ideas contained in the UR that are also part of the PSDATU. According to our analysis, 52.5% of the Reform’s recommendations are contemplated in the PSDATU. The Reform pillar most aligned with the Sectorial Program is Metropolitan Strengthening (75% alignment) and the least included pillars are Putting the City in Motion and Innovating in the City (both around 35% alignment). The best international practices provided insight into innovative solutions to urban problems experienced around the world. However, the programs were proven to be successful due to integrated planning, effective coordination among various levels of government agencies, and the active participation of all stakeholders.

The main output of our research includes a series of challenges identified in four areas: politics, institutional coordination and capacity, regulatory frameworks, and funding allocation and deficit. Political challenges are mostly related to office terms and the current ban on reelection (which was removed by the Political Reform and will come into effect in the next electoral period). Party differences and horizontal-vertical cooperation pose challenges to the coordination of urban development agendas, and it is necessary to foster cross-party agreements on fundamental urban policies that require parliament approval. The role of civil society is crucial to boost the demand and support for reform. In this sense, it is necessary to promote and consolidate partnerships between NGOS, scholars, citizens’ organizations, and government agencies.

In terms of the institutional coordination challenges, we identified a problem of insufficient human and organizational capacity to implement reform at the local level. It is thus necessary to optimize the existing resources by training government workers on technical aspects of urban reform and management skills to better facilitate the participation of the private sector and civil society. Furthermore, it is crucial to build collaboration among municipalities to share best practices and cohesion in promoting local initiatives. A related problem is the absence of coordination among municipalities, states, and the federal government to address issues such as unclear defined physical borders, outdated and conflicting laws. By creating a state-led council with representatives from each city, focused on the assignment of responsibility to each of the stated challenges, the situation could be improved. The lack of coordination between various agencies and holistic approach to urban development can be addressed by setting up formal communication channels and interagency groups to support it.

Regulatory framework challenges are mostly related to the role of interest groups pressure and local government corruption in permits and licensing allocation. Corruption hinders the
possibility of the government successfully implementing urban planning and regulation. Zoning maps are constantly changed in questionable ways and they appear to respond mostly to constructors’ interests. In this context, urban development plans will never become a reality, no matter how technically correct they are. The goal then is to change the incentives of both politicians and bureaucrats in such a way that urban planning becomes urban practice. The stronger the connection between regulations and implemented policies, the more relevant and feasible an Urban Reform will be. Possible channels to achieve this change include third party audits, publication and digitalization of zoning maps, official agreements, and negotiations to grant building permits and licenses.

Lastly, we identified problems regarding the allocation of the current resources to fund public transportation. Using financial instruments that reduce car use while simultaneously generating local income and seeking international finance opportunities as a complement to domestic investment can help overcome funding challenges.

Bearing in mind the challenges and opportunities for urban reform implementation, we analyze the feasibility of each idea proposed in the selected pillars, and present short and medium-term strategies to implement them. Focusing our research on two cities and two pillars enabled us to better understand and address tangible problems, and although our solutions are developed within this scope, many of the policy recommendations can be applied to other Mexican cities and other urban reform issues.
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I. Project Purpose

The purpose of this project is to understand the main challenges for implementing the Urban Reform (UR) in Mexico, elaborated by the Mario Molina Center, CTS Embarq Mexico, and the Mexican Institute for Competitiveness. Considering the broad scope of the Reform, we decided to narrow down our analysis to address the challenges more closely related to two of its pillars: *Putting the City in Motion* and *Revitalizing the Neighborhood*. Moreover, we focused our attention in Mexico City and Merida. The goal is to address challenges that might present in different types of cities in order to present recommendations applicable to a broader set of issues.¹

In spite of our focus on the two above-mentioned pillars, when addressing the implementation challenges we take an integral approach that considers the relationship with other pillars and stresses the need to implement a comprehensive reform. Throughout the project, we aim at finding out what type of ground would need to be set in order to make the Reform attractive both from a political and economic perspective. To do this, we disentangle which specific steps need to be taken to go through with the recommendations of the UR, we identify key stakeholders and analyze their interests and incentives to push for or stand against the desired changes. We then map out possible strategies to align the interests of the identified stakeholders with the goals of the Reform.

We provide a broad overview of the type of obstacles that can be found when trying to transform theory into practice, and propose different ways to overcome them. It is necessary, however, to recognize the limitations of the project. It is not meant to be a comprehensive and highly detailed analysis of *all* the different challenges of implementation associated with the reform, nor does it provide an infallible strategy that applies to every circumstance at any moment. Rather, it aims at creating general guidelines for implementation and to raise awareness on the different social, political and economic factors that need to be considered in policy-making. The output of our research is meant to serve as a bridge between research and policy, between socially and environmentally desirable goals and feasible solutions.

¹ For a detailed explanation of city and pillars selection please refer to the Methodology section and/or to
II. Methodology

Our team has been tasked to create an implementation plan for the Urban Reform. We have narrowed down the scope in hopes of providing thorough and specific recommendations. First, of the seven pillars proposed in the Urban Reform, two were selected: Sustainable Transportation and Revitalization of the Neighborhood. Second, to focus on the challenges specific to local implementation, we chose two cities: Merida and Mexico City.

For city selection, our client recommended selecting Mexico City as one of the cities due to the abundance of information and the fact that it is the most populated and dense city in Mexico. To select the other city, we developed a series of indicators to identify the best choice such as population size, information availability, previous attempts and political will. Taking all these factors into consideration, we reached the conclusion that Merida would the best city to compare with Mexico City (See Appendix I.2 for further details on the city selection methodology). Although the studies focus on two cities, the intention is to cover strategies encompassing a variety of challenges, to be applicable to other cities in Mexico as urban reform is implemented.

In terms of the pillars selection, Revitalization of the neighborhood was chosen primarily due to the continued violence in Mexico’s cities. Addressing issues related to abandoned homes, far distances from employment and social services, safe public spaces, and poverty can ameliorate and possibly eliminate the levels of violence. Sustainable transportation is closely linked to the first pillar, and a growing issue in nearly all of the cities of Mexico. As the urban population grows, congestion and pollution increase and productivity losses are exacerbated (See Appendix I.2 for further description on the pillar selection).

To propose a feasible urban reform implementation strategy for Merida and Mexico City focus on sustainable transportation and neighborhood revitalization, we started by assessing the Sectorial Program of Agrarian, Territorial, and Urban Development (PSDATU), elaborated by the Urban, Territorial, and Agrarian Development Ministry (Federal Government) and the Urban Reform proposed by CMM, CTS Embarq, and IMC. We analyzed the alignments and misalignments between the two documents and then incorporated the results into our recommendations for how the development strategies could be better coordinated in the future.

We also created a combination of case study review/literature review, in which we summarized and analyzed existing sustainable urbanization programs to capitalize the successes and failures of preexisting programs. To make sure our case studies are globally representative, we selected cases from all the five continents. Several of our case studies are focused on implementation strategies while the others are focused on innovative solutions to concrete urban problems. This way, the case studies could be more diverse and applicable to the situations in Merida and Mexico City.

The literature review provided a basic understanding about the current situations in the two cities and what are the policies and strategies the government is using to solve those problems and how it works. The case studies are used to learn about the challenges other countries are facing, the types of concrete solutions they have brought about to solve those problems, and assess whether they are applicable in Merida and Mexico City.
The literature review provided useful background information. To gain a deeper understanding about the challenges Merida and Mexico City are facing in terms of urban reform, we started with a stakeholder map to identify the major players and their different roles in the potential urban reform process. We then developed a list of interviewees to cover all the key stakeholders, which include the government, the private sector, academia and civil society. We visited Merida and Mexico City to conduct 26 in-person interviews, which informed our analysis with local insights (Please reference Appendix I.1 and I.3 for the interviewee list, dates, and notes). Overall, we used the interviews as an opportunity to apply the background knowledge we had gained from the literature review and delve into the topics raised in the case studies we reviewed.

Each of our research strategies (case studies/literature review, interviews) had distinct advantages and limitations. The literature review gave us a broad overview of the current situations in Mexico City and Merida, the challenges they are facing in terms of sustainable urbanization, and how they might respond to the proposed urban reform. The case studies looked at how other cities have solved those challenges and if the lessons and experiences accumulated in other countries could be applied to Mexico. However, the case studies and literature review lack the specificity needed to prepare recommendations for Merida and Mexico City, because each city comes with its own demographics and challenges. Neither the case studies nor the literary review would have been directly applicable to the two cities without additional information.

The interviews, on the other hand, were advantageous because they allowed us to gain insights to the many aspects of the city challenges and each stakeholder’s opinion of how to cope with those challenges. On the other hand, the interviews lacked breadth and the insights provided by the successes and failures of previously launched programs. Taken together, our multiple research methodologies provided a comprehensive understanding of how best to implement urban reform programs. As a result, we were able to make recommendations to help the urban reform program succeed in Merida and Mexico City, as well as other cities in Mexico.
III. Research Results

1) Literature Review and Case Studies summary

Many of the problems regarding urban development that Mexico faces are challenges that many other cities around the world have confronted. Although the local context of Merida or Mexico City is unique and presents its own obstacles, the case studies describe successful management strategies and innovative ideas that can be used as starting points.

The first four case studies describe implementation and management challenges in four different countries, and how various stakeholders are working together to solve those problems through a participatory process. The first study describes how stakeholders in Nairobi, Kenya were able to bring in the participation of the community to transform an abandoned waste lot into a public community. In Sri Lanka, we explain how shared information, special task committees, and training provided by the government and United Nations Development Program (UNDP) helped improve urbanization policy formation and implementation. Dar es Salaam’s city government manages a consultative process helps various stakeholders coordinate and manage conflicting interests to improve waste treatment, public transportation, and other urban services. Liberia’s government has devised a strategy to decentralize the federal government and strengthen the capacity of the local government to meet urbanization needs of a rapidly growing population.

The last four case studies show how sustainable, innovative and cost-effective solutions could be implemented in different contexts, and how private sectors and local communities can be actively engaged in during such a process. More specifically, the case of Curitiba shows how “people-centric planning on budget” has transformed the city into a sustainable model by providing inexpensive, creative urban solutions. In Portland, green streets and eco-roofs were designed to manage the urban storm water issues in a sustainable manner. Private sectors were encouraged to actively participate in these green efforts. The dominance of public transportation in Freiburg demonstrates how incentives and disincentives can be successfully used together to discourage the use of private vehicles, while promoting public transportation as the public’s first choice. In Havana, there is evidence urban agriculture could be a viable tool to solve urban food supply and employment issues. Currently various forms of urban farming activities are on rise in both Mexico City and Merida. But understanding how to make those efforts more sustainable to maximize its environmental and social economic value while minimizing its potential negative environmental impacts could be another challenge.

Many cities are facing similar challenges when trying to solve various problems such as traffic congestion, urban environmental degradation, urban poverty, and unemployment. To solve these problems, many innovative solutions have been proposed and implemented, including: the BRT system, public housing programs, community open spaces, green streets and eco-roofs, integrated solid waste management and sustainable urban agriculture, among many others. These solutions are playing important roles in improving people’s quality of lives in the cities, but its success is also hinged upon many other factors, such as a fully integrated planning process, the effective coordination among various levels of government agencies, the active participation of all stakeholders, and learning at the community level.

More specifically, the case studies demonstrated that an integrated planning process is essential to make sure that planners in all areas understand the overall strategy, have shared
visions, and can develop their plans together. This way, many problems of unlinked development (e.g. urban sprawl, not enough provision for green space, etc.) can be avoided. Meanwhile, the relevant agencies must also effectively coordinate their efforts so that incongruences and overlapping efforts are minimized. For example, the success story in Freiburg shows that land-use and transportation policy and efforts must go hand in hand.

Public-private partnerships are also relevant to sustainable city efforts. In many cases, the city needs to develop attractive incentives for the private sector to make decisions that will benefit, not only the businesses, but also community and citizens together as demonstrated in Curitiba and Portland. International NGOs and local organizations also play important roles in stakeholder consultation, community engagement, conflict resolution, capacity building, and information sharing as seen in Nairobi, Dar es Salaam and Havana.

Overall, sustainable development is a common goal shared by many cities all over the world. While there are many existing innovation solutions its real success would require the concerted implementation efforts from all stakeholders such as the government, the private sector, NGOs and local communities.

2) Urban Reform and PSDATU: Compatibility analysis

Our first deliverable was submitted on January 5th. The purpose of it was to analyze to what extent the seven pillars of the Urban Reform (UR) elaborated by the Centro Mario Molina (CMM), CTS Embarq and IMCO (1. territory planning, 2. metropolitan strengthening, 3. bring the city closer, 4. put the city in motion, 5. redirecting housing finance, 6. revitalizing the neighborhood and 7. innovation in the city) fits with the Sectorial Program of Agrarian, Territorial, and Urban Development 2013-2018 (PSDATU).

The PSDATU was elaborated by the Urban, Territorial, and Agrarian Development Ministry (Federal Government) and published in the Official Gazette of Mexico on December 16, 2013. The program presents a diagnosis of major urban problems of the country and refers to most of the issues identified as priorities in the CMM’s Urban Reform. However, strategies and lines of action suggested in the document do not address all issues diagnosed by the UR and, when they do, the proposals are repeatedly incomplete or vague.

In order to get a clearer reference of to what extent the proposed Urban Reform fits the PSDATU, we define an alignment indicator that distinguishes between the ideas of urban reform that are (i) completely contained in the program, (ii) partially contained and (iii) which are not contemplated in any way. We assign values of 1, 0.5 and 0, respectively, and create a percentage of alignment of each pillar.

\[
\text{Percentage of alignment} = \frac{\sum \text{Alignment indicators}}{\text{total figure of ideas}}
\]

The percentage of alignment for each of the seven pillars of urban reform as well as a percentage of global alignment was defined. The results are the following:
As it is shown in the table above, the Urban Reform’s pillar that lies mostly embedded in the PSDATU is “metropolitan strengthening,” while the least included is “Putting the city in motion,” followed closely by the pillar of “innovating in the city.” Graphs I, II and III below present the amount of UR ideas contained in the PSDATU (by pillar and total amount), and the percentage of alignment of each pillar respectively.
For further detail on the development of the Urban Reform ideas in the PSDATU, please refer to the Appendix II.

3) Interview takeaways

From January 27 to February 14 of 2014, the team has conducted 26 interviews, in the field and by web conference, to a set of different stakeholders on the implementation of the urban reform elaborated by the Centro Mario Molina. The interviews were carried out in both pilot cities, México City and Mérida.

In November 2013, we identified 40 stakeholders for the city of México, and 30 for Mérida. The selection criteria were actors’ representativeness and interest in the urban reform. As Appendix I.1 shows, we aimed to talk with public and private sectors, scholars, and civil society. We received good feedback from all sectors, with the exception of the private companies. Unfortunately, we were not able to interview them after several attempts with different companies.

The main takeaways from the interviews, which transcripts are attached to this, can be summarized as follows:
1. Our interviewees found the CMM Urban Reform proposal convenient and attractive. Most of them were aware of the document, and expressed their interest in it, and also showed that they were trying to include the suggested proposals in their urban plans (Mérida and México City), or already implemented urban policies. The International Habitat Coalition showed some concern about the lack of reference to social issues (poverty, violence, robbery, rape) occasioned indirectly by current housing policies. Also, it mentioned that some proposals on the use of land should be included (a couple of interviewees mentioned international practices on this area, such taxes on land use in Colombia and Brazil).

2. Urban reform needs to be implemented from the top and with a solid scheme of incentives and legal framework in order to be effective. Due to coordination, politics, institutional and funding issues, most of the scholars interviewed agreed on the importance of having national guidelines and intervention at the state and local levels of government to implement the urban reform. Yet, they brought up that it would be also important that national guidelines contemplate the social, cultural, economic and geographic peculiarities of each region (For example, it would be important to differentiate between areas vulnerable to earthquakes from others that are not).

3. Stakeholders show awareness about the seriousness of the urban issues in Mérida and México. None of our interviewees showed surprise or ignorance on the biggest issues of public transportation, housing policy, and corruption issues related to new developments. They were aware of the importance of increasing citizen participation, constraints of no-reelection and short elective terms to implement medium and long-run urban policies, and the impact of politics (different political parties) on dialogue and coordination in vertical and horizontal communication mechanisms. Additionally, the diagnosis made by the interviewees was consistent with our own analysis of the situation in general. Interviewees were open to discuss all the topics we proposed.

4. We found a tacit agreement that institutional issues (coordination among different local government and higher levels of governments) proved to be the most hopeless to solve immediately. Our interviewees agreed on the importance of creating a mechanism to solve metropolitan issues, but at the same time without a clue as to how. In the end, there was a hopeless acceptance that this issue depends mostly on political will. Also, there is clear agreement on the idea that no reelection and the 3-year mandate are bad incentives to implement any medium and long-term urban policy. Scholars suggested the importance of showing the variety of short-term implementation and profits of urban policies available in the Center Mario Molina’s Urban Reform.

5. There is a mixed appreciation around the importance of civil society to push forward the urban reform. Some people believe that scholars’ and citizens movements that aim to create awareness about the importance of urban reform work (worked,) but only at the national level so far. They are hopeful that the citizen’s movement and the federal pressures will provoke a spillover effect onto the local and state governments. The opportunity/ and challenge is to generate sufficient levels of awareness to put the topic ion the agenda. Yet, it is in the national agenda, but not in the local and state agendas. It is necessary to create awareness with citizens, which
would allow local governments to see recognize the necessity to coordinate with its neighbors, to seek for additional federal funds and programs for this area, and so forth.

6. **Local governments are understaffed and lack adequate funding to implement an urban reform of this magnitude.** Despite the faculties given to the local governments by Article 115 in the National Constitution, local government and even state governments, do not have the skilled staff and resources to design and implement urban policies. Providing stable funding that is not tied to politics is a crucial element in designing a strategy of urban reform implementation.

7. **Land speculation and housing policy are core issues in the urban reform.** All our interviewees were aware of the impact of new developments without control or planning on public transportation, poverty and urban development in general. Additionally, they were explicit about the strong opposition that this reform would face from developers and constructors. We could not interview any developer or constructor, despite several attempts to contact them.

8. **There is consensus on the necessity to invest more in public transportation.** In Mérida and México City, policy-makers agree that they need to increase their investment in BRT, bike lanes, and more accessibility to public transportation. They also agree on the importance of reducing the use of private cars. However, the consequences of implementing such plans are politically costly. Interviewees expressed their concern about the strong resistance of public transport’s concessionaries if these types of reforms move forward. Others expressed confidence in bringing concessionaries onboard with the reform, as long as it has clear incentives for them.

9. **Revitalization of the neighborhood does not seem to be a priority for all our interviewees.** The stakeholders expressed mixed interest in the policies proposed for revamping neighborhoods. In Mérida, this is an issue for scholars and NGOs, but clearly this is not a priority for the local and state government. In México City, the situation is different. Some government officials showed determination to improve this work, and also introduced us current work done in different neighborhoods, but others considered it secondary after transportation issues. It is unclear whether the interviewees perceived the revitalization of the neighborhood issue less a priority only relative to sustainable transportation because we were discussing those two specific issues in the same interview, or because the issue is less urgent.

10. **Public participation can prevent urban policy from losing progress with the change of political administrations.** Increasing the participation of citizens in urban policy planning organizations could maintain continuity in the programs and knowledge, and avoid the transitional losses when administrations change. There is an agreement that citizens are the real stakeholders in any urban reform of their neighborhoods and city.
IV. Challenges and recommendations

In this section we start by briefly reviewing the recommendations made by the UR to address these issues and analyze their main implementation challenges. We have identified four main areas in which this section has been divided: politics, institutional capacity and coordination, regulatory framework, and funding allocation and deficit. We disentangle the specific steps that would need to be taken to go through with the Reform’s ideas related to the two selected pillars, revitalization of the neighborhood and sustainable transportation. We inform our analysis with the interviews we held in Mexico City and Merida, our research on international practices, and additional external research. After identifying the implementation steps, we develop a stakeholder analysis to find out who are the key actors that would have the power to change the status quo. We map out their incentives and, whenever they are not aligned with the goals of the Reform, we propose a strategy to change them in its favor.

Although many of these policies are recommended with the two cities and two pillars in mind, we find that the strategies can be useful for other cities in Mexico and in the management of implementation for other UR pillars.

1) Politics and Urban Reform

The fate of the implementation of most of the proposals contained in the Urban Reform under analysis is tied to the strength and coherence of the political will of the policy-makers in charge of implementing it. While this is obviously not entirely surprising, it is worth to analyze what are the most pressing challenges in the political realm.

This section is structured as follows: first, we focus on the impact of short office terms and the absence of reelection on creating incentives for dialogue, medium-term policies and developing skilled staff. Second, we concentrate on the odds and opportunities presented by the vertical and horizontal institutional organization of Mexico. Third, we discuss the consistency (or lack of it) among federal, state, and local urban development agendas. Fourth, an analysis of the role of the civil society is introduced. Finally, we suggest short and medium-term policy recommendations for politics.

A- Office terms and the ban on reelection

The short period of political mandates and the ban on reelection have a direct impact on the creation of incentives to implement an urban reform. According to the national and local constitutions, elective terms last 3 years and reelection of their mandates is not allowed under any circumstance. This applies to municipal presidents, state senators, and representatives. Between 1990 and 2013, only 1 out of 20 municipal presidents have been elected more than once to be in that position (Tarriba, 2014). The exception to this rule is with the president’s and state governor’s terms, which extend to 6 years. Despite its special institutional status as a quasi-state, the situation of the City of Mexico is similar to municipalities.

In December 2013, the Federal Parliament passed a bill allowing for the reelection for Federal Representatives, Senators, and local governments (both majors and representatives). There are still three important criticisms on this. First, one period of reelection (the period allowed for majors) is still too limited. Second, it gives powerful faculties to the political parties since the political reform establishes that the political candidates could be reelected only if they are proposed for reelection for the same political party that originally made them
elected. And finally, it is not clear the way this reform will be implemented in certain exceptional states with terms of four years (Coahuila, Veracruz e Hidalgo).

The electoral calendar adds one peculiarity: local elections are not carried out at the same time as national elections. This means that each state defines the date that it considers more convenient. This is not necessarily a difficulty for the incumbent, or an advantage for the non-incumbent, but certainly increases the necessity of playing local politics, and tying the local agenda to profitability of the municipal’s elective terms.

Bearing in mind this political and institutional panorama, we identified five main challenges to the implementation of the Urban Reform. *First, three-year elective terms impair political incentives to implement medium and long-term urban policies.* As some of our interviewees mentioned, there is a pressing necessity to the incumbent political party to show to local constituencies results of the policies implemented by its administration.

Most of the urban planning policies demand time-consistent political commitment and patience to see results. Additionally, they have high political and economic cost, for example, enforcing housing policies that foster sustainable urban development, renewing public buses, increasing taxes on gas, or investing in public transportation instead of car infrastructure.

While most of the planning and regulatory proposals require longer periods of time to yield results, there are a few characterized by being low-cost and short-term effective (for instance, bike lanes, public transportation system reorganization, citizens ‘participation in neighborhood revitalization, among others). Three-year terms are clearly at odds with implementing medium-term urban development policies, which do not yield immediately.

*Second, there is no consistency between different political parties’ administrations in urban policies.* As noted in our interviews, each local government defines its own Urban Development Plan. The city of Mérida, for example, changed its urban policy several times since the end of the 80’s. Changes are abrupt and contradictory when different political parties alternate in government, much more than when same political parties remain in government.

*Third, the lack of know-how, and cumulative experience in the area are consequence of the official renewals with each administration.* The new administration appoints new political and technical staff not only at the senior level of government, but also at the intermediate ones. In some cases, the renewal is absolute. While there was not empirical evidence across the country, it seems plausible that this trend is especially so in local governments where the municipal president needs reliable people who belong to his own trust-circle. At state level or in the City of Mexico the situation seems to be a little bit different in the middle- and low-levels, which present more civil servant stability.

The situation is similar in local and state parliaments (Pérez Vega, 2009). The absence of reelection causes inadequate accumulation of expertise, which in turn affects the quality of the work of the commissions. Additionally the lack of elements for parliamentarians to fully fulfill their duties is not resolved with the official advice or support services, because they either does not exist or are not institutionalized and regulated. This means that even if lawmakers have the resources to do so, the use of advisors is not always determined by criteria of relevance or professionalism, but through cronyism or group interests. In addition, support services (libraries, information centers, research centers, consulting) often suffer
from the same problems of cronyism, lack of resources, and lack of interest in legislative bodies.

*Fourth, the absence of incentives for a fluent dialogue between federal, state and local governments* is due to different political deadlines and pressures marked by the end of their terms. The dynamic between governors and municipal presidents is notable; since the former will stay longer than the latter, they have more incentives to promote medium-term policies.

*Finally, accountability is affected negatively by the absence of the possibility of reelecting the same rulers*. Citizens should have the right not only to elect their leaders and representatives, but also to hold them accountable, evaluate their results and, if necessary, rehire them for another period or just fire them. Citizens should be able to evaluate how effective policy-makers have been improving public transportation and their neighborhoods. The lack of the possibility of reelection tips the balance of political power in favor of insensitive representatives because this is not instrumental in determining their political fate.

**B- Political party differences & horizontal-vertical cooperation**

The institutional and territorial organization of México as established in the National Constitution defines a vertical and horizontal structure of government. Three levels of governments compose the former: federal, state, and local, which interact with each other for administrative, funding, political and technical reasons. The latter refers to the republican system of government because the Executive, Judiciary, and Legislative branches outline the balance of power in each district.

In any of the following three situations, horizontal or vertical dialogue and cooperation seem to be challenged: first, when different political parties rule the federal, state and local levels of governments. The situation seems to be worse when there are different political parties at state and local levels. Second, when different political parties rule neighbor states or local governments. Third, when the party ruling the executive branch lacks majority in the legislative branch, even when it has more representatives than the opposition party (divided government).

The city of Mérida clearly represents the first and second circumstances. While the municipal president, Hernán Barrera, belongs to the PAN, the governor of the state of Yucatan, Rolando Zapata Bello, belongs to the PRI party, the same political party to which belongs the President of the Nation, Enrique Peña Nieto. This situation has repeated itself since 2007, when the PRI began to rule the state of Yucatán again after beating the PAN, but without retaken control of the city of Merida which remained under the PAN control.

The city of Mérida borders ten municipalities. All of them are crucial to consider in any kind of analysis of designing and implementing a local urban development plan, because of their wide-ranging effect on public transportation, housing policies and urban planning in the state capital city. Absolutely all of these local governments are ruled by the PRI party, which

---

2 Municipal President of Progreso, Daniel Zacarias (PRI); Municipal President of Chicxulub, Daniela Pool Alvarado (PRI); Municipal President of Tecoh, Raúl Felipe Quintal Carvajal (PRI); Municipal President of Abala, Cristina López (PRI); Municipal President of Timucuy, Pilar Flores (PRI); Municipal President of Conkal, Francisco Gamboa (PRI); Municipal President of Kanasín, Carlos Muñoz (PRI); Municipal President of Tixpehual, José Salas (PRI); Municipal President of Ucú, Jorge Tun (PRI) and Municipal President of Umán, Quintal In (PRI).
means that Mérida is the only municipal government in this region ruled by the opposition party.

The impact of a divided government at the local government is marginal since local legislatures (cabildos) have limited functions and the executive officials integrate them. The situation is different at the state legislatures where the divided governments are more typical. Since the last elections of 2012, 8 states of Mexico present this situation where the party ruling the executive branch does not have control of the majority in the legislature. Yet, this is not the case of the Parliament of Yucatan, where 60% (15 out of the 25 representatives) are PRI representatives, 28% (7) are PAN representatives, and the rest 12% (2 and 1 respectively) from PRD and Verde.

Coordination and understanding between the executive and legislative branch in the City of Mexico do not present serious issues (at least, in theoretical terms). The mayor of Mexico City is Miguel Ángel Mancera, who has been elected for the PRD in 2012 for six years. The Local Assembly is also under control of the PRD, who counts with 51% of the representatives (34 out of 66 representatives). In descending order, the PAN counts with 19% of the representatives (13), PRI 13% (9), Movimiento Ciudadano 6% (4), Partido del Trabajo 4,5% (3), Partido Verde 3% (2), and finally, Partido Nueva Alianza 1(1%).

Regarding the functioning of the Local Assembly’s committees in México City in areas of interest for this work, we can mention that: the Mobility and Transportation committee, presided by the PRD, had 30 meetings from 2009 to 2012. During that period, only 8 initiatives out of 25 submitted were approved. The Housing commission, also presided by the PRD, met 16 times from 2009 to 2012 but approved only 6 out 25 initiatives submitted (Reporte Legislativo, 2012). While the amount of initiatives does not tell by itself the importance of the bills passed, it shows a low legislative productivity in important areas of government. What is particularly surprising is that transportation and infrastructure were the second most mentioned topics during public assemblies (455 times, second after public administration with 593). Mexican representatives speak more about it than what they can achieve through committees (Reporte Legislativo, 2012).

As we could note in our interviews, cooperation in the local assembly is limited between different parties. Most of time non-cooperation results are due to political reasons (competition, jealousy or confronted interests) but also because of ideological differences.

Let’s analyze two recent bills: “the mobility bill,” submitted in 2013 by the PAN representative, Laura Ballesteros, and Reform 26.

In April 2013, in the Legislative Assembly of the city of Mexico, a bill named “The Mobility Law” which was developed by citizens, experts, and the main political forces, was presented. It seeks to reverse the current design of the city (which is 80% focused on the car), improve the use of public transport, and return minutes or even hours to Mexicans who commute every day in the city, to have a more competitive, secure and with better quality of life Mexico City. Despite the broad initial political support across different political parties, the bill treatment was postponed for second time in January for lack of agreement between the

---

3 At the state level, Baja California (ruled by the PAN party, but the legislative controlled by the PRI, 52%), Chiapas (Executive: PVEM, Legislative: PRI 39%), Morelos (Executive: PRD, Legislative: PRI y PRD 26,6% each), Nuevo Leon (Executive PRI, Legislative: PAN, 476%), Oaxaca (Executive: MC, Legislative: PRI: 35,7%), Puebla (Executive: PAN, Legislative: PRI, 36,5%), Sinaloa (Executive: Independent, Legislative: PRI 47,5%), Sonora (Executive: PAN, Legislative: PRI and PAN, 42,4% each)
PRD, PRI and PAN to pass it. There are not understandable reasons for this except for politics and competition between political forces (Ballesteros, 2014). According to the PAN Representative Laura Ballesteros, it is within the PRD where no consensus has been reached, and they are the ones that are generating a new proposal together, although since October ended a joint work integrating proposals from civil society, the head of government and National Action in a single initiative (Ballesteros, 2014).

Norma 26 (Rule 26) is a normative for the city of México, which aims to promote the construction of social and sustainable houses. During the last months, there have been growing accusations that this norm was utilized for corrupt purposes (building expensive development in not sustainable or accessible areas). “The Ministry of Urban Development and Housing (Seduvi) allowed irregular works with various mechanisms used by builders, including Rule 26 to build luxury housing rather than social interest”, accused deputies to the head of the agency from the Legislative Assembly. In December 2013, Deputy Myron Carlos Hernández (PRD), chairman of the Committee on Development and Urban Infrastructure, accompanied by local Deputy Salido Gabriela Magos (PAN) presented a point of agreement before the plenary of the Legislature to extend the period of suspension of Rule 26. Miron Hernandez argued the need for a "finished legislative product that meets the needs of social housing in the City of Mexico." The House of the Legislative Assembly of the Federal District approved the proposal, and it was referred to the SEDUVI for compliance. The Government of the Federal District, through SEDUVI reiterated commitment to work to ensure living spaces for city workers and generate models of inclusive housing. As we can see this case shows two features: first, the crucial role of the Legislature to make accountable the Executive branch, and second, cooperation and dialogue between the executive and legislative branches and political parties in order to stop this distrustful situation.

The political landscape of the metropolitan area in México is troublesome for two reasons. First, 3 out 4 of the neighbor states of Mexico city are ruled by the PRI party, which are aligned with the federal level. The state of Mexico is ruled by Eruviel Villegas, Hidalgo by Francisco Olvera Ruiz, y Querétaro by José Rovirosa. The exception comes with Morelos who is governed by Graco Ramirez, a PRD member. An additional complication is added by the lack of control of the state parliament in Morelos, where the PRI and PRD are even with 26.6%.

The State of Mexico is the most important border state for the Mexico City given the influx of commuters (5 million) to the city every day. As many of our interviewees noted, coordination and dialogue between both districts is pretty limited. For example, the recent creation of a Mexibús (BRT system) connecting the State of Mexico with Mexico City is a proof of cooperation, but at the same time it exposes the limited joint action between both governments.

C- Urban development agendas: same topic, same approach?

In general, there are no formal or informal mechanisms of coordination between the state and local governments in order to establish an urban development agenda. This is evident comparing their priorities in this area. Yet, public servants mostly denied the lack of communication, and tried to be optimistic about the progress attained in the last three years. Mérida and México City again present an interesting and contrasting example of local, state and federal urban development agendas coordination.
The local government of Merida has created its own urban development plan, which presents a thorough diagnosis of the current urban situation, establishes aims and strategies, and also defines an implementation procedure. The plan was published in 2013; however, this is not the first urban municipal plan. Since the end of the 1980s the different governments have showed them off proudly at the beginning of its second year, but with no concrete results at the end of the third final year.

As we could find out in our interviews, local officials feel the necessity to create their own plan. This is not surprising, because in most of the cases, they are completely aware that this will be a major triumph in this area. Unfortunately, the odds that the project will become a reality, are not very high.

In the case of Merida there is no actual overlap between the state and the local urban development agenda. While if we read Merida’s urban development plan we can identify that public transportation, housing policies, neighborhood revitalization and even security policies overlap with the state urban plan, reality is that the state still provides most of these public services. Therefore, Merida’s urban plan is a nice attempt to create and implement an urban reform, most of it consistent with our proposals, but without teeth. It is the state government that provides funding, technical, and logistical support for these proposals.

The situation is different with low-cost projects such as bike lanes. As the Director of Urban Planning, Enrique Sauri, told us, the local government of Merida worked with CTS Embarq to design future bike lanes (with no participation of the state government). They were surprised of how minimal the costs and easy the implementation of the project.

Therefore, the urban development agenda in Mérida is focused primarily on small tweaks in public transportation (bike lanes, bicycles path, lighting) and important ones in housing developments (striving to enforce regulation on new developments), and future urban planning (trying to create an entity to ensure public participation, IMPLAN). The State of Yucatan’ urban development agenda for Merida is more comprehensive in several ways than the local one. First, it focuses on reforming the entire public transportation system of Mérida —ignoring previous attempts already agreed with public transportation’s concessionaries. Second, it aims to create a metropolitan entity in charge of solving territorial disputes between the ten different municipalities that surround Mérida. Third, this entity will also try to harmonize the different urban development plans for these local governments. According to our interviewees, the Secretary of Urban Development of the State Government, wanted to collaborate in the elaboration of the local urban plan of Merida, but it was not allowed to be part of the process for politics disputes. One typical situation is that each local government urban plan assigns different functionalities to the same border area. For example, Mérida, Kanasín and Umán face these situations usually.

It seems clear that, despite officials’ declarations from both governments (local and state) affirming that they had a good relationship (dialogue and cooperation), there is no clear mechanism of coordination or intention to work together in practice. According to the scholars interviewed, the state government is creating a completely new urban agenda, ignoring previous progress and local government interests. The role of the federal government creating links between the different local governments integrating the metropolitan area of Merida is fundamental, but it does not seem to be aware of its role in this.
The agenda on urban development for Mexico City is more advanced and defined than Mérida’s and the rest of the country. However, it still faces large, and dynamic challenges. Mexico City, for its economic and political importance, enjoys greater autonomy than other local and state governments. The warning is made because it still receives most of its funds from the federal government. In this sense, the national government intervenes only to distribute funding among the states of the metropolitan area. The criterion of distribution is the size of the population living in each state, which is criticized for the considerable amount of commuters from the State of Mexico, and in less measure from other neighbor states, who also travel to Mexico City every day.

At the same time, Mexico City has its own agenda isolated from its neighbors, which turn out to be constrained. The way the city copes with the urban sprawl is intrinsically related with the way its neighbor states do it. Comparing the urban development plans and priorities in this area of SEDUVI (Secretary of Urban Development and Housing for the City of Mexico) and SEDATU (Secretary of Urban Development for the Federal Government), we conclude their plans are mostly aligned.

In conclusion, two different situations seem to be present. On one side, no coordination, competition, and lack of dialogue between local and state governments, such as in the case of Mérida. On the other side, one of better alignment not because of more dialogue, but maybe as a result of increased experience in urban policies, stronger civil society pressures, and more autonomy for designing and implementing urban policy.

D- The role of civil society

There seems to be three plausible approaches to understand the role of civil society in implementing an urban reform. The first one is called “bottom-up.” In a few words, citizens become aware of the necessity of implementing sustainable urban policies (public transportation, neighborhoods revamping, reduction of the use of cars), and then they demand these changes in policy to the policy-makers. Our interviewees pointed out this scheme in different manners. In México City, scholars and citizens pushed for a mobility bill, they worked hard trying to get a draft discussing it with different representatives and members of the Executive Government. Laura Ballesteros, PAN representative, stated vehemently: “mobility in the City of México has been the product of the work of many civil organizations, including cyclists and expert groups, which more than 10 years ago decided that it was possible to have a different city, a fair city in their spaces, but everything safer for everyone, especially for cyclists groups whose organization and expansion have transformed the way we live the city in recent years.”

Alfonso Iracheta, a scholar specialized in Mexico City and Mérida, posits that hope of an effective and progressive urban reforms resides in this movement of scholars and citizens. In Mérida scholars and public servants pointed out exactly the same, affirming that there was the growing citizens movement who fueled the creation of bike lanes in the city. Regarding the revitalization of the neighborhoods, civil society is better organized and funded in México City than in Mérida. The main difference relies on the government support of these initiatives.

The second approach focuses on the role of the government creating citizen’s awareness on the importance of developing urban policies, and the subsequent formation of civil society organizations to advocate this need. This scheme is called “top-bottom,” meaning that
governments have the function to create responsiveness on urban issues, which in the end will be beneficial for their own political purposes. Governments need to respond to citizens’ demand of urban policy. For instance, in Mexico City, SEDUVI has implemented neighborhood revitalization programs, inviting citizens to be part of it. Also, it promotes the creation of “healthy on street shops”, which fosters the creation of citizens movement claiming for these open spaces to set their shops.

The third approach is completely skeptical about the effectiveness of civil society movements achieving a sustainable urban reform. As Arturo Ortiz from Talleres Urbanos affirmed, “the real change in urban policy does not happen because of the people of La Condesa, Roma or Zona Rosa claim for bike-lanes, the urban reform requires political will and determination to fight against the biggest stakeholder involved in this”.

E- Final Remarks & Policy Recommendations

As we mentioned at the beginning of this section, political will is a crucial element in thinking of a successful strategy of implementation of the Urban Reform. Not only for the pillars we are covering in this study, but for any of them. Even if the administration in charge of implementing the proposals of the urban reform shows commitment on this area, nothing ensures the citizens of those cities that the policies will remain after the administration finishes its term.

Additional problems come from the short government periods for municipal presidents, state representatives, and senators, and the no-reelection clause. Policy-makers “need” short-term and profitable investments in order to get reelected. Unfortunately, most of the proposals in the urban reform area are not of that kind. While the reform in December 2013 allowing reelection is a step forward, it does not guarantee big changes. The political parties still have absolute control to nominate theirs candidates.

Horizontal and vertical coordination problems are typical, even if the participants belong to the same political party (in México City, PRD). The situation gets more entangled when the vertical coordination is between entities representing different political parties (State of Yucatan and Merida). The same happens at horizontal coordination among municipalities, states or even between the executive and legislative branch (cases of divided government).

The differences in the urban development agenda are clear, and they are the most obvious result of the lack of communication, coordination and teamwork among the different governments. Our case studies proved it firmly. The city of Mérida and the State of Yucatan, while they said they work perfectly together, each other is redoing what the other previously did. In the case of México, activities between the city of Mexico and the State of Mexico are limited, and almost inexistent. SEDUVI and SEDATU have agreement on priorities, but they do not seem to be working altogether.

Therefore, some consequences of mediocre and weak politics are:
1. Obstruction of funding to local and state governments;
2. Blocking the passing of bills in parliament;
3. Inability to create metropolitan urban plans, which are extremely important for cities like México or Mérida;
4. Refusal to implement medium- and long-term urban policies because they will not crop their results;
5. Absence of dialogue and coordination at all levels;
6. Deep inefficiencies of resources and time (redoing the same projects, analysis and negotiations);
7. Loss of creditability in front of third parts such as concessionaries (Merida is a good example of this because it is redesigning the public transportation system again with the same actors when it already did it two years ago).

Bearing in mind the previous analysis, our policy recommendations are:

1- Increasing citizens’ participation in urban policy planning organs will prevent urban policies from short-term politics. It is crucial to give voice and vote to citizens in urban planning organizations. Citizens know what is important for their cities. If they had the authority to veto the organization in charge of urban design, they would ensure that urban policies remain after each the conclusion of each administration. Mérida has worked on something like this, which was called IMPLAN. This entity will give citizens a key role approving urban policies, and at the same time protect urban policies from short-term politics.

2- Showing the variety of options of urban policies that could be implemented by governments immediately. Sometimes governments do not have a clear idea of the different options of urban policies that can be implemented in the short-run and with sound results. The alliance between CTS-Embarq and the Secretary of Urban Development of Mérida is a clear example of an immediate urban policy, with low-cost and clear results. As the Secretary shared with us, “(They) never thought of a bike lane as something that could be done by the local government.” Therefore, we believe crucial to prioritize urban reform proposals by the criteria of costs and implementation durability.

3- Fostering partnerships between NGOS, scholars, citizens’ organizations and government agencies with the purpose of maintaining demand for urban reform. It is important for the Center to forge alliances with scholars and other NGOs, and citizens’ organizations to expand demand for urban reform. As some policy-makers told us, if they have demand, they can move their parties and sources to achieve this reform.

4- Fostering cross-party agreements on fundamental urban policies that require parliament approval. One effective way to avoid deadlock in parliament is to generate open and engaged debates on urban issues that require parliament approval. While this is not entirely novel, most of the time there does not exist an instance of genuine open dialogue and negotiation on urban policies. On the contrary, these urban proposals are led by one party, ignoring the rest. The mobility bill is an example of an open and inclusive negotiation with all the political parties. While the bill is blocked now in the Legislative Assembly of Mexico City, it should be passed soon because it was built through consensus among different parties.
2) Institutional Coordination and Capacity

One major barrier to urban reform implementation is the lack of coordination in engaging all government levels, various agencies, the private sector, and civil society. Without an integrated effort, responsibilities are not clearly defined, creating overlapping and conflicting efforts. A second problem repeatedly mentioned in the literature and interviews, was the absence of local government capacity. Although decentralization efforts have provided legal autonomy of urban planning to municipalities, the governments lack the technical, financial, and human capacity to actually implement sustainable programs.

In each of the following sections, the specific challenges of institutional coordination and capacity are outlined, followed by proposed solutions. The solutions are based on best practices, interviews conducted with various stakeholders in Mexico, and other literature review. The first section will address the lack of human and organizational capacity at the municipal government level. Next it will address the absence of coordination of among municipalities, states, and federal government. Intra-government coordination is necessary to address issues such as unclear defined physical borders, and outdated codes that are sometimes conflicting among various levels of the government. The final section will discuss the lack of coordination between various agencies and holistic approach to urban development.

Challenge

- Insufficient human and organizational capacity to implement reform at the local level.

Solution

- Optimize existing resources by training government workers on technical aspects of urban reform and management skills to better facilitate the participation of the private sector and civil society.

- Build collaboration among municipalities to share best practices and cohesion in promoting local initiatives.

Despite the fact that the Mexican Constitution gives local governments autonomy to design and implement its own urban development policies, the lack of local institutional coordination and capacity is a fundamental problem identified by many stakeholders in both Mexico City and Merida. According to the Institute for Transportation and Development Policy (ITDP), municipal governments have the needed information to address urbanization problems, but they lack the human capital, technical knowledge, and financial resources. The issues might explain why much of the current planning work has been assigned to external consultants. Municipal workers need to be aware of the technical aspects of specific urban issues, stay up-to-date with international best practices, and also understand how to engage other stakeholders. Training in leadership, management, and administration can help governments to facilitate collaboration with external groups, such as NGOs, academia, and the private sector.

Funding, which will be covered in this report extensively, is a major challenge in addressing local capacity issues. Additional financing would help solve the key pain points, such as understaffed departments and financing new projects. Since many municipalities struggle with collecting local revenue taxes and possess so little control over the transfer of funds
from federal and state governments, their ability to have autonomy and implement reforms is limited.

However, the government must also optimize the use of existing resources. It needs to ensure existing government employees are not only properly and regularly trained on technical aspects of urban issues, but also with leadership and management skills. By learning how to mobilize stakeholders within civil society and private sector, the government can gain the support critical to the success of urban reform and benefit from their technical expertise.

Currently, the government does not engage with NGOs and academia sufficiently. Our research team conducted a study observing the alignment of the federal government’s Agricultural, Land and Urban Sector Development Program 2013-2018 (PSDATU), and another plan developed by civil society through the EMBARQ, Centro Mario Molina, and the Mexican Institute for Competitiveness called the Urban Reform Proposal (UR). In our assessment, the UR aligned with the PSDATU at only 52.5%. About two thirds of the UR’s proposals were either not included or only partially contained in the PSDATU. The 47.5% gap in alignment demonstrates there is room for improvement in communication between government and civil society.

Drawing lessons from a best practices case study, the Liberian government also recently adopted new strategies to strengthen their county-level institutional capacity for urban services delivery. Partnering with the United Nations-Habitat Training and Capacity Building Branch, the government focused on training employees in areas of leadership, local economic development, and financial management. The project started in three pilot cities, but quickly spread to 50 national trainers across 15 counties and trained over 3000 government workers as of 2011 (Gbartea, 2011). In parallel, the Governance Commission, Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs, and Ministry of Internal Affairs created the National Policy of Decentralization and Local Governance, focusing on political harmony, rights-based responsive development. Writing an explicit plan with county-to-county civic engagement discussions and publicizing its activity with the media provided gravity and formality to the issue. The management skills taught to 3000 government workers have had a positive effect on the communication between county and local government officials, and increased citizen participation.

Similarly, the government of Mexico should start with a pilot program in a few cities to work out the details and gather feedback to ensure the training program is suitable in the Mexican government context. Engaging other stakeholders that are not restricted to the three-year terms politicians are will prolong continuity through changing government administrations. Programs that take multiple stakeholders’ interests from the beginning of the process have higher chances of succeeding. The Liberian case study teaches two lessons, to build leadership and management capacity through training of existing government workers and to use those learned skills to involve the private sector and civil society. It is quite a challenge to build the skills and mechanisms to manage different stakeholders that all have different interests, but once realized, the benefits are significant.

The Mexican government would benefit greatly by promoting the participation of the public in the planning, implementation, and monitoring process. Whether it is by inviting all stakeholders to forums or inviting key individuals from relevant organizations, social participation mechanisms are needed to strengthen its support base. It is an effective way of ensuring the associations are held accountable to the public, but also educating the public so
they understand challenges the government faces. Citizens are often aware of the problems each face personally and demand reform, but lack visibility on the efforts towards improvement. Additionally, engaging citizens to volunteer on small-scale projects is another way to expand human capacity. Facilitating community projects, such as mural painting or cleaning up a public park, gives citizens a sense of ownership and at almost no cost. Although smaller in scale, these types of projects often serve as a mechanism to educate the public about the benefits of the government programs as well as media attention to bring awareness to the issues.

PPPs are also great ways to leverage resources. Providing additional training on structuring public and private partnerships (PPP) planning, such as optimal profit-sharing models, risk assessment, and understanding local business needs to scale programs would also be beneficial. If the right incentives are put in place, the government can start new programs with little public investment and human resources, and stimulate economic growth in the private sector. The Under Bridges (also known as the Bajo Puentes project) project in Mexico City is a perfect example of how the Department of Housing and Development (SEDUVI) was able to successfully transform an abandoned area into a thriving business community with open public spaces. The Under Bridges project may not have been feasible with resources of just the local government, but by offering private businesses below-market lease rates, the government avoided having to build, cleanup, and maintain the area.

Municipalities should strengthen ties with the NGO sector and academia to share research, expertise and access to other networks. Gaining the input of civil society in the PSDATU, for example, would close the gap between the civil society and government’s perspectives. Additionally, as external and relatively objective participants, the support of NGO practitioners and academics may provide more legitimacy to the governments programs.

Some NGOs specialize in building local capacity. One particular NGO, the International City/County Management Association (ICMA), brings in years of expertise and funding from external sources to implement training programs. The ICMA brings new software programs, assessment instruments, performance indicators, and other programs that have been used in Mexico for the last five years. For example, it built an ethics and transparency course from Monterrey Institute of Technology and Higher Education and a municipal management course with Monterrey and the World Bank Institute. In 2009-2011, the ICMA implemented a Regional Credit Rating Improvement Program improve credit ratings for various municipalities. Using a grant from the World Bank, the results provided long-term capital improvement plans, credit for infrastructure projects in the municipality of Puebla and state of Guerrero, along with many other accomplishments. Continuing to work with such organizations and drawing on their technical expertise and past experiences will be beneficial for Mexican municipal governments.

Isolated municipalities may not have much capacity, but when they share resources and work cohesively, they have greater impact and power. However, existing networks are either limited by their political affiliation and lack of support. For example, the National Federation of Municipalities of Mexico (FENAMM) is the largest association with over 1,500 members, but is affiliated with the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI). The National Associations of Local Councils and Mayors (ANAC) is associated with the National Action Party (PAN) has 488 members, and a few others on a much smaller scale with less than 30 members are linked to other political parties (Municipal, 2014). Although these organizations have made strides in building local capacity, the associations’ affiliation with the party has its limitations.
with working across all parties freely and weaknesses in addressing issues with continuity. Furthermore, they do not concentrate on urban reform. Due to differing political interests, it is recommended to strengthen associations that are not party-affiliated but instead, interest-based.

One potential organization that is not limited by its political ties is the National Association of Municipal Planning Institutes (AMIMP). AMIMP is a network of organizations that assist coordination among municipalities with 50 institutes across Mexico improving urban development and land-use planning. These types of associations are more likely to carry continuity in projects and share expertise when there are changes in administration. AMIMP is not formally a part of the government, but is still funded by the municipal government. They possess technical knowledge, professional expertise, and since they plan independently of politics, are given validity as objective institutions. AMIMP claims success over managing projects such as the BRT system in Leon and Guanajuato, as well as a 12-year concession for the Aguascalientes municipal landfill.

However, AMIMP struggles with a few issues. Although being disassociated with any political party has its benefits, since it is not formally part of the government structure, funding (which is already sparse) could disappear at any time. Since the association is not political, it lacks control over the planning process and the plans are often not adopted (Conan, 2012). Also, in its current state AMIMP lacks the involvement of other stakeholders. Civil society, academia, the private sector, are missing from groups such as AMIMP. Echoed by Sergio Peña in his studies of municipal planning institutes, urban governance is not just the responsibility of the government, but requires the participation and support of private organizations and civil society (Peña, 2012). Involving the public, NGO sector, academia, and private sector may be easier said than done. But the existing infrastructure of organization, such as AMIMP or ICMA, can be beneficial to facilitating coordination between all participants in the urban planning process. Through these efforts, local capacity will not only be strengthened but also become more legitimized in the eyes of all stakeholders.

**Challenge:** Absence of coordination of among municipalities, states, and federal government to address issues such as unclear defined physical borders, outdated and conflicting laws.

**Solution:** State-led council with representatives from each city, that will focus on the assigning responsibility to each of the stated challenges.

Another major challenge to implementation of urban development is weak coordination among the three spheres of government, creating confusion in the division of responsibilities. The federal, state, and municipalities are not aligned on priorities and execute differently due to differing perspectives and a lack of communication. An additional problem, previously addressed, is differing political will and party affiliation among the various levels of government. However, some have argued that even when state and cities are affiliated with the same political party, differing interests and competition for the same sources of funding is unavoidable.

The federal and state government usually carry the capacity and capital, but the local governments are responsible for implementing the plans. This creates distorted institutional
arrangements, which results in the failure of federal urban development programs in coordinating with local governments (Harvard, 20). Procuraduría Ambiental y de Ordenamiento Territorial del D.F. (PAOT) also argues the need for the autonomy of counties need to be respected, emphasizing the current lack of an urban reform plan that is decentralized (Cancino, 2014). The lack of coordination and clarity creates overlapping responsibilities, which leads to wasted effort, time, and an absence of accountability.

In some cases, such as Merida’s transportation sector, there is a complete lack of legal framework (Alonzo, 2014). There are no clear border definitions as the limits between Merida and its surrounding municipalities. This poses problems in the state of Yucatan, where there is no metropolitan institution to coordinate urban planning among the municipalities.

The national urban zoning and housing development laws are also weak, and SEDATU recognizes the need to strengthen this framework (Luna, 2014). Additionally, each city struggles to manage the different legislations in other cities and states, especially as many are outdated codes. This leads to developments that are not coordinated with the state or surrounding cities. For example, in Canacin, a rapidly growing city in Yucatan, the municipal government will sometimes build housing projects that are not coordinated with the state’s plans. As a result, the housing projects are connected with the city through only one road, with any provision of public or parking areas. States must not only provide incentives and penalties for municipalities that execute plans that are not permitted in state laws, but also facilitate a way to easily coordinate the differing legislation among municipalities.

Looking at international best practices, Sri Lanka is another country that has been focusing on the integration of its local, state, and federal government to address its growing demand for urban services, particularly in the transportation sector. Building local capacity is a major obstacle, and one of the key components of facing this challenge was the creation of the Growth Center Coordinating Committee. The committee includes the private sector, five local authorities, but also provincial and national level institutions to manage the implementation, prioritize key issues, review resources, and invite stakeholders to participate in workshops. The committee provides a forum for representatives from all levels of the government, and at least five different parts of the country. Opening up these communication channels have led to a resources such as Guidance Manual on Provincial Strategic Frameworks to strengthen the links between local and provincial councils.

States will need to take the lead on creating a council or assigning group that will lead this type of coordination for urban reform issues. Important components are the inclusion of representation by all spheres of the government: federal, state, and the municipalities within the region. Due to the size of the country, it may be necessary to have multiple councils for different areas. In Yucatan, a council is being organized that that will coordinate specifically urban planning among five different districts surrounding Merida (Sauri, 2014).

Another way of coordinating the three levels may be through the National Institute for Federalism and Municipal Development (INAFED). It was created in 2002 to help with decentralization and supporting local government autonomy. INAFED, which falls under the responsibility of the Secretariat of the Interior (SEGOB), establishes coordination of the public policies, strategies, and actions of the three levels of government. Responsibilities include establishing a legal framework for intergovernmental relations coordination, establishing procedures for planning, and creating liaisons. Within INAFED, it would be
valuable to develop a special group or liaisons that will work on urban reform to ensure it is a priority and the group has the technical expertise to handle its complexities.

One challenge, but necessary task, is to create a performance measure to track the group’s process. Whether it is the number of coordinated initiatives passed, quantity of tangible resources systemizing the communication channels, the group must be held accountable for their work. These measures must fulfill the goals of all government levels, creating incentives to cooperate. To give some teeth to the incentive structure, the group could create a conditional funding structure so that only those that have fulfilled the goals receive funding in future years. It will not be easy to align interests, and the debates and negotiations may take time, but creating a council with the power to set incentives and control funding is a promising start.

**Challenge:** Lack of coordination between various agencies and holistic approach to urban development.

**Solution:** Set up formal communication channels and process with interagency groups to support formal legislation and financial incentives.

A multidisciplinary approach of territorial planning is needed. For example, Miguel Cancino at PAOT describes the different processes from which planning are approached. One is urban, in which the optic is dominated by urbanists and architects, such as Ministry of Agricultural, Regional and Urban Development (SEDATU) focused on human settlements. The other might be more environmental, concentrating on issues such as the protection of ecosystems with urban growth. These are not necessarily conflicting interests, but there is no direct and clear flow of communication between SEDATU and the Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT). This leads to isolated projects that only partially address the larger problem of rapid and unorganized urban growth.

The housing development on the periphery of the city contributes as one of the main problems in dispersed and scattered communities. The low-income households that cannot afford housing that is near the center of the city are left with no choice, but to move into these areas that are far from employment. Traveling up to 3 hours per day and spending 30-40% of their earnings on transportation, long commutes also increase pollution and pass through unsafe environments (Ortiz, 2014). Some say that due to these problems, up to 25% of the homes built on the periphery have been abandoned (Ortíz Struck, 2014).

Housing and transportation agencies must coordinate policies to ensure that new neighborhoods are built near areas with access to public transportation, or increasing transport options for existing neighborhoods that need it. The Public Transportation for Planning and Advocacy at the Ministry of Transportation and Highways (SETRAVI) admits that one weakness of the current planning process for public transportation in Mexico City is the tendency to focus on a single-minded technology solution, rather than a fully integrated approach (Quintanar, 2014). Mobility and housing should be closely linked, and the consequences of pursuing mono-functional agendas are evident with the high ratio of abandoned homes and increased violence and poverty in the cities’ periphery.

Housing agencies are also guilty of building developments without consulting transportation agencies. The Institute of the National Housing Fund for Workers (INFONAVIT) mentioned that housing is built near new factories, with the hope that the employment will attract
citizens to a new area. In theory, it resolves the problem of commuting long distances for work, eliminating the need to consider transportation to the city. However, if these factories are shut down, as was in the case for many areas after the economy took a downturn in the late 2000s, the residents are left without any other employment options. Housing agencies cannot build homes depending on a single factory, but ensure adequate transportation or close proximity of all needed services and employment.

Although some efforts have been made to ameliorate the immediate problems, more must be done in order to ensure agencies are communicating during the planning process, before problems arise. For the 300,000-400,000 homes that are currently abandoned, the government is attempting to increase mobility to existing, focusing on salvageable communities.

Corruption also plays a part in the process of developing houses or transportation options in the wrong places. This report will separately address funding issues and creating financial incentives to prevent corruption, but additional measures are needed to set clear communication channels between the agencies. These formal means should ensure plans are made with all the stakeholders necessary to holistically improve urban reform. This means creating common goals and explicitly linking mobility with housing agendas, demonstrating environmental sustainability while addressing the need to scale social services.

In Freiburg, Germany, one of the most successful programs to promote public transport integrated land-use planning. The city focused its development of commercial and services centers with light rail routes, mixed with housing, schools, and other non-residential land uses. Another 30 locations were designated to build retail businesses where walking and bicycling are optimal. In the last 30 years, the city has tripled the number of trips by bicycle, doubled transit ridership, and reduced the share of trips by car from 38% to 32% (Buehler, 2011). The level of motorization has leveled off and per-capita CO2 emissions from transport have fallen, in spite of strong economic and population growth. Today, Freiburg is considered Germany’s ‘environmental capital’ and its most sustainable city. By finding common goals among agencies and coordinating policies, the impact of the reform has been tremendous.

One solution is creating interagency groups, or representatives from each agency that will work together to establish common goals. In Mexico, the Sustainable Integrated Urban Developments Promotion and Assessment Group (GPEDUIS) successfully brought together several agencies to address housing problems. It was created at the federal level in 2008. It includes representatives from stakeholders in the housing development process with the goal of encouraging dense housing development that are close in proximity to jobs, public transport, social services, etc. By providing a certification to developments that fit within the program’s goals, homebuilders obtain considerable benefits from the government. This includes technical assistance from the Secretariat of Social Development (SEDESOL) and SEMARNAT, preferred housing subsidies from National Housing Commission (CONAVI), housing mortgage credits from INFONAVIT, infrastructure financing and loan guarantees from National Works and Public Services Bank (BANOBRAS), and investments in land banks and infrastructure from the National Infrastructure Fund (FONADIN).

The collaboration of all of these various agencies provide powerful incentives for builders. Although only 8 developments have been certified between 2008-2012, they are evaluating 17 new developments and it is slowly gaining traction. The establishment of such a group is one significant example of how agencies can work together. Creating additional groups such
as the GPEDUIS, not only forces governmental agencies to cooperate, but also outside stakeholders to cooperate as well.

Final remarks

In our proposed recommendations, we suggest that coordinating efforts to engage other stakeholders and utilizing their resources will help address some of the missing capacity in the local government. By training government workers with the necessary management skills to facilitate external stakeholder involvement, municipalities can leverage the existing expertise of the civil society and private sector. Many of the solutions are based on using existing groups or associations (for example, INAFED or AMIMP), and changed to address specific urban planning issues or engage other important stakeholders. The existing organizations have been beneficial in other ways, but with the suggested changes, they can be significant to the urban reform efforts. Other ideas require new partnerships or creating new performance measures, because it will be most efficient in keeping individuals accountable.

3) Regulatory frameworks: carrots and sticks

Sustainable transportation systems offer a promising solution for urban congestion and pollution problems. However, as long as cities are disperse and the urban sprawl keeps growing disorderly, building an efficient and truly sustainable transport system will remain an insurmountable task. This is why the Urban Reform offers a complete approach that not only takes transport issues into account, but also focuses on housing and land use policies. That is, the Urban Reform (UR) acknowledges the connection between the different factors behind 3D cities and recommends integral solutions to transit towards compact, connected and continuous cities.

Housing and land use policies are a crucial element to consider when addressing the urban sprawl problem, not only in terms of the challenges to build an efficient and sustainable transportation system, but also in terms of revitalizing the neighborhood. Many of the housing developments (both regular and irregular) built in the periphery of the city are so far away from workplaces, schools, health care institutions, and recreation centers, that they become “dormitory cities.” That is, people only go there to sleep at night and leave again early in the morning of the next day. It is not possible to build a sense of community or of neighborhood-belonging under these circumstances.

Moreover, the long distances that people living in these complexes need to travel substantially increase the cost of coming and going from work or school everyday. According to research from Habitat International Coalition, low-income population living in the peripheries need to commute 2.5 to 3 hours every day and spend around 40% of their income in transport. These high costs are particularly worrisome among young people from the lower-income segments of the population looking for jobs, who sometimes can not even afford the costs of everyday commuting from distant housing developments. This creates a fertile ground for the emergence of gangs in dormitory cities as youths with no income and limited recreational and work opportunities tend to stay in their houses or apartments for many consecutive days.

The situation thus demands a reformulation of housing and land use policies in the cities. In this section we start by briefly reviewing the recommendations made by the UR to address
these issues and analyze their main implementation challenges. To do this, we disentangle the specific steps that would need to be taken to go through with the Reform’s ideas related to the densification of cities. We inform our analysis with the interviews we held in Mexico and Merida cities, our research on international practices, and additional research on the costs and revenues structures of housing construction companies. After identifying the implementation steps, we develop a stakeholder analysis to find out who are the key actors that would have the power to change the status quo. We map out their incentives and, whenever they are not aligned with the goals of the Reform, we propose a strategy to change them in its favor.

A) Financial and planning instruments associated with cities’ expansion: disentangling the steps behind the UR diagnosis and recommendations

The UR stresses the role of government’s financial and planning instruments in increasing the relative price of land inside the cities. The lack of an adequate tax policy and efficient regulatory frameworks has contributed to the fact that “while in the last 30 years the urban population of the country merely doubled, the urbanized surface multiplied by six” (CTS Embarq et. al, 2013). It is thus necessary to create legal, fiscal and financial mechanisms facilitate cities densification.

One of the most important measures to increase demographic density is related to the use of vacant lots inside the city. According to estimations of the Mexican Ministry of Social Development, in México there are 85000 hectares of vacant land in cities with population sizes over 50 thousand people. In those hectares, more than 5 million housing units could be built, and more than 20 million people could live there (SEDESOL, 2012). In what follows we will briefly outline the UR ideas most closely related to the incentives and penalties fight this trend in the housing industry and we next define the steps that would need to be taken to implement them.

- “Idea 37: Establish a policy of intra-urban land activation to take advantage of the existing services and infrastructure.” To do this, it would be necessary to penalize the underutilization of land by increasing property taxes in such way that they respond not to the actual value of the land but to its construction potential. This policy would have the effect of preventing land speculation.
- “Idea 41: Make the urban land market transparent”. Make public the entire database of the Housing Registry (RUV, for its initials in Spanish) to facilitate the application and development of territorial programs and prevent speculation.
- “Idea 44: Create discounts on permits and licenses or tax exemptions” to facilitate and lower the costs of moving. The goal is to allow people to move to more convenient locations (closer to their everyday activities) without incurring high transaction costs.
- “Idea 86- Condition federal funding to real estate projects” with criteria based on location, connectivity, public service provision and infrastructure, and access to public transportation

The general goal of these recommendations is to prevent the construction of new housing projects in the peripheries of the cities. In order to do that, it is necessary to lower the price of building and buying inside the city (make densification relatively cheaper) relative to building and buying in the outskirts. How would this work?

First we need to quantify the problem in terms of the amount of housing constructions inside and outside the cities to understand the pattern of the urban expansion.
According to a study of Banco Bilbao Vizcaya Argentaria (BBVA) about the real estate situation in Mexico, more than half of the housing developments built in the country in 2012 were concentrated in municipalities with less than 500 thousand people. The figure below illustrates the concentration of new constructions in low-density municipalities, which, according to the aforementioned study, are mainly around metropolitan areas. These municipalities exhibit serious infrastructure deficiencies in terms of the proximity of schools, hospitals, and access to electricity and connectivity (public transport).

Moreover, on average, the 86 municipalities that concentrate 80% of the registered housing did not increase their gross domestic product or their employment rates. On the contrary, they show decreased economic activity (from 2004 to 2009) in both indicators. In this scenario, it is hard to explain the concentration of constructing activity in these areas based on the local demand side. This is just an indirect indicator of what is diagnosed in the Reform. That is, the main economic activities of the potential buyers of these constructions take place far away from them, inside the cities.

Why are the constructors building there, then? It must be the case that the long distances from the construction locations to the centers of economic activity will be compensated by other advantages that will make their product attractive to the buyers. From a market perspective, it would not make sense for the constructors to choose these locations unless they are sure they will be able to sell their product. Hence, they should be able to offer houses at lower prices than houses offered inside the cities. The difference in prices should be high enough to compensate the commuting costs and other non-directly monetary costs related to the overall lower life quality in these locations.

However, as we just showed, there is not a lot of competition inside the cities, as most of the construction is concentrated in municipalities around the metropolitan areas. In this scenario, constructors do not need to be too concerned with offsetting decreases in life quality and increases in commuting costs of their buyers. If there is nowhere else to buy, consumers will have to take the product where it is available. The question then is, why is the supply concentrated in this low-density municipalities in the first place? What explains the relative lack of competitors inside the cities? Assuming there is some degree of competition in the housing industry, it must be the case that producing in higher-density locations is not a profitable strategy in equilibrium. Hence, the supply has gradually shifted to more profitable locations (i.e. the outskirts of the cities), where they achieve the largest difference between costs and revenues: it is there where they maximize their profits.
The second step is thus to analyze the costs and revenues structures of the construction companies. If we want to understand why it is more profitable to build in low-density locations we need to know what are the main costs that construction companies need to cover and where do their revenues come from. The table below uses information on 2012 costs from a survey conducted by BBVA to a group of 20 mayor construction firms. It can be appreciated that land acquisition is only 10.3% of the total expenses, on average, of the industry. This is due to the fact that land in low-density locations is typically much cheaper than in the cities, which is the main determinant for the preference of companies to build in these regions. Construction costs are, not surprisingly, the main expense of the industry, and we can assume these do not vary significantly across locations (low-density vs. high-density municipalities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits and licenses</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanization expenses</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercialization</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary expenses</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors’ elaboration with data from BBVA (2012).

Urbanization expenses include basic infrastructure (12.6% of the total) and urban equipment (6.7%). Extraordinary expenses include extraordinary payments to authorities (0.7%), maintenance to finished units (1.1%) and others (3.1%).

The main sources of revenue for the housing industry are the credits granted to formal-sector workers through the Institute of the National Fund of Housing for the Workers (INFONAVIT for its initials in Spanish) and the Institute of Social Security and Services for the State Workers Fund (FOVISSSTE). These two government agencies account for 70.3% and 11.1% of the total revenues for the industry, respectively. Private credits (from the commercial bank) account for only 8.2% of the revenues, while co-financing schemes (also through commercial bank) and consumer up-front payments are only 7.5% and 3%, respectively, of the total.

This allows for a considerable margin of action of the government, who can influence costs and revenues structures of the industry both through permits and licenses polices and through credit (and subsidy) allocation schemes.

The third step is to change the cost and revenues structures of the construction industry in order to increase supply in higher-density locations.

We know that moving to higher-density areas would increase land-acquisition costs for these companies. Hence, there are two possible routes (not mutually exclusive) to incentivize a supply shift from low to high-density municipalities. The first is related to the project costs and the second to the sources of revenue.

From the cost perspective:
- Increase the cost of permits and licenses for housing projects in low-density municipalities.
- Relatedly, decrease the cost of permits and licenses in high-density municipalities. This could be done either as a simultaneous or an alternative strategy. The cost should be understood not only as the actual payments but also as the time and effort requirements to obtain the permits. The process should be as expedite and clear as possible.
- Increase the urbanization infrastructure requirements. The further away the projects are
from economic activity centers, the higher the requirements of infrastructure provision should be. This should not only be in terms of shifting the cost of public services infrastructure from the government to the developer, but also in terms of requiring the creation of high quality public spaces that can allow for a sense of community to be created in the housing projects.

From the revenues perspective:

- Decrease government sources of funding for housing projects in low-density regions. Strategically allocate credits and subsidies in higher-density locations. Condition government funds to compliance with general standards of city densification, access to transport and public spaces provision.

These two routes are directly related to the UR ideas mentioned above. The purpose of outlining them in this way is, as we said before, to disentangle the specific steps and actors involved in bringing these changes about.

The fourth step is to identify the main actors with the power to change the status quo and understand their interests in the sector.

Local governments are the main actor with the capacity to affect the costs, as they are the ones in charge of granting construction and land use permits. The federal government is the main actor with the capacity to affect the revenues structure of housing developers. The question then is how to create the right incentives for these actors? How can we persuade them to adopt the recommended policies?

From the federal government side, important steps have been taken to fight the urban expansion trend. In a way, the recommendations of the UR in this sense are already part of the PSDATU. Moreover, the procedural rules of the National Program of Housing Financing and Subsidies (elaborated jointly by SEDATU and CONAVI and published in February, 2014) include very specific regulations regarding the allocation of credits and subsidies subject to the location of the housing projects. The problem is that this program works through a scoring system that allows construction companies to subvert the system by scoring higher in other sustainability indicators while they keep building in the peripheries. Thus, we end up having highly modern, sustainable projects, in locations that are still far away from the cities. The environmental improvements of these projects might even be offset by the pollution associated to long daily commutes between the workplace or schools and the house. Moreover, there is no use in having highly energy-efficient houses if they are going to end up abandoned anyways. It is necessary to establish a zero-tolerance policy of urban contention.

From the local government side, it is unclear whether they are taking any measure in terms of conditioning permits and licensing agreements to location criteria. Moreover, property taxes are not responsive to the construction potential of the land but to the actual value of the land.
B) Implementation challenges and recommendations

Goal: incentivize cities densification through a carrot-and-stick approach that increases the relative profitability of building inside the cities

Challenge 1) Interest groups pressure and local governments corruption in permits and licensing allocation

“Corruption in urban development can lead to urban sprawl and the suboptimal use of public resources” (Lagunes, 2012). As we discussed, most of the major housing construction companies own or buy land reserves in the outskirts of the city. Frequently, however, the locations where companies want to build are zoned as non-urban. Developers thus need to obtain permits to change in the land category of their preferred locations. Negotiations to get these changes are frequently obscure and involve bribing of public officials and even threats to local authorities opposing their interests.4

In a Study on Corruption and Accountability in Mexico, Paul Lagunes identifies several institutional factors related to the lack of responsiveness of the government to public interest. He argues that the legal framework grants bureaucrats a lot of room for discretional behavior so that they frequently make opportunistic interpretations of the law. This, combined with the economic power of special interest groups, such as real estate developers, creates a fertile ground for corruption. Moreover, as the bureaucracy does not respond to voters, their decisions don’t have any serious consequences.

The link between the voters and the bureaucrats are the elected officials. However, the latter often rely on the decisions of the bureaucracy due to lack of alternatives (insufficient human resources with the necessary technical and administrative experience in the subject) and, more importantly, because they do not have strong incentives to respond to their constituents. In particular, the current ban on reelection creates a disconnection between the electorate and the incumbent majors, who is mainly accountable to her political party and/or interest groups, as it is mainly them who can support the continuation of her political career. However, the recently approved Political Reform will modify the system of incentives in a favorable way. This change and the opportunities it presents will be addressed in the recommendations section.

Corruption hinders the possibility of the government to implement urban planning. If zoning maps are constantly changed as it best suits the constructors’ interests, urban development plans will never become a reality, no matter how technically correct they are. Moreover, and as a consequence of zoning maps and building codes violations, the treasuries of municipal governments are severely constrained, as they have to provide public services (roads, security, sewage systems, and electricity) to these housing projects, regardless of their distance from the city.

The main point at stake here is that “even if the laws were revised and perfected, market pressures would endure. Now add corruption to the mix” (Lagunes, 2012). The goal then is

4 Paul Lagunes cites an example of one expeditor (contracted by a mayor real estate developer) who admitted “to paying the former mayor of a Mexico City borough over 500,000 USD (or some 7 million Mexican pesos) in exchange for approving a number of building permits.” For more concrete evidence on corruption in the building industry see: Lagunes, 2012; Hardoon and Heinrich, 2011; Transparency International, 2012)
to change the incentives of both politicians and bureaucrats in such way that urban planning becomes urban practice. The stronger the connection between regulations and implemented policies, the more relevant and feasible an Urban Reform will be.

Recommendations

1) Third party audits provide an effective oversight mechanism over corrupt bureaucrats. As we mentioned before, elected officials most of the times have to rely on the decisions of their administrations, and they do not always have the time, resources, or interest to verify the legality of them. Thus, establishing a system of external audits that verify the compliance with regulations in permits and licenses grants, will serve as an enforcement mechanism. There is sound evidence all over the world in support the efficacy of audits as a tool against corruption. For the particular case of the Mexican real estate industry and the government agencies in charge of granting building permits, Paul Lagunes (2012) conducted a field experiment in which he found that “monitoring spurs greater diligence, stringency, and honesty among bureaucrats”. It should be noted that the changes in behavior were not caused directly by the audits but by the credible threat of sanction. That is, only when bureaucrats know both that their permit-granting deliberations will be assessed and that there will be a sanction for irregularities, they become more likely to comply with the existing regulations.

The question would then be: why would politicians push for the establishment of an auditing scheme if they have not done thus far? We answer this by looking at one of the most important changes that will be brought about with the Political Reform: the possibility of reelection. Majors and legislators will have more incentives to respond to their constituents if keeping them in office awards their performance. The results of respecting the existing (or future) regulations in urban policy would be visible before the end of their terms (either three or six year periods) and they will be able to claim credit for the improvements. Thus, they will be able to use the system of audits and the associated reductions in corruption as a tool for reelection.

2) Publication and digitalization of official documents and negotiations to grant building permits and licenses

This will reduce the margin for discretionary behavior of the bureaucrats as their decisions will be exposed and the responsibilities attributions will be made transparent. The incentives to push for the publication and digitalization of these documents will be the same as the ones described to establish a system of external audits. Moreover, it can be expected that by publicizing the processes, the steps and requirements to obtain a permit will become more evident for citizens or firms interested in the industry. This will in turn foster competitiveness in a currently highly concentrated sector. Increased transparency and competitiveness are generally associated with more efficient allocation of resources, lower prices and a more complete satisfaction of demand. Overall, the spillover effects of reduced corruption and increased competition will be translated in a more efficient market allocation of land resources. The number of abandoned dwellings should decrease thus creating an additional source of income for cities in the form of increased property taxes collection.
Challenge 2) Increasing the cost of constructing in the periphery is not necessarily associated with an increase in the housing offer for low-income population inside the cities.

Due to land speculation problems and an overall higher demand of land inside the cities, the costs of land are significantly larger there than in the outskirts. While it is desirable to concentrate housing construction in high-density areas, it is possible that low-income population that is able to buy properties under the current scheme will not be able to afford the costs of houses inside the cities. It is thus necessary to create a scheme that provides affordable housing for this segment of the population.

Recommendations:

1) **Study migration dynamics and plan counter-speculation policies accordingly.** Migration to and from the cities is one crucial factor behind land speculation. As we found from our research and interviews in Merida, being the safest city in the country attracts an increasing number of immigrants (both national and international). This has created an important problem of land speculation: in spite of having extended areas of vacant land inside the city, developers are already building housing complexes in the outskirts of Merida due to the relatively higher prices of land in the inside. The UR already contemplates the problem of land speculation and proposes, as was mentioned before, the implementation of property taxes that respond to the potential of construction of the land (as opposed to its actual value).

There are good international experiences in Brazil and Colombia to prevent increases in the price of land due to speculation. In Brazil they established a similar practice to the one proposed by the UR, where the property tax increases for under-utilized land inside the city. Moreover, after subsequent years of under-utilization, the government reserves the right to expropriate vacant lots or abandoned dwellings at their **cadastral price** (not market value), thus penalizing the owners and creating a source of revenue for the government to build lower–priced houses. In Colombia they have a similar scheme but instead of expropriating the land, the government forces the owners to auction their properties at 70% of the market price after 5 years of underutilization, or at 70% of the cadastral price after 7 years of underutilization.

2) **Take advantage of additional, non-financial, resources: social construction of habitat, civil society technical assistance, and learning from urban-popular organizations schemes.**

The costs of production and maintenance of housing can be significantly reduced by incorporating social-cooperation schemes as those promoted by Habitat International Coalition and/or the organization schemes of urban-popular associations. Moreover, if properly organized, members of other civil society organizations (architects and engineers associations, for example) can provide pro-bono technical assistance for the construction of housing for lower-income population.
4) Funding Allocation and Funding Deficit

During our interviews in Merida and Mexico City, the funding issues were frequently pointed out to be one of the major barriers to implement various urban reform programs such as sustainable transportation and affordable housing. Specifically, the main challenges identified are: 1) Some local governments don’t have adequate funding resources to support public transportation programs; 2) The funding policy of housing and transportation are not fully aligned; and 3) Funding shortage at both the federal and local levels to support urban reform programs. The following section elaborates on each of the challenges identified and proposes solutions based on our research and interviews.

Challenge

• Some local governments do not have adequate funding resources to support public transportation programs

Solution

• Change the way how federal funding resources is currently allocated and increase the allocation for public transportation
• Use financial instruments to generate local revenues and support public transportation

Lack of adequate funding resources to support public transportation projects is one of the major issues identified by our interviewees in Merida and Mexico City. There are two factors contributing to such a situation. First, the current funding resources from the federal government is more allocated on private car use rather than public transportation development. Second, some of the local government in Mexico doesn’t have enough local revenues to cover public transportation improvement programs, even smalls ones like the creation of bike lanes, as having been indicated by one of our interviewees in Merida.

For the funding allocation of the federal resources, a study report from the Mexican Finance Group comprised of 16 NGOs work on environmental, budget, gender equity and human rights uses, found that 70% of the resources allocated from the federal budget on transportation were invested in programs that expand, modernize, or build road infrastructure (2012). A study conducted by the Institute for Transportation and Development Policy (ITDP) did a more detailed analysis of the federal budget of 2012 and reached similar conclusions (Figure 1). One note to be taken is that Merida got 215 million Pesos of federal fund on transportation in 2012, among them, 67 percent was spent on infrastructure development while the allocation on public transporation is basically negligible (ITDP, 2013). Another note is that the current mayor of Mexico City decreased the municipal government’s budget on public transportation from around 18 billion in 2012 to 17 billion Pesos in 2013 after he took office in 2012 (Notimex, 2013).
These studies and numbers show that public transportation still hasn’t received enough attention as it should have and the federal spending on transportation is heavily in favor of car use—manifested by the fact that the majority of the financial resources was used to expand and maintain the road infrastructure and build more parking facilities. These efforts were intended to ease the current congestions, however, in effect they are actually encouraging more car driving on the road which brought about a lot of environmental externalities such as traffic jams, noises, and air pollution. Comparatively, a few resources have been invested in more sustainable transport programs such as public transit projects and infrastructure such as bicycle and pedestrian structure as have been clearly shown by Figure 1.

To reverse this, federal budgetary funds must be redirected in a manner to support public transportation as an alternative. For this, one initiative worth noting in Mexico is the federal government’s Public Transportation Federal Support Program (PROTRAM). This program was created in 2009 by the federal government to support nationwide sustainable mobility efforts. PROTRAM offers grants to subnational governments for up to 50% of the infrastructure cost of public transportation projects. To ensure the quality of the projects, CTS-Mexico was invited by the government of Merida to serve as advisors and help evaluate the technical and financial feasibility of public transportation projects seeking funding from PROTRAM. One limitation with PROTRAM though, is that it only funds mass transit projects, while nonmotorized transport—i.e. pedestrian and bicycle facilities could not be funded through this program.

Another proposal provided by ITDP is to create an urban mobility fund at the federal level to support programs focusing on public and non-motorized transport. To make sure such a fund will not be used for other purposes such as infrastructure development, it is suggested that basic requirements must be imposed such as an integrated sustainable urban mobility plan. In addition, it is suggested that a special entity needs to be created to review and evaluate the

(Source: ITDP Mexico)
proposals based on specific evaluation criteria such as cost-benefit assessment, environmental externalities and alternative options, among others (ITDP, 2012).

These are all efforts aiming to earmark more funding resources for public transportation. However, for long-term sustainable transportation development, it is fundamentally important to change the current funding allocation structure and channel more resources into public transportation development in a more sustainable way. To make sure the funding resources are allocated in the most efficient way, a detailed nation-wide study needs to be conducted to learn more about people’s transportation needs, the most cost-effective and sustainable way to meet those needs, and then allocate the funding accordingly. In this way, more funds could be allocated to the creation of sidewalks, bus lines, subways and bike lanes to foster more sustainable transportation in Mexico.

Except for the current structure of funding allocation, another major factor which is constraining local government’s efforts towards public transportation is their limited revenue resources. When we were doing field investigation in Merida, one of our interviewees indicated that the local government in Merida does not have many financial resources. Even for small public transportation improvements like the creation of bike lanes, they would have to rely on the funds provided by the state and national government. While federal funding allocation could be revised in a way to support more public transportation projects, as suggested earlier, there is still the need that other funding options should be explored to finance the local share of public transportation improvements to ensure stability and sustainability.

Like in many other countries, both road infrastructure and gasoline in Mexico are subsidized, since they are considered as public services. As drivers do not need to bear the full cost of automobile use, they tend to overuse it. The availability of low-cost or even free parking spaces exacerbate such a situation. The car ownership tax in Mexico is also problematic in environmental terms, because the tax is only applied for the first 10 years of a vehicle’s life span. As such, it encourages the use of older vehicles, which is less energy efficient and more polluting. Additionally, the current tax design contains an incentive for higher use, as the more a car is used, the less the tax costs per kilometer traveled (ITDP Mexico, 2013). Even worse, this tax was eliminated in early 2012 by the federal government. As an alternative, the right was given to the local government to decide whether to collect it or not. Consequently, the municipal government of Mexico City decided not to collect car ownership tax anymore. At the same time, the states have granted a subsidy on car ownership for the majority of the vehicles in circulation (Montes and Cortes, 2012). This subsidy has increased the quantity of car ownership as it reduces the purchasing costs and the annual ownership cost, leading the country to the opposite direction of sustainable transportation. As for the some of the local government like Mexico City, this means reduced income and lower financial autonomy.

To promote public transportation, the first thing needs to be changed in Mexico is to discourage car use rather than encourage it. For this change to happen, the subsidy for car ownership should be eliminated while the car ownership tax needs to be reinstated. Meanwhile, the defects in the previous tax system needs to be amended. For example, the car ownership tax needs to be applied to the whole lifespan of a vehicle rather than just the first 10 years, and, the tax costs should be gradually increased in proportion with the increase of kilometers traveled. In addition, the government might also consider to phase out the current subsidies on gasoline step by step and replace it with a special tax on gasoline consumption. The experiences in Canada, Germany, Finland, Norway and several other countries show that
such a tax can not only help reduce the use of automobile, but also generate additional funds for public transportation services (Sumner et al, 2009).

Except for the use of taxes, there are some other financial measures which might be explored to generate local revenues for public transportation while at the same time discouraging the use of private cars. For example, to charge high liscence and title fees for the car. Currently in Beijing and Mexico City, the government is using even-uneven license plate numbers to restrict the use of private cars on the road. In response, affluent families bought a second vehicle to cope with such a policy, thus worsening the existing situation. The ever-increasing number of cars on the roads of Beijing demonstrate that such a policy is not very effective in controlling car use. As an alternative solution, Singapore imposed heavy purchasing permits as an addition to the ownership tax on automobile owners to control the amount and growth rate of its vehicle fleet, which turns out to be more effective.

Similarly, programs like congestion pricing could also be considered. In cities like London, Stockholm, and Milan, the local government is using congestion pricing to discourage drivers from driving at the peak hour and entering the downtown areas. They imposed charges on specific segments or regions of the transportation system, mainly as a toll. The charges also change during the day to reflect congestion levels to encourage the drivers to consider other time periods or other transportation modes.

Parking meters could also be used to discourage the use of cars while generating income for local governments. A study by Shoup (2010) found that parking meters bring in more money than home ownership tax in the city of London. In the City of Westminster, the majority of the money collected through parking meters were used for public transportation and public transportation services for the elderly and disabled (Westminster City Council, 2010).

Considering that Mexico’s vehicle feet has grew from 7 million in 1990 to 22 in 2010 and is estimated to reach 60-70 million vehicles by 2030 (CTS-INE, 2010), and the fact that Mexico City’s car ownership has increased from 38 per cent of homes owning cars in 2000 to 46 per cent in 2010 (Veloz, 2011) which now has over 5 million vehicles go through the city every day (Alvarado, 2010), it is envisaged that the above-mentioned measures will not only oblige motorists to pay for the damages they inflict on society, encouraging less reliance on cars, but also generate sizable revenue resources for the local government to be used for the creation of sidewalks, bike lanes, BRT systems, or the introduction of bike share programs.

In summary, the essence of these financial instruments is to increase the costs and inconvenience of private car use, while make public transportation less expensive and more readily available. As a result, it can be expectedly that more people will choose to use public transportation rather than private cars.

While it is generally believed supplemental funding at the local level is needed for public transportation projects, the local government can also make improvements by optimizing the use of existing funds available. The experience in Merida is such a case in point. The local government started with a very limited budget, but used it to create three bike lanes in different neighborhood of the city, which has been quite successful and used frequently.

**Challenge**

- The funding policy of housing and transportation are not fully aligned
Solution

- Set preconditions to fully integrate the use of both funding sources

Most of the new houses developed in Mexico City are dispersed in the suburb areas (figure 2) where there is very limited or no access to public transportation, so people living there have to rely on private cars to move around. Since a large number of families living in those areas are low-income families, the dependence on cars has greatly increased their financial burden, or even led to mortgage payment default.

Figure 2: New housing development (yellow areas) in Mexico City

![New housing development (yellow areas) in Mexico City](Source: Oxygen Mexico City, 2013)

The study conducted by Rauterkus, Thrall and Hangen (2010) have demonstrated that the probability of mortgage non-payment increases with car ownership. At the same time, they found that people whose homes are located in neighborhoods that offered easy accessibility to goods and services are less likely to miss payments. These findings were reaffirmed by a document entitled “The State of Housing in Mexico 2011” (CIDOC and SHF, 2011), in it the researchers mentioned that the distance of the housing developments as a factor explaining why 21% of those houses were eventually abandoned.

The problem is: low-income people can only get credit for the houses located in the far suburban areas, where many people commute 2.5 to 3 hours daily for work. According to an interview with International Coalition Habit, 40% of low-income people’s salaries are spent in commuting, which further perpetuate their poverty. Additionally, the current housing credit policy is providing greater credit offering for the acquisition of single family housing (mainly new), which increased the demand for land, basic urban services, transport and means of communication and resulted in larger amount of investment in infrastructure.

Our interviews in Merida and Mexico City reveal that the Institute of the National Housing Fund for Workers (INFONAVIT) social housing program requires private developers to not only build houses, but also provide streets, sidewalks, electricity and clean water to the new neighborhoods they develop. Basically, the government demands 10% of the land for social
purposes such as schools, hospitals, recreational, and public spaces. If the developers do not fulfill these requirements, they are prohibited from selling new social houses through INFONAVIT in the future. However, one missing component in the previous requirement is that there is no mention of accessibility to public transportation. For this, one good news is, the Mexican government is trying to fix this in its newly passed Housing Bill, in that Bill the government requires that INFONAVIT and The National Housing Commission (CONAVI) to take accessibility to public transportation as one of the assessment criteria when issuing credit for new housing development.

Following such a direction, Bogota also has some good experience to offer. As a city which is facing similar challenges as in Mexico City, Bogota introduced an innovative land-banking/poverty-alleviation program in 1999, called Metrovivienda. Under Metrovivienda, transporation and housing are treated as bundled goods. The city acquires plots when they are in open agricultural uses at relatively cheap prices and proceeds to plan and title the land and provide public utilities, roads and open space. Property is sold to developers at higher prices to help cover infrastructure costs with the proviso that average prices be kept under US$8,500 per unit and are affordable to families with incomes of US$200 per month. This program turns out to be very successful in Bogota, till the end of 2011, four Metrovivienda sites have been created which housed some 8000 families, and the program is aiming to construct 440,000 new housing units (Cervero, 2011). Putting housing near stations helps the city’s poor in two ways-prividing improved housing and public transport services. By coupling affordable housing with affordable transport, Bogota leaders have improved access to jobs, shops and services while reducing the joint costs of what often consumes two-thirds of the poor’s income: housing and transport.

As a necessary addition to the funding policy of housing development, the investment in the transportation sector should also be prioritized in a way to extend public transportation to the areas already occupied by low-income households by adding subway lines, bus roads or bikeshare programs to link those areas to the center of the city. Through these measures, it is expected that the funding resources in both housing sector and transportation sector can be fully integrated in a way to be oriented towards improving public transportation use rather than the use of private cars.

**Challenge**

- **Funding shortage at both the federal and local level to support urban reform**

**Solution**

- **Create innovative solutions to fill the funding gaps**
- **Seek international finance opportunities as a supplement to domestic investment**

Due to shortage of funding, many of our interviewees indicated that they are understaffed and do not have enough human and technical resources to cover the services needed. One example is the limited human resources at the federal transportation department, the other is the fact that several municipalities in Mexico are struggling with collecting local revenue taxes. The financial constraints have greatly limited the government’s efforts to expand basic services, such as better transportation, public spaces, and affordable housing.

On the other hand, these challenges also present to be opportunities for the private sector to complement public priorities to improve access and efficiency of social and community services. In the past several years, the creation of innovative public-private partnerships
(PPPs) between government, business, and civil society has seen success all over the world. By working across sectors and utilizing the unique strengths of each partner, PPPs can deliver benefits to society that go far beyond what partners could have achieved on their own. Well-designed PPPs can pool together financial and technical resources, such as money, materials, skills, knowledge, networks, and the credibility of their brands. At the same time, they also share responsibilities, risks, costs and benefits and can be a win-win for all parties involved.

One example is the PPP solution to a rural water supply project in Rwanda. In 2004, half of Rwanda’s rural piped water systems were non-functional due to poor management and poor cost-recovery. The Rwandan government then brought private-sector participation in water supply as a viable strategy to help make public expenditures more efficient by reducing burden of maintenance and rehabilitation costs, and to expand services to more people. This program has turned out to be very successful, within 6 years of its implementation, Rwanda has been able to serve about 1 million people with reliable water supply (IFC, 2011).

Recognizing the effectiveness of PPPs, many Latin American countries such as Brazil, Colombia, and Peru have modified their regulatory frameworks to encourage them. For example, Colombia enacted legislation in 2012 to enable closer cooperation between public and private entities on projects related to road construction, public housing, clean energy, and more (Sanbrailo, 2013). Mexico might consider using similar policy and mechanism to bring additional resources to support its overall urban reform efforts.

Other than PPPs, international financial resources provided by the International Finance Corporation (IFC), World Bank, bilateral aid agencies or NGOs could also be explored to support part of the work.
## V. Appendix I

### 1) Identified Stakeholders

(Stakeholders that we were not able to interview are in shaded rows)

**Mexico City**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDATU</td>
<td>Advisors to the Secretary</td>
<td>Janet de Luna</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jdeluna.sedatu@gmail.com">jdeluna.sedatu@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>53285000, ext. 57451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eduardo Torres</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eduardo.torres@sedatu.gob.mx">eduardo.torres@sedatu.gob.mx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDUVI</td>
<td>Advisors to the Secretary</td>
<td>Laura Janka</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ljanka@seduvi.df.gob.mx">ljanka@seduvi.df.gob.mx</a></td>
<td>51302100 Ext. 2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eduardo Aguilar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miguel Ángel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cancino Aguilar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAOT</td>
<td>Procurador</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gcorresq@aldf.gob.mx">gcorresq@aldf.gob.mx</a></td>
<td>5130 1900 ext. 2405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local representative-Mobility</td>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ham. Mobility committee (PAN)</td>
<td>Hernández</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDF</td>
<td>Committee (PRD)</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gcortesq@aldf.gob.mx">gcortesq@aldf.gob.mx</a></td>
<td>5130 1900 ext. 2410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Representative-</td>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President of Urban</td>
<td>Hernández</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development and</td>
<td>Mirón</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDF</td>
<td>Committee (PRD)</td>
<td>Genaro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gcervantesv@aldf.gob.mx">gcervantesv@aldf.gob.mx</a></td>
<td>5130 1900 ext. 2307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Representative-Presision</td>
<td>Cervantes Vega</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President of Housing</td>
<td>Zedillo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:czedillo@infonavit.org">czedillo@infonavit.org</a></td>
<td>53226300/332701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFONAVIT</td>
<td>Subdirector of Social</td>
<td>Velasco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Cristobal</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcgil@infonavit.org">jcgil@infonavit.org</a></td>
<td>53226300/332744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFONAVIT</td>
<td>Subdirector of Credit</td>
<td>Gil Ramirez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Quintanar</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dgpv@mail.setravi.df.gob.mx">dgpv@mail.setravi.df.gob.mx</a></td>
<td>52081674 Ext. 1101 y 1308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETRAVI</td>
<td>Director of Planning</td>
<td>Dhyana Shanti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Vialities</td>
<td>Quintanar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA/CMIC</td>
<td>Vicepresidente</td>
<td>Luis Fernando</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>(55) 5424740 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ejecutivo del</td>
<td>Zárate Rocha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporativo ICA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFa Grupo Inmobiliario</td>
<td>Director General</td>
<td>Elias Fasja</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONU-Hábitat México</td>
<td>National Coordinator of the UN Program for human settlements in México</td>
<td>María Dolores Franco Delgado</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mexico@onuhabitat.org">mexico@onuhabitat.org</a></td>
<td>(55) 5328 5000 Ext. 50847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECMM/FENA MM</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Patricia González Edith Bárcenas</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cemm@cemm.com.mx">cemm@cemm.com.mx</a></td>
<td>(55) 4330.0473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITDP</td>
<td>Director for Mexico</td>
<td>Xavier Treviño</td>
<td><a href="mailto:xavier.trevino@itdp.org">xavier.trevino@itdp.org</a></td>
<td>55 3626-2963 Ext. 1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITDP</td>
<td>Director for Latin America</td>
<td>Bernardo Baranda Sepúlveda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bernardo.baranda@itdp.org">bernardo.baranda@itdp.org</a></td>
<td>(+52) 55 3626-2963 ext. 1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grupo Espacio Siete</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>María Elena Martinez Carranza</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEQUUM A.C.</td>
<td>Main researcher</td>
<td>Leonardo Martinez Flores</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lmf@aequum.org">lmf@aequum.org</a></td>
<td>(55) 9172 1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat International Coalition</td>
<td>Enrique Ortiz</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hic-al@hic-al.org">hic-al@hic-al.org</a></td>
<td>55-55121586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa y Ciudad</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td><a href="mailto:casayciudad@prodigy.net.mx">casayciudad@prodigy.net.mx</a></td>
<td>56 74 21 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taller Territorial</td>
<td>Arturo Ortiz</td>
<td>Struck</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arturo@tallerterritorial.com">arturo@tallerterritorial.com</a></td>
<td>55456972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAM</td>
<td>Professor/Researcher at UNAM</td>
<td>Alicia Ziccardi Contigiani</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ziccardi@puec.unam.mx">ziccardi@puec.unam.mx</a></td>
<td>5522-1957/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5522-2052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAM</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Priscila Connolly</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pcd@correo.azc.uam.mx">pcd@correo.azc.uam.mx</a></td>
<td>(55) 5950-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad Azcapotzalco</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dietrichsen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joseluiscortes@ui.mx">joseluiscortes@ui.mx</a></td>
<td>4143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberoamericana</td>
<td>Dirección de Educación Continua</td>
<td>José Luis Cortés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAM</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Delgado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azcapotzalco</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>René Coulomb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bosc</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmeb@correo.azc.uam.mx">rmeb@correo.azc.uam.mx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAM</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Javier Delgado Campos</td>
<td><a href="mailto:phdinews@igg.unam.mx">phdinews@igg.unam.mx</a></td>
<td>5623 0222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ext.: 44841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAM</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Roberto Eibenschutz</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eibensch@correo.xoc.uam.mx">eibensch@correo.xoc.uam.mx</a></td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xochimilco Universidad</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Gerardo Gómez del Campo</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberoamericana</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Salomón</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAM</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>González A.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:salomonglez@gmail.com">salomonglez@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuajimalpa</td>
<td>Coordinadora Académica de la Maestría en Demografía</td>
<td>Landy Lizbeth Sánchez Peña</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lsanchez@colmex.mx">lsanchez@colmex.mx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colmex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>World Fellow</td>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td><a href="mailto:betancourt@yale.edu">betancourt@yale.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Betancourt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:betancourt.enrique@gmail.com">betancourt.enrique@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Colegio</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Lagunes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pfl2106@columbia.edu">pfl2106@columbia.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexiquense</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Alfonso Iracheta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Merida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Development</td>
<td>Director of Urban Development</td>
<td>Arq. Federico Sauri Molina</td>
<td><a href="mailto:federico.sauri@merida.gob.mx">federico.sauri@merida.gob.mx</a></td>
<td>9420038, Ext. 81004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Development</td>
<td>Subdivision of Planning</td>
<td>Arq. Ericka Herrera Saucedo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ericka.herrera@merida.gob.mx">ericka.herrera@merida.gob.mx</a></td>
<td>Ext. 81047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Development</td>
<td>Chief of Urban Planning</td>
<td>Arq. Lourdes Solis Mendez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lourdes.solis@merida.gob.mx">lourdes.solis@merida.gob.mx</a></td>
<td>Ext. 81026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Development</td>
<td>Chief of new developments and sustainability</td>
<td>Arq. Luz Rosado Zalazar</td>
<td><a href="mailto:luz.rosado@merida.gob.mx">luz.rosado@merida.gob.mx</a></td>
<td>Ext. 81071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Govt. // Governance</td>
<td>Chief of Transportation Division</td>
<td>Ing. René Flores Ayora</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rene.flores@merida.gob.mx">rene.flores@merida.gob.mx</a></td>
<td>Ext. 84511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning Division</td>
<td>General Director</td>
<td>Lic. Jorge Muñoz Gonzalez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jorge.munoz@merida.gob.mx">jorge.munoz@merida.gob.mx</a></td>
<td>(999)942000 ext. 80750 y 80751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGO’s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Estratégico Yucatán</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Ing. Humberto Sauri</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hsauriduch@hotmail.com">hsauriduch@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>9253355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBARQ - Mobility and Urban Development</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Arq. Tanya Jiménez</td>
<td>tjimenez@embarq mexico.org</td>
<td>+52 3096-5742 ext. 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Merida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@urbanmerida.es">info@urbanmerida.es</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colegio Yucateco de Arquitectos (Architects Association)</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Lic. José Peniche Gallareta</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jpeniche@colegioyucatecodearquitectos.org">jpeniche@colegioyucatecodearquitectos.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colegio Yucateco de Ingenieros Civiles (Civil Engineers Association)</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Ing. Jorge Alfonso Arcila Arjona</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ciggerencia@cicyucatan.com">ciggerencia@cicyucatan.com</a></td>
<td>(999) 925-9869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2) City and Pillar Selection

First, of the seven pillars proposed in the Urban Reform, two were selected: Sustainable Transportation and Revitalization of the Neighborhood. Second, to focus on the challenges specific to local implementation, we chose two cities: Merida and Mexico City. Here, we explain the rationale for choosing these particular cities and pillars further in detail. Although many of the challenges and solutions will be drawn upon information from researching these two cities and pillars, many of the lessons we find are applicable to other cities in Mexico.

#### City Selection: Mexico City and Merida

The initial cities considered were the following main cities: Mexico City, Los Cabos, Guadalajara, Toluca, and Merida. These were based on recommendations from the CMM and Alberto Diaz-Cayero, an advisor to the Stanford CMM team, and an increased probability of connecting with stakeholders in the cities. All cities are in need of urban reform with large or rapidly growing populations. However, to narrow this down further, additional research was conducted to determine which two would be provide the most meaning assessment.

There were four main criteria factored into the city selection methodology, these being: contrast between the two cities chosen, the amount of information available about urban development, previous attempts of implementing similar urban reform in the city, and political will. The contrast factor includes the difference in population, density, GDP, political party, current transportation infrastructure, and security indicators. The objective was to choose cities that were highly contrasting, to cover as different types cities and challenges that might arise with implementation across the country. Information availability includes potential contacts that are stakeholders in the urban reform process, as well as the accessibility of literature and studies. Previous attempts considered government, private sector, and joint public-private programs, as well as past and existing organizations that support urban reform. Political will not only factors in the incumbent political party, but also considers the civil society’s activism or willingness to adopt urban reform.

Mexico City was chosen as a first city. As the first city selected, the contrast criterion was not applicable. The abundance of information and contacts within the government and civil society was also tremendous, and there was consensus that assessing one of the largest cities in Mexico would provide valuable insight. Figure 1 shows the results from the four criteria with the four remaining cities compared to Mexico City. In all cities there was at least medium to medium-high levels of political will and high levels of information available. All cities had existing or previous urban development programs, in the form of a government
department focused on urban reform or at least housed within a department that included it on the agenda. After evaluating contrast, Merida and Los Cabos are the remaining choices. However, Los Cabos is particularly unique with its dependence on tourism and high levels of floating population, and it would be difficult to generalize lessons from them. Due to this, Merida was the optimal choice as the second city. Figure 2 illustrates some of the key differences between Merida and Mexico City that were considered in the analysis.

Figure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Contrast</th>
<th>Information availability</th>
<th>Previous attempts</th>
<th>Political will</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Cabos</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluca</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merida</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>México DF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2

**Pillar Selection: Moving the City and Revitalize Neighborhoods**

The seven pillars of the Urban Reform are as follows:
1) Land use planning: The creation of a unified national system for land planning.

2) Urban density: A program to develop density inside city boundaries, articulating policies and Federal investment to promote intra-urban projects.

3) Strengthening metropolitan centers: Creation of a comprehensive framework to support capacity building in metropolitan areas

4) Moving the city: A national program for sustainable urban mobility, which brings together under one supervisor all the urban mobility programs and projects planned and financed by the Federal government.

5) Revitalize neighborhoods: National program to intervene on the ground, and socially, toward improving deteriorated urban areas across Mexico.

6) Reorient housing financing: Link funding and federal subsidies with strict urbanization and quality of life indicators for sustainable neighborhoods.

7) City innovation: Create the sectorial fund to innovate in cities toward research, development and demonstration of pilot urban initiatives.

Due to high concentrations of poverty, lack of social services, and distance from jobs, homes are being abandoned, which only exacerbates the already severe violence Mexico is facing. Despite efforts to capture the drug cartel members and strengthen police forces, citizens still feel unsafe in their own communities. Another approach to eliminating violence is to improve deteriorated housing and communities. Poverty, lack of nearby employment options, and inaccessibility to public goods, such as health, has forced citizens, particularly young men, into paths of violence. By encouraging safe open spaces, cities can rebuild the social fabric of communities. Through accessible transportation or housing near employment, it can boost local economies. Providing access to social services and basic utilities, people are no longer pushed to use desperate means to obtain them. Through revitalization of the neighborhood, Mexico can eliminate violence with a powerful, yet peaceful, approach.

The second pillar chosen, sustainable urban mobility, is closely linked with revitalization of the neighborhood. The poor communities are deprived of efficient public transportation options, which exacerbate and trap them in poverty due to the lack of access to employment, basic utility, and social services. Those that commute between the periphery and the city center waste up to 2-3 hours of time and about 25% of their income on travel costs (UR). Even within the city centers, congested roads lead to wasted productivity and high levels of pollution. As cities in Mexico continue to grow at a rapid pace, with vehicles increasing from 30 million to 70 million by 2030, the need for more efficient public transport is urgent (UR). This pillar in particular resonates in all cities, and effects citizens of all class, location, and status. For these reasons, and its close link to the revitalization of the neighborhood, sustainable transportation is the second pillar the implementation plan will address.

Each of these pillars has high priority and highly interconnected to one another. In fact, many of the recommendations in the report point to the necessity for an integrated approach that addresses urban reform holistically. Many of the implementation challenges and solutions proposed could be encountered while working on any of the pillars. That stated, many of the interviews and studies relied on those in the transportation, housing, and urban development stakeholders.
Diagnosis:
Sauri considers Mérida is facing already serious issues because of an inefficient urban planning. Mérida has a population of aprox. 800,000 people. Counting the people living around the city, the sum increases to more than 1 million. Sauri is aware that the government of Merida needs to take action before getting to 1 million of people, the tipping point for most of these medium-size cities.
Sauri points that Mérida’s surface is of 800km2, this is the same space that Guadalajara covered when it was a city of 5 millions of people (as we abovementioned, the metropolitan area of Merida has not more than 1 million of people).
There are four main reasons to explain the dynamic growth of the city of Mérida, according to the Local Secretary:
· Safety: Mérida is pondered as the safest city in the country. This is a great incentive for people around the country to move to the “White City”.
· Geography: Because of Merida is located on a plateau there is not geographic constraint to expand the city limitless.
· Public services: The city functions as the political, economic, cultural and social center of the peninsula. Best education (universities), health (doctors and hospitals) and commercial services are offered in Mérida.
· Tourism and International investors: American and Canadian middle-age tourists invest in the city buying houses around the historic center.
Sauri enumerates the principal current effects of an inefficient urban planning, as follows:
· Traffic congestion.
· Land speculation.
· Garbage collection insufficiency because of the extension of the city.
· Water pollution (before the current sprawling they could find clean water at 12 meters under, now it is possible at 18 meters) and inability to increase the capacity of current water purification plants (they count with 3 plants)
Merida was one of the first cities in the country to create its Urban Development Plan in the end of the 80s. Unfortunately, Sauri affirms, Urban plans need to be changed almost systematically with any new local government. The Urban Plan aims to compact the city.

Institutional issues:
It seems that the local and state governments in Mérida have a good relationship. They have fluent dialogue, and cooperation is not unusual. However, situation seems to be different with the national government. They work closely with the state government.
There is a particular distribution of functions between the local and the state government. The state government is in charge of security, water, public transportation and roads infrastructure in Mérida, while the local government provides security only for the
historic center, and counts with some funds (provided by the national government) that they can use to develop small projects such as the bike lanes.

**Regarding Urban Planning, the local government of Mérida aims to create the Municipal Institute of Planning (IMPLAN, in Spanish) in March 2014.** The institute will be focus on the urban development planning of the city exclusively. Regrettably, current urban planning is under Saurí’s Secretary but they cannot do this properly giving the overwhelming daily activity they have to solve (construction permits, cultural patrimony administration, new developments, among others).

**The IMPLAN was thought by the local government of Mérida and CTS Embarq.** The government of Mérida is particularly concern with the idea of making this new institution able to enforce its recommendations to the local government. In other words, they want a new local institution “with teeth, with a strong civil society and public participation”. “Unfortunately, local governments change every three years, IMPLAN will provide the local government with consistency throughout administrations”.

**There is not a metropolitan institution to coordinate urban planning among the different districts that surrounds Mérida.** Saurí does not seem concern about this issue. He mentions that they are working on creating a new council for the five municipalities, but he has not further information to provide.

**There are many indeterminate borders between Mérida and its neighbor districts.** This situation provokes important inconsistencies on what kind of use of the land is allowed or denied.

**Regarding the feasibility and convenience of creating a National Law of Urban Planning and Development,** Saurí thinks that “it is feasible, and beneficial. We are already working with the SEDATU”. Yet, he adds “We have to avoid to come back to the “national centralism””. A national policy has to be sensitive to local particularities (“This is not an earthquake area, so they should avoid asking us on that”).

**Funding**
While it is not problematic with the state government, it is pretty messy with the national government (Merida is ruled by the PAN and México by the PRI – What is surprising is that Yucatán is ruled by the PRI as well). They had some political issues with a couple of national agencies such as SEDUMA orINA.
Saurí mentions also that Merida receives only 7% of the state budget. To him, that sounds unrealistic since 51% of the people in Yucatán live in Mérida.

**Land Speculation & Housing policy**
**Because of the geographic characteristics explained before there is an abundant offer of land.** Saurí recognizes that land speculation is an important problem for Mérida. Particularly, in the north of the city where “developers” buy lands and retain it till its price increases to resell it. Sometimes the land acquired for speculative business is “ejidal”, a special form of land property neither public nor private, which makes things even more complicated.

It is crucial to regularize land acquisition for speculative or irregular developments purpose. Saurí identifies three situations regarding land and developers.

- **Public & Private Partnerships:** Private developers acquire land (public or private) but they are forced to not only to build houses, but also to provide streets, streets ‘name, sidewalks, electricity (lighting) and clean water to this new neighborhood. The government seems to be fine with this kind of developer because it is confident that if they do not do this in a proper way they cannot sell these new social houses through INFONAVIT. It is interesting to note that the government demands 10% of the land for social purposes (schools,
recreational spaces, public spaces, and so forth). There is not mention to the requirement of being accessible to public transportation though.

- **Private developments without INFONAVIT (or any state/national) funding:** These are private new developments of “close-neighborhoods” (condominiums), far away from the city. Yet, these developments are characterized by better quality of houses ‘constructions, and ultimately they don’t “municipalize” the neighborhood (they do not ask for any support from the local government). They have to provide streets, and everything to the people living on them, also being these people the ones paying for these services.
- **Opportunistic developers:** individuals or developers who buy land, and build a set of houses without provision of any kind of public service or municipal overview. Many times people living in these constructions come later to the municipal government demanding these basic services. There will be people living in the north of the city without clear water, lighting and public transportation. There is a strong relationship between these new developments far away from the city and the increase of crime. Because of these dormitory- cities, a lot of thefts without violence are produced daily while people are working in the city.

**Public Spaces**

They are creating new public spaces encouraging public participation. This dynamic proved to be successful for them (people take higher care of their neighborhoods if they were part of its revitalization). Merida is creating libraries, theaters, and so forth in more disadvantage neighborhoods. Also, they created these “online parks”, basically it means the provision of WiFi in public squares and police stations.

**Public Transportation**

The city of Mérida does not count with regulation on public transportation (Sauri mentions that there is a state law on public transportation). Also, he adds, “We don’t have any index to measure public transportation. Probably the Public Transportation Secretary at the State level could have one”. Regarding the use of cars, he posits that there exists a tax on car ownership, which is collected by the state government. Yet, they collect property taxes. Public transportation is inefficient in Mérida in part because 8 out of the 10 existing roads start and end in the historic center. According to Sauri, “roads administration is pretty corrupt.” Same happens with buses, which depart from the historic center. They wait with their engines on, to be full of people. This is extremely polluting. They have created three cycling trails so far in different neighborhoods of the city. “The success is evident, a lot of people go every Sunday to bike there” Sauri says. Regarding bike lanes, they worked with CTS Embarq, and the local officials found that a lot of improvement can be made with little money. The local government found this project, and it will be launch in the following months. Not bike sharing programs for now; there is some resistance of local people because in their workplaces there is not shower or locker room. A civil movement asking for bike lanes (+2000 “cicloturilles”) has started one year ago.

**Interviewee:** Eduardo Batllori  
**Title:** Urban Development Secretary to the State Government of Yucatán  
**Stakeholder classification:** government  
**Venue:** Mérida, Yucatan.  
**Date:** 01-28-2014
One of the main challenges identified was that housing projects are monofunctional. This happens both in private developments and in those financed by the government. Since the 90s Merida has focused in the development of infrastructure and has tried to consolidate as a service-oriented city, due to the fact that there is little to none industrial or agricultural activity.

The buying and selling of lands has responded to a mercantilist perspective of urban development.

Problems of Merida:
- It is overly extended: it has the same surface than Guadalajara while it has just a little more than half its population (800,000 people).
- Lack of borders definition: the limits between Merida and its surrounding counties (municipios) are not clear.
- Every county has different legislations and there’s a particular problem with the rapid and uncontrolled growth of Canacin- they frequently build housing projects that are connected with the city through only ONE road. They are built without the state’s permission and do not provide any public areas or parking spaces.
- The city operates under a segregationist model that comes back from the colony where there was a clear spatial division among different castas (ethnic groups). Now the division is made around socioeconomic differences and it is frequent to find fancy housing projects with high walls that separate the from other (poorer) neighbourhoods.
- Relatedly, rich neighbourhoods are clustered in the North of the city while the South of the city is mostly populated by poor people, frequently immigrants from the henequen crisis.
- Lack of trees in the North (where they have built most of the new/modern housing projects).
- Deforestation and lack of trees is a particularly worrisome problem as it increases the already high temperatures of the region. Consequently, use of A.C. is higher every day.

Transport issues:
- Since the 50-60’s decade, there has been little to no change in its operation and regulation.
- Virtually all of the bus routes converge in the center of Merida thus increasing traffic and heat problems in the area.
- Transport cost have increased, they frequently operate over or under capacity (having some buses extremely full while others are practically empty) and inefficiently → this lowers the relative price of using a car.
- The periférico was created to contain the city growth, but the truth is that the city is still giving permission to build outside of it. Hence, people have to commute long distances in order to reach the bus stops.

Housing and land use issues:
- Land use permissions are an attribution of the city’s government (in specific, of the ayuntamiento).
The costs of maintaining the city are increasing importantly, and what the city raises from predial (property tax) is not enough to cover these costs.

Urban development plans change every three years, so there are contradictory maps of land use.

Interests of constructing companies to build new housing projects.

Speculation problems have decreased the power of the state in urban planning.

Ongoing/recent changes in regulation (unclear if they are already doing this, if they are planning to do it or if it is his personal opinion on what should be changed):

Condition federal funding to DUIS (Desarrollos Urbanos Integrales Sustentables) certification as a way to promote verticality, inclusion (as opposed to socioeconomic segregation), development of public spaces and businesses

- After the “Ley de fraccionamientos” (housing projects law) was approved, the state lost power over building permits but they still have a veto power: an urban-environmental factibility study is needed before majors can approve permits for land use. The entity in charge of the study is accountable to the state’s government (not the city’s).

- Relatedly, Yucatan’s Ministry of Urban Development has to review and approve the urban development programs and environmental regulations of Merida. This is crucial as the power associated with land use permits is very high.

State’s goals:

- Fill-in urban spaces.
- Promote vertical housing developments.
- Reduce the existing concentration of infrastructure investment in the North and promote investment in the North
- Create green corridors and bike paths
- Invest around 8 million dollars to increase connectivity within the state- they have started with the construction of the gated community San Marcos.

Challenges:

Inconsistencies between local (state level) and federal legislations.

Private constructors that are not working with state subsidies are still building low density projects in the North

Property registration conflicts among counties

Can the county (of Merida) finance the transport administration. He does not think so and that is why he argues it has to be done by the state of Yucatan.

Note: he mentioned that most of their development programs are done by private consultants. On the other hand, they are not in touch with NGO’s or academics.

Interviewee: Humberto Sauri
Title: Strategic Plan of Yucatán, Chair
Stakeholder classification: NGO
Venue: Mérida, Yucatan.
Date: 01-28-2014
Criticises the IMPLAN (Instituto Municipal de Planeación- Municipal Planning Institute) Patricio Patron (former governor of Yucatan) created it but “without teeth”. It had no enforcement powers. Sauri argues that it should have been given a veto faculty for any construction development plan. It should be a step previous to the local House of Representatives approval (cabildo) approval.

His organization has a plan that was negotiated and approved by transport concessionaires which, in his view, are the harder to convince and he presented it to Merida’s government but they only archived it and never implemented any of the proposals.

**Interviewee:** Ginés Laucirica & Alfredo Alonzo  
**Title:** Director of the School of Architecture, Autonomous University of Yucatan  
**Stakeholder classification:** academia  
**Venue:** Teleconference  
**Date:** 02-17-2014

Alonzo thinks CMM has designed a very good proposal on Urban Development. The reason for that is that Mexico doesn’t count with this kind of urban policies, particularly mobility policies at all. Regarding mobility there is not a clear and consistent national-wide policy; instead there are some general ideas (at national level). The concept of mobility doesn’t even exist in the state government’s agenda. **Because of there is not a legal framework on transportation in the federal level; there isn’t one at the local level either.** Alonzo thinks that this kind of legal frameworks should be regional. He is skeptical about the effectiveness and fitness of a national bill on these issues, the problem is not about the design, he expresses, it is about implementation, i.e. who is in charge of implementing this new bill. He is completely doubtful on this, at least in the short-run.

**Urban development and mobility policies are not connected.** There is not intertwining in the design of these policies, but they are completely related in reality. **He doesn’t think there exist a real policy on urban development in Mérida.** There are some guidelines (also, policies) on regulating public image, land use, but the conception of unfolding a policy of urban development, as a key tool to improve citizen’s life does not exist. **Alonzo considers that the public consultations with scholars and citizens forums carried on by the SEDATU, called “De la Reforma Rural a la Reforma Urbana”, were useful in 2013.** The SEDATU Plan is really important, because it establishes some basic rules for the next 6 years. Yucatan doesn’t count with a Urban Development Plan since 15 years ago. Each state has to be in charge of that. He is a little bit more hopeful now after the SEDATU plan has been published. He hopes that Yucatán decides to move forward designing and implementing its own..

**There is not institutional coordination on Transportation issues in the Metropolitan Area of Merida so far.** There absence of a proper legal framework for those situations is fundamental to not allow the creation of a urban development policy. The Federal Human Settlement Bill allows these future organizations at metropolitan level. **He is convinced that the National State has to be in charge of the Urban Development policy, particularly in these situations of metropolitan sprawl.** Yet, this potential National Agency has to bear in mind the regional particularities (weather, geography, etc.) to avoid common past mistakes like asking you about earthquakes when you live in a area where earthquakes are completely unlikely.

**Because of most of the local governments have limited economic (funds) and human (skilled officials) resources to work on Urban Development, the redistribution of**
findings turns out to be essential. Local governments are not prepared enough to implement this UDP. Redistributing resources could be key for that (endowing local government with resources and skilled people). For example, the implementation of bike lanes, there are not bike lanes (some isolated attempts in Merida), and it is hard for them to understand that they are cheap and easy to realize. It would result important and beneficial to have a federal entity in charge of the redistribution of funds, but its also cool to define who will manage it, which would be its functions, etc.

There has been an important upsurge in traffic in Merida. The economic growth has increased the use of private cars, but local infrastructure is not prepared to cope with all those new automobiles. It’s important to note that citizens organize activities to foster the use of bike (demand), “it’s most a urban thing, but in the rural areas the use of bikes is usual, especially in Merida. In Mérida, and he also would say in Mexico in general, there is not respect to the pedestrian.

There exist not indicators of UDP/Urban Mobility in Mexico at all. They would be extremely helpful. The national government denies the lack of them.

Public transportation is completely in charge of private hands in Mérida. Concessionaries are the most powerful stakeholders in this issue. Diagnostic: urban transportation is fragmented and disconnected because of the lack of regulation and planning. Heavy cargo transportation companies are completely unregulated in Merida. They get into the Historic Centre every day increasing traffic and pollution. “This situation is disastrous in Mérida”. Results fundamental, he believes, to show clear incentives and certainty to private sector with the purpose of cushion its rebuffs.

There is a complete lack of neighborhood revitalization policies in Mérida and Yucatan. Housing policies are exclusively focus on “new developments of housing” in Yucatan. It is not about revamping or modernizing the already built houses. The government of Merida is not interested in revitalize public spaces. It is not a priority. According to them, developers have the obligation to build these public spaces. “We know they sometimes do it, and others don’t “

Alonzo says “we cannot think of an Urban Development Plan without having in mind housing policies”. Yet, there is a metropolitan coordination in Merida, it focuses on new constructions, but not in revamping the old constructions/neighborhoods. In Merida the local government is exclusively interested in the Historic Centre. Also, there is not a concrete plan to define images for each neighborhood (there is not awareness of the linkage of this with economic development). Public participation in the revitalization of neighborhoods is a challenge. He does not image sustainable channels for that. Now Merida has only “public forums” but there doesn’t exist anything else.

Private/public partnerships participation does not exist in neighborhoods. Public markets used to have relevant social, economic and environmental function in the neighborhoods. We need to recuperate the primacy of every neighborhood’ downtown. Unfortunately, this does not exist in new housing developments. There is not certainty for private actors in neighborhoods

Alonzo concludes summing up the main challenges that this reform could face:

- **There lack of legal framework** at federal level in some areas, and its complete lack at the states level.
- **Absence or inefficiency of institutional coordination between governments. “We used to think that that situation extended to different political parties ruling in each district**, yet we can see now that with same political parties ruling two districts the conflict is even bigger because of the different entrenched interest of each other.” The only solution is the Federal government intervention here.
• **Limited resources for local governments.** They do not have institutional, skills and funding resources to cope with an urban reform.

• **Strong resistance by concessionaries of public transportation.** Unfortunately, the government of Yucatan is not able to sit down with the concessionaries and discuss a new public transportation plan (new routes, tariffs, security, and so forth). Private companies have earned a lot of money during these years; therefore the challenge is to show them that these changes (new rules aiming more transparency, efficiency and safety) are beneficial for them as well.

• **Exactly the same happens with constructors.** Yet, there is a huge opportunity to negotiate with developers now. Most of the construction companies are in crisis, now is the moment to discuss with them what measures can be implemented with the purpose of attaining a sustainable urban development policy.

**Interviewee: Alfonso Iracheta**
**Title:** Professor at El Colegio Mexiquense
**Stakeholder classification:** academia
**Venue:** Teleconference
**Date:** 02-17-2014

**Metropolitan perspective:**
Iracheta summarizes three simultaneous and powerful processes of urbanization in Mérida nowadays:
· First, the consolidation of the city of Mérida leaving many empty spaces, which is produced by the lack of any kind of planning policy.
· Second, the sprawling of the city towards the north (middle and high classes) and the rest (low classes), which produces urban disorder and proves the absence of local and state laws enforcement. He calls this process periphery sprawling. Government is the first one in creating new plans for these areas, and also the first one to not respect its own plans. When developers approached to public officials, they look at these housing projects as business opportunities not as urban development. Results: urban sprawling and informal settlements in the south, all of them poor, without any support from the government.
· Third, and last, it is abandonment of the historic center. No revitalization projects at all for that area.

**Public Transportation & Mobility:**
Since many years ago, and even now, Merida has a reasonable system of public transportation; citizens do not experience traffic, important delays, long commuting, and so forth. Therefore, transportation is not a priority. Yet, everyday public transportation is getting more complex and citizen’s demands to pay attention to this issue are starting to grow. **Concessionaries are in charge of the public transportation,** and they are without any doubt the biggest stakeholder in this area. They were beneficiated by the government inertia on this issue.

**New reform on public transportation announced by the state government is not serious.** They have nothing in concrete, such a bunch of ideas from the past, which now seem to be a novel. The reform has a lethal mistake: it is still focused on the use of the car. Following this reform Merida will never be compact. He is working on a new public transportation reform, which takes inputs from previous works, adds new ideas and also, thinks of this problem as a metropolitan one. He will prepare the plan and present it to the state government. Public transportation planning is intrinsically related with the use of land. Unfortunately, land speculation is a fashionable and usual way of living in Mérida.
**Metropolitan:**
Iracheta is in charge of designing a program for Urban Development for Region 2 of the State of Yucatan. Merida and its neighbors form region 2. The program will have to main objectives:

- **Aim 1:** Updating analysis of the current urban situation in Mérida. Land uses, urban sprawl, public transportation, pollution, empty urban spaces.
- **Aim 2:** Designing public policy proposal for these areas (public transportation, land use, containing urban sprawl, neighborhoods revitalization), and strategies for their implementation. This program will not be in charge of the implementation, yet they will submit this document to the state government.

Eduardo Batllori, Urban Development Secretary for the State of Yucatan, is in charge of this project, in the governments ‘end.

**There is a clear tension between state and local governments.** Mexican Constitution Article 115 gives to local governments ample autonomy to design and implement their own policies, including of course urban development. Yet, they don’t have enough funds, skills and resources in most of the cases to do it. Most of the municipalities don’t count with urban development plans; they are working on this now. The state government uses to help them on this, but the relationship between them is not good in the State of Yucatan.

**The dialogue between the state and local government is bad.** “Local and state officials are pretty primitive”. Batllori (because of his professional background as a scholar and technician) has some leverage to negotiate with the local government, yet they couldn’t agree on a unique program of urban development. The Government of Merida wanted to have their own plan without coordination with the state, and Sauri (Urban Development Secretary for the Government of Merida) did it. “They cannot implement it, but they brag it off”

**Implementation challenges:**
Iracheta is not optimistic about future implementation of CMM’s reform, or even the proposals that he is working on right now. “Mexico has become in a deeply bureaucratic state, where land speculation reigns”. He knows that the state government will do nothing with his proposals. Government will not support it politically, economically, etc.

**Scholars and citizens movement to create awareness about the importance of this topics works (worked) but only at the national level so far.** Also, he mentions that now is extremely important to voice the necessity to recover the land approach of development. Mobility issues and the fight against poverty and inequality need an urban reform.

**He is hopeful that the citizens movement and the federal pressures will provoke some kind of spill-over effect unto the local and state governments.** The opportunity/challenge is to generate awareness to put the topic in the agenda. Yet, it is in the national agenda, but not in the local and state agendas. We need to create awareness with citizens, which would allow local governments to see the necessity to coordinate with its neighbors, to seek for additional federal funds and programs for this area, and so forth.

**There are some politics issues:** The fact that there is not re-election for local governments, with terms of only 3 years, gives them not incentives to work seriously on this area. “Why would they spend money on this? It would take 1 year to create the plan, and also even more important people don’t care that much. Because of that, it is important that the State government take the lead.

**Revitalization of neighborhoods:**
Iracheta agrees on CMM’s proposal and manifests that governments have not planning on public spaces and neighborhood revamping. CMM’s proposals are great. He
completely agrees on them. The local and state governments are doing nothing on this area except for some uncoordinated attempts to revitalize public spaces. Iracheta is working with CONACYT and CONAVI in a new project called “Filling up empty spaces”. They have identified 52 empty spaces in Merida city, which sums up 3000 hectares. They have chosen 1 of these empty spaces, where there are people living there, with some infrastructure, with the purpose of intervening on it to revitalize social housing, improve public space and environment.

**Interviewee:** Ricardo López Santillan  
**Title:** Professor at CEPHIS, UNAM  
**Stateholder Classification:** Academia  
**Venue:** Teleconference  
**Date:** 02-12-2014

**Urban planning & reform**

Proposals elaborated by the Centro Mario Molina are convenient and attractive in general. Indeed a new local and federal legal framework is needed to develop accurate indicators, achieving integrated systems and changing the system of concessions, however in the latter I see the greatest difficulty because of the "uses and customs" of the Mexican political system. Locally concessions are a kind of political favor. Concessions are awarded to loyal political cronies, as they have been for the PRI grantees passenger. Very often they are used in rallies for the "rush" of protesters or officers attending political events.

Urban reform will need to be implemented from the top and with an interesting scheme of incentives. López Santillán affirms that “all the proposals are viable, even the last one, changing the system of concessions, but it will be very difficult to implement if this comprehensive reform is not promoted from the top and counts with compelling enough incentives for users and concessionaries.” A negotiation with the concessionaries will not be easy because in most of the country are under the cooperative scheme. They are strictly, collective ownership, which means they cannot negotiate with one "director" or "chief" in turn, but the owners' meeting.

Any reform in Mexico is complicated if the stakeholders who oppose to the reform have the support of the party that has a majority in the parliamentary chambers. Counting with the parliamentary majority and achieving the necessary consensus could be relatively simple, however, the PRI has benefited from the "support" of official concessionaries for public events, and has also benefited its clientele with concessions.

Regarding the creation of new or improving current indexes for testing public transportation and urban development in general, he thinks there is enough information produced by COMEY and SEDUMA (statewide), there is also an observatory metropolitan municipality of Mérida.

**Institutional challenges**

Inter-institutional relationships are always delicate in Mexico given the conflicts of interest between government agencies and eventually with concessionaries. In the case of Mérida is very clear the distant relationship between SEDUMA and COMEY, both state agencies, and to make things more complicated, add to it that the municipality of Mérida is governed by an antagonistic party, also different from the other neighboring municipalities. The state secretary of transportation and COMEY are responsible of coordinating the metropolitan policies of transportation and housing, according to López. In order to improve
the functioning of this institution in charge of metropolitan issues, it will be crucial to forget party differences and get to work for common goals. Leave out the personal electoral ambitions of the heads of the agencies and meet citizens' demands.

**Furthermore, the issue of resources in Mexico, and particularly in the southeast, is always complicated.** Funding for any project, whether public, private or mixed requires the sum of many wills and businesspeople are often extremely cautious or avid for lucrative low risk business provided by the government.

**López Santillán believes that the most important challenge when implementing this urban reform will be "cultural".** Namely, political culture and handling of loyal clientele, the use of a passenger shoddy to which we have become accustomed or individuals who have opted for the private vehicle. It also has to do with "corporate culture" that is timid and little proactive; with limited willingness to invest heavily unless they are "protected" by the government.

**Housing**

The territorial conflict most relevant for López Santillán has to do with the expansion of the metropolitan area. The city is inside the beltway, which has space for 500,000 people more, however, the availability of cheap “ejidal” land in the periphery has provoked a vast land market around the city, ready to urbanize, which impacts negatively on the "green belts". In other words, a widespread urban area means the loss of green spaces. This means more asphalt, more fuel for the movement of people and goods besides how expensive it is to the municipalities or local governments provide infrastructure to areas away from the center. Policies that appear to be successful in this regard are the protection of vegetation zones surrounding the city and the attempt of making the city more compact (increase density), but there would have to propose the use of many existing vacant inside Mérida, although clearly many speculators who own land " intra-urban ", have no intention to sell or develop their lots.

**There exists state laws that demand to the homebuilders (developers) common public spaces**, however what they do is to leave voids within subdivisions. It means spaces that are not enabled neither as parks or anything like that, just let the vegetation as it was so that the neighbors organize to "enable them" as public spaces.

**Public Spaces**

There are several interesting programs launched by the COMEY, however there is always the suspicion that these plans will die when a new administration is elected, or they are purely political attempts prior to the general elections. There are also really interesting plans carry out by Mérida local government but their impact is less. In any case, given that the state government is a party and the local of another antagonistic one, there is a clear difficulty to "agree."

**Mexico City**

**Interviewee: Genaro Cervantes**

**Title: President of the Housing Committee at Mexico’s City House of Representatives**

**Stakeholders Classification: Government**

**Venue: ALDF**

**Date: 01-29-2014**
A budget of 2454 million pesos (around 1.8 million USD) was approved for housing projects targeted for low-income population. The main problem to spend this money is that they can’t get enough space for housing projects inside the city. Most of the space is used for social projects.

There is a high default rate among borrowers from INVI (the housing credit agency of Mexico City). FIDERE (entity created to recover the defaulted credits of INVI) has only been able to recover 700 million of the more than 1.5 billion defaulted pesos.


There are 613 social organizations that focus on providing housing alternatives for people that do not have access to state or private credit markets. To get a credit from the bank, a person must earn more than 5 minimum wages. The INVI targets people who earns from 2 to 4 minimum wages. People earning less than 2 minimum salaries (or earning more, but in the informal market) have nowhere to go to find a credit. Social organizations are an option for them. This is why one of the Housing Committee’s priorities is to protect these organizations.

**Interviewee:** Carlos Hernandez Miron  
**Title:** President of the Urban Infrastructure and Development Committee at Mexico’s City House of Representatives  
**Venue:** ALDF  
**Date:** 01-29-2014

Mexico City has a peculiar status that distinguishes it from the rest of the (states) in the country: it is not a state integrated in the federation. It does not have its own constitution, the government has not the same attributions as other local governments and its citizens have therefore a different status (less rights than citizens from other state). That limits the planning possibilities of the city.

The local HR has approved a 7, 000 million pesos package to invest in mobility and public safety in the city.

- Metrobus network ampliation
- Expand subway lines to the South of the city (Tlalpan delegation).
- Renew microbuses at a rate of 4,000 per year. The current ones are highly pollutant. This renewing system is hard because it involves negotiations with the concessionaires that are very well organized and might cause social problems.
- The idea is to create a polycentric cities, where workers do not need to travel long distances every day: to create small cities inside the city.
- Support the ongoing boom in bicycle use through increased investment in bike-share programs, construction of bike paths and awareness campaigns.
- Creation of an elevated train
- Cable car in Magdalena Contreras (delegation in the South of the City)

Proyecto ZODES (Zonas de Desarrollo Económico y Social)  
http://www.capital21.df.gob.mx/?p=5760
• An area of 208 hectares owned by the city will be used to develop, together with private investors and the federal government, infrastructure for housing, hospitals, schools, and cultural centers. Internal transport systems will be created for the ZODES. The idea is to create small cities inside the city, where people can work, take children to school and have all the services in the same area.

Pacto para el Fondo Metropolitano- Coordination scheme for Mexico City, Estado de Mexico and Hidalgo. Created by the Federal government. It is necessary to improve this coordination mechanism as more than 5 million people from Estado de Mexico go to Mexico City every day for work and other activities.

**Interviewee: Laura Ballesteros**  
**Title:** Legislation Representative  
**Stakeholder classification:** government  
**Venue:** Mexico City  
**Date:** 01-30-2014

### Main Takeaways

She is promoting Mobility Law in Mexico City, this law is expected to be passed soon. The next step for her is to promote the public space law. Her thoughts is that Mobility should be regarded as basic human rights and therefore such a law is very necessary

### Issues:

- Mexico City is not a walkable city, most streets have no sidewalk, public space is very limited, and automobiles are squeezing pedestrians out of the streets. Overall, the city is very pedestrian-unfriendly  
- The purpose of the Mobility Law is to promote public transportation for everyone, particularly safe walking and safe bicycling in Mexico City  
- The law regards mobility as a basic human right and will protect it  
- Walking and bicycling are important components of mobility  
- Government officials have different agendas. For example, officials in charge of taxi didn’t show a lot of interest in mobility law  
- Mobility should be strengthen to improve people’s quality of life  
- Some progress on public transportation in Mexico City were achieved out of some politician’s good will, but many are not good at strategic planning

### Solutions

- All public transportation systems should be well connected with one another. E.g. convenient transit and connects between subways, buses, bikeshare stations.  
- Urban development should be more centralized, with central plans as umbrella, followed by more detailed plans and implementation strategies at the local level  
- The city should also lineate more sidewalks, this is would also benefit the shops and stores along the streets  
- Forbid cars and shops to push the sidewalks  
- More bike share programs should be played in Mexico City. The current Bikeshare program went pretty well  
- Change the structure of the public administration
Interviewee: Juan Cristóbal Gil  
*Job title:* Loans portfolio management Director, INFONAVIT  
*Stakeholder classification:* Federal institute  
*Venue:* Mexico City  
*Date:* January 30, 2014

INFONAVIT

Housing issues
- The housing is built based on where the workers live, but there are two reasons why homes are abandoned: 1) sometimes when the economy declines and factories shut down, the workers return to their hometowns 2) Transportation is still too far
- Solution that is being implemented
  - In order to address this, there are increased subsidies for housing in intra-urban communities (closer to the center of the city)

---

Interviewee: Carlos Zedillo
*Job title:* Sustainable Development Director, INFONAVIT  
*Stakeholder classification:* Federal institute  
*Venue:* Mexico City  
*Date:* January 30, 2014

- Challenges
  - Metrics: quantity not quality standards: location, sustainability, and development focus was lacking - need quality
    - The quality of the homes themselves are not great, small spaces, the public areas are not safe and environmentally friendly, etc
    - costs of building a home can be reduced
  - Lack of coordination vertically (among the three levels of government) and horizontally (ONAVIS)
  - Lack of local capabilities in urban development and housing
  - Recognizes the abandoned homes as a major issue, locations are not ideal

- Measures to improve problems
  - Fulfill all campaign commitments (200+) by President Pena Nieto related to this
  - Take advantage of installed infrastructure and urban equipment in the cities
  - Combination of retrofitting existing homes and ensuring future homes built are in areas that make sense and sustainably - environment, energy and water infrastructure, low transportation costs, information technologies
  - Retrofitting existing communities with citizen participation - this helps make the citizens feel they are responsible for the public spaces and a part of the process - for example: painting murals on the buildings together
Reclaiming public spaces for the shared community - the area in front of someone’s house is not just their driveway or extra space, but a community’s shared space. Reuse deteriorated urban space

Optimize land use - increasing density and reusing deteriorated urban space. Use of economic incentives to control where new housing developments are built; 2014 housing subsidies will be based on location, infrastructure, density, and competitiveness

Land reserves eligible for subsidies: Urban zones: U1, U2, U3 defined by CONAVI

- However, other areas are eligible if they are still near sources of employment, other housing, have started construction, or within certified developments defined by SEDATU

Land reserve will be sufficient to build more than 4 million units, which meets housing demand for the next 10 years

Coordination: Finance based on pillars determined by Ministry of Agrarian, Territorial and Urban Development: 1) location/mobility 2) redensification/verticality 3) services/surrounding/community 4) environmental improvement 5) information technology access

- Goals regarding loan origination:
  - Improve housing supply and demand - Promote higher density urban development
  - Conavi subsidies
  - Promoting products with an economic incentive focused on verticality and location
  - Increase loan selection requirements through credit information companies, loan origination score, and risk index
  - Improve access to information for employees to make better decisions for his housing needs

Interviewee: Dhyana Quintanar
Job title: Director for public transportation planning and advocacy, SETRAVI
Stakeholder classification: government
Venue: Mexico City
Date: January 30, 2014

Main Takeaways

1. Challenges
   - Don’t have enough staff to do all the work that needs to be done. Compared with the public transportation bureau of New York City, the transportation department in Mexico City is severely understaffed.
   - The public lack awareness of the urgency of the issue
   - The current public transportation in Mexico City always focus on single-technology solution (e.g. BRT, bikeshare, etc.) rather than integrated approach.
   - Most of the current planning work was delegated to external consultants such as ITDP, the capacity within the relevant government agencies were not strengthened during such a process.
   - Public transportation is a largely unregulated sector in Mexico City and that is why housing without public services/facilities could still be sold.
There is no sufficient coordination between transportation development and housing development. Poor people need housing, but then they need to spend more money on transportation to get to work.

2. Solutions
   · Federal policy to promote public transportation and make relevant fund available to the implementation agencies
   · Public media, social media should devote more space to raise awareness of public transportation issues
   · The paradigm shift also requires shared vision and leadership from the government
   · Take into consideration of the local context and adopt integrated approach and solutions
   · Demographic elements should be bear in mind when trying to develop any urban reform plans, public transportation should be made accessible and affordable to the majority of the people in the city
   · Urban reform should be a constantly on-going process, to make adjustment frequently based on real situations.
   · Optimize the current institution structure. Make clear who has the entitlement to do what
   · Change the way how money was allocated currently
   · Provide affordable housing in the city area
   · Make it a political priority
   · Stick-and-carrot in parallel during the implementation process

3. Others
   · Possible steps to change the status-quo
     1) People feel the pain and the inconvenience of the current situation and they start to demand solutions
     2) mass discussions on public media about the issues and solutions (all stakeholders get involved in the discussion process, including academia, media, etc.)
     3) air quality and congestions, environmental equalities were brought onto the current political agenda
     4) participate in international discussions and learn from other countries.
     5) public-services go hand-in-hand with infrastructure development
     6) attract international financing, NGOs should play important roles during such a process
     · Start from the low-hung fruit and then getting to harder tasks with expertise and experiences accumulated during such a process
     · Demonstrate good solutions and scale them up

Interviewee: Eduardo Aguilar and Laura Janka

Stakeholder classification: Local Government
Date: January 30, 2014
Venue: Mexico City

- Problems
- Finance - there is never sufficient levels of funding to build public spaces
- Methodology is outdated as are the codes and regulations
- Coordination between states and cities
- Systemizing processes - if there is a successful project, how can it be repeated?
- Metrics – currently they use land valuation before and after projects are built, how many people are affected, but they need additional metrics of success
• Solutions
• Finance – PPP (public private partnerships)
  o Win-win situation as a great way to generate revenue and transfer the responsibility and costs of building to the private sector. Starting to develop similar projects in which the government provided subsidies to bring in private businesses, business booms, land value increases, and governments are able to share some of the financial revenue in order to subsidize more public projects.
  o Need to figure out ways to negotiate fair profit-sharing models
• Coordination – it is becoming easier as the political will exists. Public space projects are actually quite popular with citizens now, because they have seen the benefits of these projects and spaces
• “Complete” roads -

**Interviewee:** Janet de Luna and Ernesto Torres  
**Job title:** Ministry for Social Development  
**Stakeholder classification:** government  
**Date:** Jan, 31 2014 @ 9:30am  
**Venue:** The office of Ministry of Social Development

**Other plans to come up:**
National development plan  
Sectorial plans  
Special plans  
Extended version of both plans

**Main Takeaways**

**Issues**
- Housing development in Mexico city is moving to the opposite direction, many newly developed housed are dispersed in the suburb areas
- Lack of capacity at many levels
- Rotation of terms of policy makers makes the implementation of long-term strategy very difficult
- How to finance urban reform is a big issue, the current property tax was not adequately collected. Some household didn’t pay any property tax for decades. The government lack information and adequate technological tools to collect the property tax as it should be
- These services need new financial strategies. The government is thinking to contract the property tax collection duties to private sector. This is a rather unique possible solution as tax collection has long-been regarded the most important duties of the government
- Water supply and urban solid waste disposal could also be taken by private sectors
- People in Mexico City prefer to have private gardens but there are land constraints. So public space should be more actively promoted to replace the demand for private garden.
- People regard the ownership of private cars as a symbol of social status
- Metropolitan coordination issues, the transportation and housing policies and planning work should be well coordinated and integrated.

**Solutions**
· Promote urban consolidation, bring together dispersed housing, to make them well connected with mobility strategies
· Change people’s mindset about private gardens and private cars (public medias should be mobilized to promote changes, new culture and new mindset)
· Stronger national legislation needed in terms of urban zoning and housing development
· Promote PPP to solve part of the urban development challenges
· Create National Land Institute to make land available and serve the needs of low-income people
· The federal government should sign coordination agreement with more than 100 selected cities

**Interviewee:** Miguel Angel Cancino  
**Job title:** Director of the Procuraduría Ambiental y de Ordenamiento Territorial del D.F. (PAOT)  
**Stakeholder classification:** government  
**Date:** Jan. 31 2014 @ 9:30am  
**Venue:** The office of Ministry of Social Development

In Mexico, the institutions of urban development have not received enough attention. The urban development policy of the city is very old (from the 70’s). There is a large division between local and federal decisions that creates a segregation of urban policies.

There are two different processes to order the territory- two optics from which the space is understood:

1) The urban approach: which is a topic mainly dominated by architects and urbanists (as a reference, we can see how SEDATU is mainly focused in human settlements).
2) The environmental approach: environmental issues are not mentioned enough when urban design is discussed. There is no clear and direct flow of communication between SEMARNAT and SEDATU, for example.

The problem with this division is that territorial ordering is that it prevents the creation of integral development plans. What we have in Mexico now are isolated projects that only partially address the larger problem of territorial ordering.

It is indeed necessary to push for an urban reform, but it should be pursued respecting the federalism of the country. He finds the document (the UR) to be very centralizing. What should be promoted above all is the creation of more efficient coordination strategies among the different levels of government. Even though our actual federalism needs to be reformed and coordination problems need to be solved, it is necessary to respect the autonomy of the counties.

This is why a multidisciplinary approach of territorial planning is needed. Urban planning cannot leave aside larger environmental issues and there should always be a territorial referent. For example, the UR is in favor of promoting cities re-densification. This might be appealing from an urbanistic point of view, but what happens then with water provision systems? Will the city be capable of providing water for more dense cities? How? How much would this cost and to whom?
Also, regarding city re-densification, a related problem is the price of the land inside the city. Mainly due to speculators, land is excessively expensive so it would be very difficult for medium to low-income people to buy houses or apartments there. Hence, there have to be limits to speculation- being the owner of a piece of land should not mean you have an unlimited right to use it for whatever purposes you like if this is negatively affecting your community. There has to be public participation in the planning processes and a notion of urban public policy. The problem is that construction companies (represented in CANADEVI) are very powerful and have great incidence in policy decisions. There are frequent violations to the land use laws and regulations.

Interviewee: Arturo Ortiz Struck and Talleres Territoriales
Job title: Taller Territorial
Stakeholder classification: NGO
Date: Jan, 31 2014
Venue: Mexico City

• The urban situation of Mexico is the consequence of aggressive economic policies
• We are not planning housing we are planning credits

Historical explanation of urban sprawl:
• Land Reform in early 1990’s by Carlos Salinas made it possible for construction companies to buy cheap land from former ejidos (communal lands) outside the cities. They would then build some houses and sell the at very high prices. This housing projects did not respond to any logic of employment or recreational areas.

Informal settlements:
• They are a mix of Mafia and Robin Hood organization. But, essentially, they are run and controlled by citizens. Mostly, citizens that cannot access formal credit markets.
• It is the most common scheme of urban development in Mexico. What this tells us is that “you can’t control cities”.
• Unlike projects built by large construction companies they do follow an urban logic and their growth is better organized (?)
• They take the land and then sell it to the person who offers more money- without titling. People who buy these lands can pay for them gradually, with no interests, but they have to participate in “faenas” (community work), demonstrations and fundraising
• The Federal Commission of Electricity then brings the public lightning and they (the leaders of the informal settlers) build and manage the schools. These are used to teach and transmit their ideology.
• Reproduction of poverty: people that arrives to these settlements come from formal more developed areas, where they live with their parent and/or more extended families. However, but they prefer to live there in order to have some property of their own (not shared).
• In terms of quality- casas GEO (houses built by one of the most important construction companies) are better. However, these informal settlements provide a better environment to maintain the family and solidarity structure inside the
neighbourhoods. Drug cartels, nonetheless, are known to be increasingly active in these settlements—both selling and recruiting new members.

- Politically—these settlements are very easy to control—they are easy to identify geographically and to condition the delivery of social programs on their votes.

The government has let both construction companies and informal settlers to do whatever they want. The problem is that in none of these schemes are citizens able to exercise their rights. They end of living under a state of exception, with their own laws.

Interviewees: Xavier Trevino-Bernardo Baranda

Job title: Director, ITDP  
Stakeholder classification: NGO  
Date: Jan, 30/2014 morning  
Venue: ITDP office, Mexico City

Background of ITDP

ITDP has been working in Mexico since 2006, giving support to cities which promote sustainable and equitable transport systems and improve the quality of life of their citizens. Its work includes developing efficient bike infrastructure and public bike systems, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) planning and optimization, parking policy reform, and city revitalization. ITDP also works to influence transport policy on the city level, partnership with local institution, city governments and civil society.

Main takeaways:

1. Main challenges for promoting public transportation in Mexico City
   - Lack of money at local level
   - There is no formal metropolitan agencies in Mexico?
   - Lack of political will, government officials have different visions and priorities for urban development
   - State depend a lot on national government for funding support
   - Federal government put no priority on urban reform
   - Lack of integrated planning in terms of transportation
   - Insufficient relevant knowledge at local level
   - Parking issues and land tenure issues
   - Lack of sufficient public participation during some decision making process (public transportation, low-income housing). The government is afraid that public participation might become uncontrollable
   - The new housing provided for the low-income people is pretty far from the inner-cities where they can find employment opportunities. The problem is that low-income people have no alternative choices and can only get loan credit for those houses dispersed in the suburb area (figure 1). Some of those houses even lack basic public facilities and services such as water and electricity supply and there is no official requirement from the government that those facilities must be in place before a house unit can be sold.
   - Low-income people need to take long-distance public transportation to get to their work place, this makes the traffic issues even worse during peak hours

2. Current Good Practices in Mexico City
   - A well-connected subway system
   - BRT system
3. Proposed Solutions
   - Create an overarching agency at the federal level to focus on all relevant urban development issues
   - Relevant capacity building in the public sector is very important
   - Create incentives for effective coordination
   - For public transportation infrastructure, operation coordination and benefit sharing is very important. A mechanism should be put into place
   - Promote inter-city connection
   - Use demonstration project to promote success story, replicate and scale them up at other places
   - Educate the local community. Develop and implement protocol for fruitful public participation
   - Provide subsidies for low income community
   - Enhance contract management in terms of infrastructure development (Transportation, public housing).

Other comments:
   - IATP’s stakeholder map changed every 2 years
   - People from IATP showed us a map which marked that a large majority of the new housing at dispersed at suburb areas.

Figure 1:

**Interviewee:** Enrique Ortiz  
**Title:** International Coalition Habitat  
**Area:** NGO  
**Venue:** México D.F.  
**Date:** 01-31-2014

In Mexico, there is an extreme necessity for public transportation. All the current means of transportation are saturated. The BRT, subways, bike lanes and trolleys are excellent measures but they are not enough. At the same time, only the “microbuses” are able to connect poor neighborhoods with the rest of the city because of infrastructure restrictions. These minibuses makes traffics complicated, and are unsafe.

There is not a coordinated policy of public transportation between the city of México and the state of Mexico. Even though 5 million of people from the state of Mexico come to México City every day. Urban planning myopia is common currency in policy-makers in both districts. Both districts are ruled by different political parties (PRD in Mexico City, and PRI in the state of México). At the same time, the National Government intervenes in this situation redistributing funds for public transportation.

Insufficiency of public transportation is intrinsically tied to unplanned housing policies. New Developments (neighborhoods) build distant from the city, without access to any public transportation, perpetuate poverty and make sustainable development impossible. Many people commute 2.5/3 hours everyday. Also, most of them have to live their families (kids) alone increasing the likelihood of home violence. According to this organization, 40% of people’s salaries are spent in commuting.
Urban Reform Proposals elaborated by the Centro Mario Molina are too technical in some aspects, and they ignore a holistic approach to solve urban development issues. For instance, when the document refers to compact cities, it is really important to think about “where are going to live all the poor people? If they are not included in this planning, they will end up living in the periphery, and that is extremely bad for any serious urban reform”. He thinks that the Urban Reform needs to focus more on the land policy.

It is important for the State to take advantage of the added value (plusvalía) of any public investment. There are good international experiences in Brazil (the property tax will increase if you have your terrain empty promoting land speculation; in the short term if you don’t use it, the government will expropriate it at its cadastral price, not market price) and Colombia (same situation, but instead of expropriating it, the government force owners to audit the land, first 70% of the market price, and then 70% of the cadastral price) regarding the use of land.

Construction companies are extremely powerful in México. The government expropriates construction companies’ land at market price (not cadastral one).

Mexico City needs a strong policy to discourage the use of private automobiles. Yet, there is a contradictory message sent by local authorities because they keep investing money in road and highways. Implementation is key for a policy of this kind. He mentions that Mexico is a big exporter of automobiles, automotive industries have a clear interest in avoiding change in this area. Political myopia (looking for short-term benefits) does not help to design and implement a long-term policy of public transportation (for example, building a train is more expensive and takes more time than a highway but its medium-term benefits are already higher).

Regarding public spaces, fear is the biggest enemy of them. Mexican citizens tend to close the streets and avoid to go out to spend time in public spaces because of the fear they have to crime. Additionally, it is important to recover and protect neighborhoods’ identities and make citizens part of this process of revamping their neighborhoods. Ortiz also adds, there are very interesting programs for revitalizing neighborhoods, such as “social production of habitat”.

Interviewee: Paul Lagunes
Title: Prof. at Yale University
Area: Academia
Venue: teleconference
Date: 02-05-2014

Walmart scandal is emblematic of the way urban politics work in Mexico. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/18/business/walmart-bribes-teotihuacan.html?_r=0

One of the most important elements to understand what happened there is who has control over partial plans (maps that establish what can and cannot be constructed in a city). Querétaro is a good example of transparence in partial planning. Mexico City and Estado de México are very obscure.

A good first step to improve urban planning would be, therefore, to develop a model county partial plan that takes into account economic and ecologic interests and that is built together with the construction companies (they are the first ones to be benefited from homogeneity). This plan should be used by the country’s counties and all of their partial plans should be made public.
It is key to promote the transparency of land use maps and partial plans. It is not that these plans don’t exist, the problem is that it is very hard (sometimes impossible) to have access to them. It should be the municipalities’ obligation to make them public.

The mechanism that he studies in his PhD dissertation would work (external audits to government officials that grant building permits), he shows the evidence to prove that.

The problem is how to make this solution viable- what incentives are there to implement these audits and from whom would the change in regulations would come?- He suggests reelection (currently not allowed in Mexico) as a means to making politicians accountable to their constituencies. This would create incentives for the adoption of oversight mechanisms of the officials that increase the chances of them not giving permits that do not benefit the community but only the construction companies. Another possible incentive is related to international support- condition financial assistance to urban certifications and to the implementation of external audits.

Problem of abandoned dwellings: counties should receive a larger share of the (house) property tax so that they become directly interested in reducing the amount of abandoned houses.

Conditioning funds for housing projects that are closer to the urban center is a good idea, but the problem is that it would cause an increase in the prices of houses. The closer a house is to the center of the city, the more expensive it gets.

Prescriptions to address urban issues should not rely too much in the city council because they are particularly corrupt when it comes to granting land use permits. A good idea would be to make the major directly responsible for these permits, so that responsibility does not get too diffused among legislators. The major should assume the political cost. He does not think that the federal government should get directly involved in urban planning of the counties. Rather, it should indirectly reward or punish (financially) them depending on their performance in a series of predefined metrics related to urban development.
VI. Appendix I

Deliverable I:

Análisis de alineación entre la Reforma Urbana y el Programa Sectorial de Desarrollo Agrario, Territorial y Urbano 2013-2018

Enero 2014
Executive Summary

On December 16, 2013 the Agricultural, Land and Urban Sector Development Program 2013-2018 (PSDATU) was published in the Official Gazette of Mexico. The program presents a diagnosis of major urban problems of the country and refers to most of the issues identified as priorities in the Urban Reform (UR). However, strategies and lines of action suggested in the document do not address all issues identified in the diagnosis and, when they do, the proposals are incomplete or vague repeatedly.

In order to get a clearer reference of to what extent the proposed Urban Reform fits the PSDATU, we define an alignment indicator that distinguishes between the ideas of urban reform that are completely contained in the program, partially contained and which are not contemplated in any way. We assign values of 1, 0.5 and 0, respectively, and create a percentage of alignment.

\[
\text{Percentage of alignment} = \frac{\sum \text{Alignment indicators}}{\text{total figure of ideas}}
\]

The percentage of alignment for each of the seven pillars of urban reform as well as a percentage of global alignment was defined. The results are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Reform Pillar</th>
<th>Ideas contained in the PSDATU</th>
<th>Ideas partially contained in the PSDATU</th>
<th>Ideas not contained in the PSDATU</th>
<th>Alignment percentage RU-PSDATU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Territory planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Metropolitan strengthening</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bring the city closer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Put the city in motion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Redirecting housing finance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Revitalizing the neighborhood</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Innovating in the city</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is shown in the table above, the urban reform’s pillar that lies mostly embedded in the PSDATU is “metropolitan strengthening”, while the less included in it is “putting the city in motion”, followed closely by the pillar of “innovating in the city”. Graphs I, II and III below present the amount of UR ideas contained in the PSDATU (by pillar and total amount), and the percentage of alignment of each pillar respectively.
With the purpose of deepening the understanding of this analysis, next section presents in detail how many, which and to what extent each of the 100 ideas of the Urban Reform are contemplated in the PSDATU.
Resumen ejecutivo

El 16 de diciembre del 2013 se publicó en el Diario Oficial de la Federación el Programa Sectorial de Desarrollo Agrario, Territorial y Urbano 2013-2018 (PSDATU). El programa presenta un diagnóstico de los principales problemas urbanos del país y hace referencia a la mayor parte de los temas identificados como prioritarios en la Reforma Urbana. Sin embargo, las estrategias y líneas de acción sugeridas en el documento no dan respuesta a todos los problemas señalados en el diagnóstico y, cuando sí lo hacen, las propuestas son en muchas ocasiones incompletas o vagas.

Con el propósito de obtener una referencia más clara del grado en el que las propuestas de la Reforma Urbana se insertan en el PSDATU, definimos un indicador de alineación que distingue entre las ideas de la reforma urbana que están completamente contenidas en el Programa, las que están parcialmente contenidas y las que no se contemplan en ninguna forma. Asignamos valores de 1, 0.5 y 0, respectivamente, y creamos un porcentaje de alineación.

\[
Porcentaje \ de \ alineación = \frac{\sum \text{Indicadores de alineación}}{\text{número total de ideas}}
\]

Se definió el porcentaje de alineación para cada uno de los siete pilares de la Reforma Urbana así como un porcentaje de alineación global. Los resultados son los siguientes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilar de la Reforma Urbana (RU)</th>
<th>Ideas contempladas por el PSDATU</th>
<th>Ideas parcialmente contempladas por el PSDATU</th>
<th>Ideas no contempladas por el PSDATU</th>
<th>Porcentaje de alineación RU-PSDATU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planear el territorio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fortalecer lo metropolitano</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Acercar la ciudad</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mover la ciudad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reformular las Políticas de Vivienda</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Revitalizar el Barrio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Innovar en la ciudad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Como puede observarse en la tabla, el pilar de la Reforma Urbana que se encuentra más incorporado en el PSDATU es el relacionado al fortalecimiento de lo metropolitano mientras que el menos incorporado es relativo a mover la ciudad seguido muy de cerca por el pilar de innovación. Asimismo los gráficos I, II y III representan cantidad de ideas contempladas (por pilar y por su cantidad en total) y porcentaje de alineación por pilar respectivamente.
Para observar con mayor detalle cuántas y cuáles de las 100 ideas de la Reforma Urbana se contemplan en el PSDATU, se presenta en la siguiente sección un análisis detallado, idea por idea, de la alineación entre ambos documentos.
### Pilar 1: Ideas para planear el territorio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reforma Urbana- 100 ideas</th>
<th>PSDATU</th>
<th>Observaciones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Idea 1** | **Estrategia 1.1:** Impulsar la coordinación interinstitucional e intergubernamental con autoridades locales y la sociedad para mejorar la planeación y el ordenamiento territorial.  
**Línea de Acción 1:** Crear un Sistema Nacional de Planeación Territorial que priorice el diseño e implementación de políticas en materia de ordenamiento territorial.  
**Línea de Acción 6:** Involucrar a las autoridades locales en el diseño e implementación de estrategias de ordenamiento territorial para incrementar el bienestar de las localidades.  
**Línea de Acción 8:** Promover en conjunto con las entidades federativas y municipios, acciones y proyectos de intervención que eleven la productividad y sustentabilidad del territorio.  
**Estrategia 1.1:** Parcialmente cubierto por el PSDATU. Si bien las líneas de acción no son idénticas a la idea 1 de la propuesta del CMM, creemos que ellas contienen la esencia de la misma. Sin embargo, necesitarían ajustes para ser consideradas similares. |
| **Idea 2** | **Estrategia 1.1:** Impulsar la coordinación interinstitucional e intergubernamental con autoridades locales y la sociedad para mejorar la planeación y el ordenamiento territorial.  
**Línea de Acción 3:** Integrar el inventario de Terrenos Nacionales que conforman el patrimonio nacional para la planeación de las políticas de ordenamiento territorial.  
**Estrategia 1.3:** Modernizar los RPP y el registro de propiedad rural, los catastros de entidades y municipios, y el rural nacional.  
**Línea de Acción 1:** Impulsar el uso de tecnologías de la información para digitalizar los registros públicos de la propiedad y el catastro rural nacional, estatal y municipal.  
**Línea de Acción 4:** Promover que el registro en los sistemas de información se realice con variables homogéneas y con perspectiva de género.  
**Estrategia 1.4:** Otorgar seguridad jurídica y documental en la tenencia de tierra ejidal y comunal, para garantizar el ejercicio de los derechos de los sujetos agrarios.  
**Línea de Acción 1:** Integrar, desarrollar y actualizar un sistema nacional de información para el ordenamiento territorial. | Parcialmente cubierto por el PSDATU. |

**Idea 1**
Crear una figura supra-sectorial a nivel federal para la integración y coordinación de planes y programas territoriales.

**Idea 2**
Simplificar el Sistema Nacional de Planeación del Territorio.
Idea 3
Diferenciar a los municipios.

No se encontró propuesta similar en el PSDATU.

Idea 4
Reconocer a la Zona Metropolitana del Valle de México como un territorio que requiere un marco institucional y normativo especial.

No se encontró propuesta similar en el PSDATU.

Idea 5
Establecer sistemas funcionales urbano-rurales.

Estrategia 1.1: Impulsar la coordinación interinstitucional e intergubernamental con autoridades locales y la sociedad para mejorar la planeación y el ordenamiento territorial.

No se encontró propuesta similar, pero sí relacionadas indirectamente. Las líneas de acción están indirectamente relacionadas con la propuesta 5.

Estrategia 1.4: Otorgar seguridad jurídica y documental en la tenencia de tierra ejidal y comunal, para garantizar el ejercicio de los derechos de los sujetos agrarios.

Línea de Acción 7: Fomentar acciones coordinadas para la incorporación ordenada de la propiedad rural al desarrollo regional y urbano.

Estrategia 3.4: Procurar que la vivienda se inserte en un entorno digno y contribuya al desarrollo de las personas.

Línea de acción 6: Promover la operación de observatorios urbanos para incidir en la formulación de políticas públicas y proyectos para fortalecer el desarrollo social y urbano.

Idea 6
Crear un Observatorio Territorial y Urbano Nacional.

Parcialmente cubierto.

Idea 7
Condicionar la entrega de transferencias federales a estados y municipios.

No se encontró propuesta similar en el PSDATU.

Idea 8
Integrar Plan de de los asentamientos humanos en el territorio nacional.

Estrategia 1.1: Impulsar la coordinación interinstitucional e intergubernamental con autoridades

Contemplado. La propuesta es similar a las líneas de acción
Ordenamiento Territorial y Programa de Desarrollo Urbano en un solo instrumento de planeación.

**Idea 9**

Vincular planeación territorial con estrategias de cambio climático.

**Línea de acción 2**: Promover el ordenamiento territorial como una estrategia nacional para la adecuada distribución de la población y uso eficiente del territorio.

**Línea de acción 4**: Establecer planes y programas para administrar y optimizar el aprovechamiento de los terrenos baldíos, nacionales y demásías.

**Estrategia 1.1**: Impulsar la coordinación interinstitucional e intergubernamental con autoridades locales y la sociedad para mejorar la planeación y el ordenamiento territorial.

**Línea de acción 5**: Promover la actualización de la normatividad de ordenamiento territorial incorporando objetivos de sustentabilidad y de seguridad.

**Idea 10**

Actualizar y reformular guías y metodologías para la elaboración de los instrumentos reconocidos en el Sistema Nacional de Planeación del Territorio.

**Estrategia 1.1**: Impulsar la coordinación interinstitucional e intergubernamental con autoridades locales y la sociedad para mejorar la planeación y el ordenamiento territorial.

**Línea de acción 5**: Promover la actualización de la normatividad de ordenamiento territorial incorporando objetivos de sustentabilidad y de seguridad.

**Estrategia 1.3**: Modernizar los RPP y el registro de propiedad rural, los catastros de entidades y municipios, y el rural nacional.

**Línea de acción 2**: Contar con información de la propiedad rural actualizada para la adecuada identificación y correlación de sus titulares, poseedores o usufructuarios.

**Línea de acción 3**: Identificar la propiedad de manera física y su uso, por entidad federativa, para el ordenamiento y el desarrollo sustentable de los asentamientos humanos.

**Estrategia 3.2**: Orientar el financiamiento para la vivienda digna y sustentable con criterios territoriales que promuevan la densificación.

**Línea de acción 2**: Desarrollar, en coordinación con la Estrategia Digital Nacional una herramienta con información geoestadística que sirva para la planeación urbana y el monitoreo de las ciudades.

**Estrategia 4.5**: Generar información de calidad para una mejor toma de decisiones de actores públicos, del PSDATU.

Contemplado. La propuesta es similar a las líneas de acción del PSDATU.

**Idea 11**

Potenciar la valoración de impactos ambientales y sociales en el análisis costo-beneficio para la planeación y ordenación del territorio.

**Estrategia 3.2**: Orientar el financiamiento para la vivienda digna y sustentable con criterios territoriales que promuevan la densificación.

**Línea de acción 2**: Desarrollar, en coordinación con la Estrategia Digital Nacional una herramienta con información geoestadística que sirva para la planeación urbana y el monitoreo de las ciudades.

**Estrategia 4.5**: Generar información de calidad para una mejor toma de decisiones de actores públicos, del PSDATU.

Contemplado. La propuesta es similar a las líneas de acción del PSDATU.

No se encontró propuesta idéntica en el PSDATU. Sin embargo, se hallaron propuestas relacionadas.
territorio.

**Línea de acción 2:** Apoyar a instituciones de educación superior para formar especialistas y realizar investigaciones sobre desarrollo urbano y vivienda.

**Idea 12**
Obligar a la rendición cuentas en la gestión del territorio en los tres órdenes de gobierno.

**Idea 13**
Crear instancias para la planeación del territorio integradas por los tres órdenes de gobierno.

**Estrategia 1.1:** Impulsar la coordinación interinstitucional e intergubernamental con autoridades locales y la sociedad para mejorar la planeación y el ordenamiento territorial.

**Línea de acción 6:** Involucrar a las autoridades locales en el diseño e implementación de estrategias de ordenamiento territorial para incrementar el bienestar de las localidades.

**Línea de acción 8:** Promover en conjunto con las entidades federativas y municipios, acciones y proyectos de intervención que eleven la productividad y sustentabilidad del territorio.

**Estrategia 2.2:** Prever las necesidades de reservas territoriales para el desarrollo de asentamientos humanos, centros de población y zonas metropolitanas.

**Línea de acción 3:** Impulsar la concurrencia de acciones de los tres órdenes de gobierno y los sectores social y privado para fomentar la gestión del territorio.

**Estrategia 3.1:** Controlar la expansión de las manchas urbanas en coordinación con los gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de acción 1:** Promover la firma y ejecución de convenios de colaboración con los gobiernos estatales y municipales en materia de desarrollo urbano.

**Estrategia 3.3:** Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de acción 10:** Crear mecanismos de interacción con los cuerpos de planeación territorial y urbana entre los tres órdenes de gobierno.

**Estrategia 2.2:** Controlar la expansión urbana fuera de los polígonos de crecimiento definidos, por medio de Desarrollos Certificados.

**Línea de acción 4:** Instrumentar esquemas de
financiamiento para obras de infraestructura y urbanización en Desarrollos Certificados. Considerar a la idea 14 parte del PSDATU.

### Pilar 2: Ideas para fortalecer lo metropolitan

**Idea 15**
Unificar criterios para la definición de municipios metropolitanos.

**Estrategia 2.1:** Coordinar con los gobiernos locales acciones en materia de planeación y desarrollo sustentable de las zonas metropolitanas del país.

**Línea de acción 1:** Diagnosticar la problemática y la situación actual de las zonas metropolitanas del país para formular recomendaciones a las instancias competentes.

**Línea de acción 5:** Participar en la regulación de zonas conurbadas y centros de población ubicados en dos o más entidades federativas o municipios.

**Contemplado indirectamente por el PSDATU.**

**Idea 16**
Priorizar la acción en determinadas zonas metropolitanas en base a una estrategia nacional de desarrollo.

**Estrategia 2.1:** Coordinar con los gobiernos locales acciones en materia de planeación y desarrollo sustentable de las zonas metropolitanas del país.

**Línea de acción 3:** Propiciar el fortalecimiento institucional de las autoridades, actores e instancias locales para impulsar el desarrollo metropolitan sustentable.

**Línea de acción 4:** Apoyar a los gobiernos locales para mejorar la planeación urbana sustentable y armonizar los programas de desarrollo metropolitano.

**Línea de acción 6:** Promover que los programas metropolitanos antecedan a los programas de desarrollo urbano locales, para integrar modelos de desarrollo metropolitano eficiente.

**Línea de acción 7:** Apoyar la creación de órganos de planeación y coordinación de las zonas metropolitanas del país para maximizar la eficiencia de su gestión.

**Línea de acción 8:** Promover que el Fondo Metropolitano se destine a proyectos con impacto en el desarrollo de las zonas metropolitanas del país.

**Contemplado.**

**Idea 17**
Supeditar los programa de desarrollo urbano municipal a planes metropolitanos y programas estatales de desarrollo urbano.

**Estrategia 1.1:** Impulsar la coordinación interinstitucional e intergubernamental con autoridades locales y la sociedad para mejorar la planeación y el ordenamiento territorial.

**Línea de acción 6:** Involucrar a las autoridades locales en el diseño e implementación de estrategias de ordenamiento territorial para incrementar el bienestar de las localidades.

**Estrategia 2.1:** Coordinar con los gobiernos locales acciones en materia de planeación y desarrollo sustentable de las zonas metropolitanas del país.

**Línea de acción 2:** Propiciar el fortalecimiento institucional de las autoridades, actores e instancias locales para impulsar el desarrollo metropolitano sustentable.

**Línea de acción 4:** Apoyar a los gobiernos locales para...
mejorar la planeación urbana sustentable y armonizar los programas de desarrollo metropolitanos.

**Línea de acción 5:** Participar en la regulación de zonas conurbadas y centros de población ubicados en dos o más entidades federativas o municipios.

**Línea de acción 6:** Promover que los programas metropolitanos antecedan a los programas de desarrollo urbano locales, para integrar modelos de desarrollo metropolitano eficiente.

**Línea de acción 7:** Apoyar la creación de órganos de planeación y coordinación de las zonas metropolitanas del país para maximizar la eficiencia de su gestión.

**Idea 18**
Establecer incentivos y sanciones a la coordinación metropolitana.

**Estrategia 2.1:** Coordinar con los gobiernos locales acciones en materia de planeación y desarrollo sustentable de las zonas metropolitanas del país.

**Línea de acción 2:** Establecer mecanismos de comunicación interinstitucional e intergubernamental que faciliten el intercambio de información y repercutan en mejores servicios públicos a los ciudadanos.

**Línea de acción 8:** Promover que el Fondo Metropolitano se destine a proyectos con impacto en el desarrollo de las zonas metropolitanas del país.

**Idea 19**
Fortalecer las instituciones locales a cargo de la planeación integral, seguimiento y evaluación de políticas de carácter metropolitano.

**Estrategia 2.1:** Coordinar con los gobiernos locales acciones en materia de planeación y desarrollo sustentable de las zonas metropolitanas del país.

**Línea de acción 3:** Propiciar el fortalecimiento institucional de las autoridades, actores e instancias locales para impulsar el desarrollo metropolitano sustentable.

**Línea de acción 4:** Apoyar a los gobiernos locales para mejorar la planeación urbana sustentable y armonizar los programas de desarrollo metropolitano.

**Idea 20**
Involucrar a los ciudadanos en la planeación del territorio metropolitano.

**Estrategia 2.1:** Coordinar con los gobiernos locales acciones en materia de planeación y desarrollo sustentable de las zonas metropolitanas del país.

**Línea de acción 3:** Propiciar el fortalecimiento institucional de las autoridades, actores e instancias locales para impulsar el desarrollo metropolitano sustentable.

**Idea 22**
Definir una cartera de

**Estrategia 2.1:** Coordinar con los gobiernos locales acciones en materia de planeación y desarrollo sustentable de las zonas metropolitanas del país.
proyectos urbanos detonantes del plan metropolitano.

**Idea 23**
Generar impuestos locales de carácter metropolitano.

**Línea de acción 8:** Promover que el Fondo Metropolitano se destine a proyectos con impacto en el desarrollo de las zonas metropolitanas del país.

**Estrategia 3.5:** Promover que las autoridades locales y municipales armonicen sus Programas de Desarrollo de acuerdo a la Política Nacional de Desarrollo Regional.

**Línea de acción 3:** Impulsar instrumentos para el financiamiento regional del desarrollo.

**Idea 24**
Establecer un sistema de subastas para permisos de construcción.

**Estrategia 2.2:** Controlar la expansión urbana fuera de los polígonos de crecimiento definidos, por medio de Desarrollos Certificados.

**Línea de acción 1:** Incorporar a los Desarrollos Certificados los diferentes tipos de usos de suelo que permitan integrar el uso habitacional con actividades económicas compatibles.

**Línea de acción 2:** Generar en los Desarrollos Certificados, subcentros urbanos y centros de barrio con un sistema de movilidad conectado que brinde continuidad a la estructura urbana.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilar 3: Ideas para acercar la ciudad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Idea 25**
Desarrollar una política nacional de suelo urbano

**Estrategia 1.1:** Impulsar la coordinación interinstitucional e intergubernamental con autoridades locales y la sociedad para mejorar la planeación y el ordenamiento territorial.

**Línea de acción 1:** Crear un Sistema Nacional de Planeación Territorial que priorice el diseño e implementación de políticas en materia de ordenamiento territorial.

**Línea de acción 2:** Promover el ordenamiento territorial como una estrategia nacional para la adecuada distribución de la población y uso eficiente del territorio.

**Estrategia 1.2:** Otorgar certeza jurídica en la tenencia de la tierra mediante la regularización y la certificación de la propiedad.

**Línea de acción 1:** Regularizar la tenencia de la tierra bajo criterios de planeación que aseguren el efectivo aprovechamiento del territorio.

**Línea de acción 5:** Desincorporar la propiedad social para el desarrollo de la infraestructura del país integrando carpetas básicas de expropiación de bienes ejidales y comunales.

**Estrategia 1.3:** Modernizar los RPP y el registro de propiedad rural, los catastros de entidades y municipios, y el rural nacional.

**Línea de acción 3:** Identificar la propiedad de manera física y su uso, por entidad federativa, para el
ordenamiento y el desarrollo sustentable de los asentamientos humanos.

**Estrategia 1.5:** Otorgar seguridad jurídica y documental en la tenencia de tierra ejidal y comunal, para garantizar el ejercicio de los derechos de los sujetos agrarios.

**Línea de acción 3:** Generar constancias de asientos registrales, que proporcionan seguridad jurídica en la propiedad social, permitiendo al sujeto de derecho mejores oportunidades.

**Línea de acción 2:** Conducir el proceso de ordenamiento ecológico general del territorio y apoyar los procesos de ordenamiento regionales y locales.

**Estrategia 2.3:** Prever las necesidades de reservas territoriales para el desarrollo de asentamientos humanos, centros de población y zonas metropolitanas.

**Línea de acción 1:** Identificar, registrar, cuantificar y evaluar las reservas territoriales públicas y privadas adquiridas con fines habitacionales.

**Línea de acción 2:** Concertar el desarrollo de proyectos con los sectores público, privado y social, para constituir reservas territoriales y ofertar el suelo al desarrollo urbano.

**Línea de acción 3:** Incorporar reservas territoriales para el uso de suelo en el que se propicie el desarrollo urbano.

**Línea de acción 4:** Constituir reservas territoriales que garanticen la sostenibilidad del desarrollo regional de los centros de población.

**Línea de acción 5:** Integrar reservas de crecimiento aptas para la infraestructura, la obra pública y el desarrollo regional.

**Estrategia 3.1:** Controlar la expansión de las manchas urbanas en coordinación con los gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de acción 4:** Fomentar una mayor densidad habitacional promoviendo el uso intensivo del suelo, evitando la especulación y subutilización del mismo.

**Línea de acción 5:** Generar una oferta masiva de suelo bien ubicado, con proyecto urbanístico y servicios básicos para la población de bajos ingresos.

**Estrategia 3.3:** Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de acción 2:** Coordinar programas de oferta de
**Idea 26**
Adoptar el Desarrollo Orientado al Transporte Sustentable (DOTS).

**Estrategia 3.3:** Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de acción 1:** Contribuir a que las ciudades cuenten con la infraestructura necesaria para la provisión de servicios básicos, en especial a los hogares de bajos ingresos.

**Línea de acción 4:** Promover usos mixtos compatibles que apoyen la generación de empleos cercanos a la vivienda, fomenten el comercio local y disminuyan necesidades de movilidad.

**Línea de acción 5:** Fortalecer el tejido social y la seguridad de las comunidades mediante el rescate de espacios públicos en condiciones de deterioro o abandono.

**Línea de acción 6:** Impulsar la movilidad urbana sustentable promoviendo sistemas de transporte masivo y no-motorizado y desincentivando el uso del automóvil.

**Línea de acción 7:** Integrar las viviendas con el desarrollo urbano y regional mediante la implementación de sistemas de transporte y movilidad sustentable.

**Línea de acción 9:** Impulsar acciones de movilidad segura, señalización, pasos peatonales y seguridad vial en beneficio de la ciudadanía.

---

**Idea 27**
Definir Normas Oficiales Mexicanas para el desarrollo urbano.

**Estrategia 3.1:** Controlar la expansión de las manchas urbanas en coordinación con los gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de acción 2:** Promover la elaboración de planes de desarrollo urbano basados en fundamentos técnicos y con visión de largo plazo.

**Estrategia 3.5:** Promover que las autoridades locales y municipales armonicen sus Programas de Desarrollo de acuerdo a la Política Nacional de Desarrollo Regional.

**Línea de acción 1:** Formar y consolidar equipos técnicos con capacidades para desarrollar las funciones de planeación y gestión regional del desarrollo

**Línea de acción 2:** Crear espacios interinstitucionales e intergubernamentales de diálogo, coordinación y de concertación, así como acuerdos de asociación horizontal voluntaria.

---

**Idea 28**
Respetar usos de suelo y lotes con servicios en zonas aptas para el desarrollo de vivienda.

**Estrategia 3.4:** Procurar que la vivienda se inserte en un entorno digno y contribuya al desarrollo de las

Contemplado.

No se halló propuesta similar, sin embargo, existen líneas de acción relacionadas indirectamente.

No fue encontrada en el documento propuesta similar.
suelo ambientalmente valiosos.

Idea 29
Decretar zonas de protección ambiental en todas las ciudades mexicanas.

Idea 30
Establecer reservas territoriales perimetrales ligadas a los planes metropolitanos.

Idea 31
Financiar la adquisición de suelo urbano de interés social.

Idea 32
Detectar zonas aptas para el reciclaje urbano en planes metropolitanos.

Idea 33
Promover procesos de densificación y reciclaje en zonas intraurbanas.

Estrategia 2.1: Coordinar con los gobiernos locales acciones en materia de planeación y desarrollo sustentable de las zonas metropolitanas del país.

Línea de acción 9: Promover la adopción de Perímetros de Contención Urbana entre las autoridades locales con el fin de identificar zonas urbanizables contiguas.

Estrategia 2.3: Prever las necesidades de reservas territoriales para el desarrollo de asentamientos humanos, centros de población y zonas metropolitanas.

Línea de acción 2: Concertar el desarrollo de proyectos con los sectores público, privado y social, para constituir reservas territoriales y ofertar el suelo al desarrollo urbano.

Estrategia 3.1: Controlar la expansión de las manchas urbanas en coordinación con los gobiernos estatales y municipales.

Línea de acción 6: Rescatar derechos de vía y zonas federales en estado de abandono, subutilización y que sean susceptibles de uso futuro.

Estrategia 3.3: Prever las necesidades de reservas territoriales para el desarrollo de asentamientos humanos, centros de población y zonas metropolitanas.

Línea de acción 1: Identificar, registrar, cuantificar y evaluar las reservas territoriales públicas y privadas adquiridas con fines habitacionales.

Estrategia 3.1: Controlar la expansión de las manchas urbanas en coordinación con los gobiernos estatales y municipales.

Línea de acción 3: Incentivar que el crecimiento y reemplazo del parque habitacional se concentre al interior de los centros urbanos existentes.

Línea de acción 4: Fomentar una mayor densidad habitacional promoviendo el uso intensivo del suelo, evitando la especulación y subutilización del mismo.

Estrategia 3.4: Procurar que la vivienda se inserte en
un entorno digno y contribuya al desarrollo de las personas.

**Línea de acción 3:** Incentivar la construcción de vivienda social en los centros urbanos existentes, para mitigar la segregación espacial en las ciudades.

**Estrategia 3.3:** Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de acción 7:** Integrar las viviendas con el desarrollo urbano y regional mediante la implementación de sistemas de transporte y movilidad sustentable.

**Estrategia 3.2:** Orientar el financiamiento para la vivienda digna y sustentable con criterios territoriales que promuevan la densificación.

**Línea de acción 1:** Promover el financiamiento a viviendas cercanas a fuentes de empleo, equipamiento, transporte, vías de comunicación y con acceso a servicios básicos.

**Estrategia 3.4:** Procurar que la vivienda se inserte en un entorno digno y contribuya al desarrollo de las personas.

**Línea de acción 4:** Promover que al interior de los desarrollos inmobiliarios se construyan y operen pequeños comercios que fomenten la actividad económica y el consumo local.

**Estrategia 3.3:** Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de acción 4:** Promover usos mixtos compatibles que apoyen la generación de empleos cercanos a la vivienda, fomenten el comercio local y disminuyan necesidades de movilidad.

**Estrategia 1.1:** Impulsar la coordinación interinstitucional e intergubernamental con autoridades locales y la sociedad para mejorar la planeación y el ordenamiento territorial.

**Línea de acción 4:** Establecer planes y programas para administrar y optimizar el aprovechamiento de los terrenos baldíos, nacionales y demásias.

**Estrategia 2.2:** Controlar la expansión urbana fuera de los polígonos de crecimiento definidos, por medio de Desarrollos Certificados.

**Línea de acción 2:** Generar en los Desarrollos Certificados, subcentros urbanos y centros de barrio con un sistema de movilidad conectado que brinde
continuidad a la estructura urbana.

**Estrategia 3.1:** Controlar la expansión de las manchas urbanas en coordinación con los gobiernos estatales y municipales.  
**Línea de acción 3:** Incentivar que el crecimiento y reemplazo del parque habitacional se concentre al interior de los centros urbanos existentes.

**Idea 38**  
Implementar esquemas de captura de plusvalías.  
**Idea 39**  
Fomentar esquemas de participación público-privada.

**Estrategia 2.3:** Prever las necesidades de reservas territoriales para el desarrollo de asentamientos humanos, centros de población y zonas metropolitanas.  
**Línea de acción 2:** Concertar el desarrollo de proyectos con los sectores público, privado y social, para constituir reservas territoriales y ofertar el suelo al desarrollo urbano.

**Estrategia 2.2:** Controlar la expansión urbana fuera de los polígonos de crecimiento definidos, por medio de Desarrollos Certificados.  
**Línea de acción 3:** Impulsar la concurrencia de acciones de los tres órdenes de gobierno y los sectores social y privado para fomentar la gestión del territorio.  
**Idea 40**  
Desarrollar un mercado de capitales para la inversión inmobiliaria.  
**Idea 41**  
Transparentar el mercado de suelo urbano.

**Estrategia 3.2:**  
**Línea de acción 1:** Promover el financiamiento a viviendas cercanas a fuentes de empleo, equipamiento, transporte, vías de comunicación y con acceso a servicios básicos.  
**Estrategia 2.2:** Controlar la expansión urbana fuera de los polígonos de crecimiento definidos, por medio de Desarrollos Certificados.  
**Línea de acción 4:** Instrumentar esquemas de financiamiento para obras de infraestructura y urbanización en Desarrollos Certificados.  
**Idea 42**  
Reconocer y aprovechar los atributos de la urbanización popular.  
**Idea 43**  
Impulsar esquema

No fue encontrada en el documento propuesta similar. El concepto de plusvalía es utilizado en la sección de soluciones habitacionales. Contemplado.

Contemplado.

No existe en relación al suelo, pero sí sobre el mercado de vivienda.

Contemplado.

No hay referencia a pequeños inversores en particular, pero sí
Desarrolladores inmobiliarios. 

De pequeños desarrolladores inmobiliarios. 

**Linea de acción 3:** Impulsar la concurrencia de acciones de los tres órdenes de gobierno y los sectores social y privado para fomentar la gestión del territorio. 

**Linea de acción 4:** Instrumentar esquemas de financiamiento para obras de infraestructura y urbanización en Desarrollos Certificados. 

No fue encontrada en el documento propuesta similar.

**Idea 44** Generar descuentos o exenciones fiscales, registrales y notariales que faciliten y hagan menos costoso el cambio de domicilio.

**Idea 45** Hacer la transición de políticas de transporte a políticas de movilidad. 

**Estrategia 3.3:** Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales. 

**Linea de acción 4:** Promover usos mixtos compatibles que apoyen la generación de empleos cercanos a la vivienda, fomenten el comercio local y disminuyan necesidades de movilidad. 

**Linea de acción 6:** Impulsar la movilidad urbana sustentable promoviendo sistemas de transporte masivo y no motorizado y desincentivando el uso del automóvil. 

**Linea de acción 7:** Integrar las viviendas con el desarrollo urbano y regional mediante la implementación de sistemas de transporte y movilidad sustentable. 

**Linea de acción 9:** Impulsar acciones de movilidad segura, señalización, pasos peatonales y seguridad vial en beneficio de la ciudadanía. 

Indirectamente contemplado.

**Idea 46** Generar un marco normativo y legal a nivel federal para la movilidad. 

**Idea 47** Establecer una Norma Oficial Mexicana para la operación de servicios de transporte

No fue encontrada en el documento propuesta similar.
Idea 48
Ligar políticas de movilidad con políticas de desarrollo urbano.

Estrategia 3.3: Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

Línea de acción 7: Integrar las viviendas con el desarrollo urbano y regional mediante la implementación de sistemas de transporte y movilidad sustentable.

Línea de acción 10: Crear mecanismos de interacción con los cuerpos de planeación territorial y urbana entre los tres órdenes de gobierno.

Contemplado.

Idea 49
Planear la movilidad a nivel metropolitano.

Idea 50
Ottorzar atribuciones claras en movilidad y transporte urbano en el gobierno federal.

Estrategia 3.3: Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

Línea de acción 10: Crear mecanismos de interacción con los cuerpos de planeación territorial y urbana entre los tres órdenes de gobierno.

No fue encontrada en el documento propuesta similar.

Idea 51
Redistribuir recursos para la movilidad urbana, hoy destinados de manera preferente a infraestructura orientada al automóvil particular, y favorecer sistemas de transporte público y no motorizado.

Estrategia 3.3: Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

Línea de acción 6: Impulsar la movilidad urbana sustentable promoviendo sistemas de transporte masivo y no motorizado y desincentivando el uso del automóvil.

Parcialmente contemplado. El PSDATU no es específico en este punto.

Idea 52
Desarrollar indicadores para la evaluación de sistemas de movilidad urbana que permitan su monitoreo y faciliten la evaluación de soluciones y la priorización de

Indicador: Inversión federal en movilidad
Porcentaje de la inversión federal realizada en infraestructura para la movilidad urbana sustentable en relación al total de las inversiones realizadas con recursos del ramo 23 y 33. (Línea de acción 7, estrategia 3.3; Unidad de medida: Porcentaje). La inversión pública en infraestructura para la movilidad incluye infraestructura peatonal, ciclista, de espacio público y de transporte público.

Parcialmente cubierto por el PSDATU. Sólo hay un indicador de movilidad, sería necesario crear varios que midan los varios aspectos de este tema.
recursos. La aplicación de estos instrumentos debe estar a cargo de las instancias metropolitanas de movilidad.

**Idea 53**

Impulsar sistemas integrados de transporte urbano. La integración debe ser física, operacional y tarifaria, y para ello es necesario seguir un plan integrado de mediano y largo plazo de movilidad y desarrollo urbano. Para ello se propone destinar asistencia técnica y recursos financieros federales para la planeación e implementación de estos sistemas.

**Idea 54**

Cambiar el sistema de concesiones de transporte público. Implica facilitar el traspaso de un modelo basado en el hombre-camión a un esquema empresarial planeado y regulado por instituciones gubernamentales. Ello significa el desarrollo de

**Estrategia 3.3.** Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de Acción 7:** Integrar las viviendas con el desarrollo urbano y regional mediante la implementación de sistemas de transporte y movilidad sustentable.

Parcialmente cubierto por el PSDATU. No se hace énfasis ni en la asistencia técnica ni en la creación de un plan operacional ni tarifario.

No hay mención alguna al sistema de concesiones de transporte público en el PSDATU.
mecanismos legales para la prestación de servicios condicionados al cumplimiento de estándares mínimos de orden técnico, de calidad del servicio, y de sustentabilidad financiera. Bajo este esquema, es rol de la Federación el asistir técnicamente y otorgar financiamiento para la modernización del transporte público, condicionando fondos a una adecuada relación entre la autoridad y los prestadores del servicio.

**Idea 55**
Garantizar la accesibilidad y conectividad vial, rescatando el dominio de lo público en el diseño y gestión de la estructura vial urbana. En ésta deben contemplarse espacios adecuados para la circulación de cada medio y la interrelación entre ellos, privilegiando la caminata, la

**Estrategia 3.2.** Orientar el financiamiento para la vivienda digna y sustentable con criterios territoriales que promuevan la densificación.

**Línea de acción 1:**
Promover el financiamiento a viviendas cercanas a fuentes de empleo, equipamiento, transporte, vías de comunicación y con acceso a servicios básicos.

**Estrategia Transversal**
**Igualdad de Oportunidades y no Discriminación contra las Mujeres**

**Línea de acción 6:**
Promover cruces vecinales seguros y accesibles, en vialidades urbanas primarias para la protección de mujeres, niñas y niños.

Parcialmente cubierto. No se menciona la necesidad de inversión en estructura vial para ciclistas. Al hablar de la necesidad de cruces peatonales seguros el énfasis se hace únicamente en mujeres y niñas. Es necesario considerar a todos los peatones y proponer mecanismos de conectividad para las viviendas.
bicicleta y el transporte público. A su vez, se propone establecer mecanismos para dar conectividad a fraccionamientos cerrados y garantizarla en todo nuevo desarrollo inmobiliario.

**Idea 56**
Gestionar el uso del automóvil privado. Desde los planes de movilidad y desarrollo urbano financiados por la federación se deben exigir requisitos para la gestión de la demanda de transporte, como gestión de estacionamientos, promoción de esquemas de intermodalidad, estrategias para regular y desincentivar el uso del automóvil, etc.

**Estrategia 3.3.** Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de Acción 6:** Impulsar la movilidad urbana sustentable promoviendo sistemas de transporte masivo y no motorizado y desincentivando el uso del automóvil.

Parcialmente cubierto. Se menciona el tema de manera genérica, sin hacer alusión a temas como la gestión de estacionamientos o estrategias más específicas para desincentivar el uso del automóvil.

**Idea 57**
Fomentar programas de movilidad institucional. Implica generar regulaciones e incentivos normativos y fiscales para que las empresas e instituciones desarrollen

**Estrategia 3.3.** Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de Acción 4:**
Promover usos mixtos compatibles que apoyen la generación de empleos cercanos a la vivienda, fomenten el comercio local y disminuyan necesidades de movilidad.

**Línea de Acción 6:** Impulsar la movilidad urbana sustentable promoviendo sistemas de transporte masivo y no motorizado y desincentivando el uso del automóvil.

Cubierto por PSDATU.
Integrar las viviendas con el desarrollo urbano y regional mediante la implementación de sistemas de transporte y movilidad sustentable.

3. Diagnóstico del desarrollo urbano y la vivienda.

3.3. Movilidad urbana sustentable.

Es necesario generar, en conjunto con los gobiernos locales, un esquema de incentivos normativos y tributarios adecuados para el sector inmobiliario, que oriente la localización de los desarrollos habitacionales y disminuya los lugares mínimos para estacionamiento de manera que permita darle un uso más eficiente al suelo, de acuerdo a los planes de desarrollo urbano y criterios de densificación y sustentabilidad.

**Idea 58**

Fomentar el uso de la bicicleta como medio de transporte urbano a través de un Programa Nacional de Fomento a la Bicicleta a cargo de la SEDATU que provea financiamiento y asistencia técnica para la generación de planes y estrategias locales, y para la construcción de infraestructura ciclista (ciclovías, estacionamientos, rediseño de vías, bicicletas públicas, etc.)

**Indicador: Inversión federal en movilidad**

Porcentaje de la inversión federal realizada en infraestructura para la movilidad urbana sustentable en relación al total de las inversiones realizadas con recursos del ramo 23 y 33. (Línea de acción 7, estrategia 3.3; Unidad de medida: Porcentaje). La inversión pública en infraestructura para la movilidad incluye infraestructura peatonal, ciclista, de espacio público y de transporte público.

Parcialmente cubierto. Aunque el indicador contempla inversión en bicicleta, no hay un rubro específico en los objetivos o líneas de acción que se enfoque en la promoción del uso de la bicicleta como lo propone la idea 58. No se hace mención de incentivos específicos para este rubro en particular.

**Estrategia 3.3.** Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con...
políticas de movilidad urbana. Involucra el desarrollo de programas de financiamiento y asistencia técnica para fomentar la movilidad peatonal, y el condicionamiento de recursos federales para obras urbanas al cumplimiento de estándares de accesibilidad y seguridad para el adecuado desplazamiento a pie.

**Idea 60**
Modificar reglas de operación de Programa de Transporte Masivo (PROTRAM) para que puedan canalizarse recursos a ciudades intermedias (de menos de 500 mil habitantes), hoy desatendidas.

**Idea 61**
Desarrollar mecanismos para financiar la operación del transporte público, hoy no cubierta por fondos federales, que sólo cubren la construcción de infraestructura.

**Idea 62**
Condicionar

3. **Diagnóstico del desarrollo urbano y la vivienda.**

3.3.-**Movilidad urbana sustentable.**
El PROTRAM no ha logrado potenciar la demanda de los sistemas debido a la ubicación de la infraestructura implementada, y a la escasa promoción de corredores intermodales que se propicien viajes peatonales y el uso masivo de la bicicleta.

No contemplado por el PSDATU. Aunque se hace mención a las fallas del PROTRAM no se proponen líneas de acción específicas para eliminar dichas fallas. Además, no se hace referencia a la falla mencionada en la Idea 60, en relación a la falta de atención para ciudades intermedias.

**Idea 62**
Condicionar

2. **Diagnóstico del ordenamiento territorial.**

No hay mención alguna a mecanismos de financiamiento para la operación del transporte público en el PSDATU.

No cubierto por el PSDATU. Sólo se menciona (en el
2.3.- Ordenamiento territorial y atención a zonas de riesgo.

Es necesaria la instalación de Consejos Estatales de Ordenamiento Territorial como órganos estratégicos para la toma de decisiones, que contribuyan a definir la ocupación y uso del territorio en zonas aptas para el desarrollo; integrar sistemas urbano-rurales en función de la dinámica económica, la movilidad, accesibilidad y conectividad; así como identificar e instrumentar acciones para reducir la vulnerabilidad de los asentamientos humanos ante fenómenos naturales y de impactos al medio ambiente.

3. Diagnóstico del desarrollo urbano y la vivienda.

3.3.- Movilidad urbana sustentable.

A la fecha, el FONADIN, ha apoyado 66 proyectos, los cuales han implicado una inversión total de 188,587 millones de pesos. De estos recursos, 10,915 millones se han destinado para implementar 9 proyectos de transporte público masivo, sin embargo, no todos estos sistemas han finalizado su etapa de implementación. Esto sugiere que, además de las cuestiones de financiamiento para infraestructura y estudios de factibilidad, los sistemas de BRT requieren de un acompañamiento federal más integral que asegure una buena capacidad institucional y de gestión en los gobiernos estatales y municipales para que dichos sistemas logren superar los retos de su puesta en marcha y promuevan la reducción de gases efecto invernadero del sector transporte.

Idea 63

Eliminar el subsidio a la gasolina de manera progresiva y aprovechar los recursos liberados para el financiamiento de sistemas de movilidad urbana sustentable. Una vez terminado el subsidio, se

3.3.- Movilidad urbana sustentable.

La política de subsidio a la gasolina también genera distorsiones en la decisión de uso del automóvil: al mes de junio de 2013, el subsidio federal a las gasolinas y diésel alcanzó 64.4 mil millones de pesos. No contemplado por PSDATU. Se reconoce el problema en el diagnóstico, pero no se propone una estrategia (como, justamente, eliminar el subsidio) para resolverlo.
propone desarrollar un impuesto específico a los combustibles que proporcione ingresos estables para financiar las políticas de movilidad urbana sustentable.

**Idea 64**
Dar certidumbre financiera y jurídica a la participación privada en movilidad urbana a través de la fijación de reglas claras de operación de servicios de transporte público (tarifa, estándares de provisión, resolución de conflictos, etc.) establecidas en contratos de servicio. Esto a su vez implica el desarrollo de canales transparentes de información.

**Idea 65**
Incluir al transporte de carga en políticas y programas de movilidad urbana. Esto significa considerar la planeación y regulación de circulación de transporte de carga en planes y programas.

El PSDATU no hace alusión a cambios regulatorios ni a la necesidad de mejora en las reglas de operación del transporte público. No se establecen mecanismos para promover la participación de la inversión privada en la movilidad urbana.

El Programa no incluye medidas relacionadas a transporte de carga.
integrados de desarrollo urbano y movilidad.

**Idea 66**
Hacer de la seguridad vial una política de país. Implica unificar lineamientos y mecanismos a través de una Ley de Seguridad Vial, y el desarrollo de programas federales de asistencia técnica y financiera para que estados y municipios implementen medidas de gestión de tráfico, rediseño vial, capacitación y educación vial. Relacionado con esto, se propone la obligatoriedad a nivel nacional de estrictos exámenes para la obtención de licencias de conducir. Estas políticas se deben complementar con programas de capacitación para conductores de transporte público, policías, y funcionarios públicos a cargo de políticas de movilidad.

**Idea 67**
Garantizar la accesibilidad universal en las

---

**Estrategia 3.3.** Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de acción 9:**
Impulsar acciones de movilidad segura, señalización, pasos peatonales y seguridad vial en beneficio de la ciudadanía.

Parcialmente cubierto: no se menciona la necesidad de crear una Ley de Seguridad Vial ni de volver de carácter obligatorio los exámenes para obtener licencias de conducir.

---

**Estrategia Transversal** Igualdad de Oportunidades y no Discriminación contra las Mujeres

**Línea de acción 6**

Parcialmente cubierto. No se enfatiza el tema de la accesibilidad universal como tal, sino sólo en referencia a
ciudades del país, a través de la fijación de normas oficiales y el apoyo financiero de un fondo federal para asegurar el acceso efectivo de personas con movilidad reducida a todos los edificios y espacios públicos, y a sistemas de transporte público especialmente adaptados a sus necesidades.

Promover cruces vecinales seguros y accesibles, en vialidades urbanas primarias para la protección de mujeres, niñas y niños.

**Línea de acción 10**

Diseñar acciones afirmativas para que las mujeres con discapacidad y adultas mayores tengan acceso a la propiedad de una vivienda.

**Pilar 5: Reformular las Políticas de Vivienda**

**Idea 68**

Enfocar las políticas de vivienda al rezago cualitativo. El rezago de 9 millones de viviendas de México es mayoritariamente cualitativo, no cuantitativo, por lo que es necesario reforzar esfuerzos públicos al financiamiento y asistencia técnica para programas de mejoramiento y autoconstrucción en sitio propio.

**Estrategia 4.2.** Fomentar la producción social organizada en los programas de vivienda popular.

**Línea de acción 1**

Atender de manera prioritaria las necesidades de vivienda popular en los municipios de la Cruzada Nacional Contra el Hambre.

**Línea de acción 2**

Apoyar financieramente la producción social y la autoproducción de vivienda para el desarrollo socioeconómico de las comunidades.

**Estrategia 4.3.** Generar una oferta óptima de créditos y subsidios para acciones de vivienda.

**Línea de acción 1**

Fortalecer el poder adquisitivo de las personas de bajos ingresos mediante subsidios focalizados que permitan atender el rezago de vivienda.

**Línea de acción 6**

Acompañar las acciones que atienden el rezago de vivienda, con medidas que incentiven la formalidad.

**Estrategia Transversal Igualdad de Oportunidades y no Discriminación contra las Mujeres**

**Línea de acción 4**

Diseñar alternativas mixtas de autoconstrucción de
vivienda para las jefas de hogar con empresas de responsabilidad social.

**Línea de acción 6**
Apoyar alternativas de autoconstrucción de viviendas para las mujeres.

**Línea de acción 12**
Promover programas de autoconstrucción de vivienda y títulos de propiedad para mujeres en pobreza.

---

**Idea 69**
Estimar las reales necesidades de vivienda para cada ciudad. Para ello se tiene que contar con un completo registro de demandantes a nivel nacional que identifique la demanda presente y proyectada de vivienda nueva, vivienda en renta y mejoramiento del parque habitacional existente. Tanto los programas de financiamiento como los distintos instrumentos de planeación territorial tienen ajustarse a estas estimaciones de carácter oficial, las cuales deberán quedar plasmadas en el Programa Nacional de Desarrollo Urbano y Vivienda.

---

**Idea 70**
Enfocar políticas de vivienda en sectores no atendidos. La

---

**Estrategia 4.3.** Generar una oferta óptima de créditos y subsidios para acciones de vivienda.

---

**Línea de acción 1**
Fortalecer el poder adquisitivo de las personas de bajos
distribución de los recursos para la vivienda debe hacerse de acuerdo a las reales necesidades habitacionales, y no a la capacidad de crédito de las familias. En este sentido, los esfuerzos deben concentrarse en el 60 por ciento de la población que es autoempleada o trabaja en el sector informal, y que en la actualidad no cuenta con programas públicos que atiendan sus necesidades.

**Idea 71**
Diversificar las opciones al acceso a la vivienda. Las políticas sectoriales deben enfocar sus esfuerzos en esquemas distintos a la propiedad privada de la vivienda, más flexibles, y que reconozcan las necesidades cambiantes en el tiempo y el espacio de las familias mexicanas. Entre estos esquemas a promover están la renta de vivienda, ingresos mediante subsidios focalizados que permitan atender el rezago de vivienda.

**Estrategia 4.4.** Diversificar el mercado de soluciones de vivienda para atender eficazmente las necesidades de los diferentes segmentos de la población.

**Línea de acción 3**
Desarrollar productos y mecanismos para potenciar la atención a la población abierta, preferentemente rural y micro empresarios.

**Línea de acción 4**
Llevar soluciones de vivienda digna a la población no atendida por los sistemas tradicionales de seguridad social, incentivando la formalidad.

**Estrategia 4.4.** Diversificar el mercado de soluciones de vivienda para atender eficazmente las necesidades de los diferentes segmentos de la población.

**Línea de acción 2**
Incentivar el mercado de renta habitacional mediante subsidios a la renta y garantías basadas en el subsidio y la subcuenta de vivienda.

**Línea de acción 6**
Promover la vivienda en renta como alternativa para los derechohabientes con una alta movilidad laboral que requieren soluciones más flexibles.

**Línea de acción 8**
Instrumentar esquemas viables que permitan incrementar la participación que se tiene actualmente en el mercado de vivienda en renta.
la renta con opción de compra, o esquemas público privados de tenencia de la tierra.

**Idea 72**  
Financiar el desarrollo urbano, no sólo la vivienda. El financiamiento a la vivienda debe ser entendido como el último eslabón de una cadena que debe considerar mecanismos integrados para el financiamiento del suelo, la infraestructura y servicios.

**Estrategia 2.2.** Controlar la expansión urbana fuera de los polígonos de crecimiento definidos, por medio de Desarrollos Certificados

**Línea de acción 1**  
Incorporar a los Desarrollos Certificados los diferentes tipos de usos de suelo que permitan integrar el uso habitacional con actividades económicas compatibles.

**Línea de acción 4**  
Instrumentar esquemas de financiamiento para obras de infraestructura y urbanización en Desarrollos Certificados.

**Estrategia 3.1.** Controlar la expansión de las manchas urbanas en coordinación con los gobiernos estatales y municipales (todas las **líneas de acción**)

**Estrategia 3.3.** Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de acción 1**  
Contribuir a que las ciudades cuenten con la infraestructura necesaria para la provisión de servicios básicos, en especial a los hogares de bajos ingresos.

**Línea de acción 2**  
Coordinar programas de oferta de suelo y lotes con servicios en zonas aptas para el desarrollo de vivienda.

**Estrategia 4.1.** Promover la oferta de soluciones habitacionales de calidad.

**Línea de acción 3**  
Otorgar créditos para rehabilitar, ampliar o mejorar las viviendas.

**Línea de acción 5**  
Otorgar líneas de crédito a desarrolladores de vivienda, que cumplan con los criterios necesarios de elegibilidad vigentes, cuando se observe astringencia

Parcialmente cubierto. Cuando se habla de financiar se enfocan sobre todo en vivienda. Cuando hablan de desarrollo urbano usan sobre todo términos como: incentivar, promover, fomentar, planear. Sólo una vez se habla explícitamente financiamiento a infraestructura y urbanización. No está contemplado como un financiamiento escalonado.

**Idea 73**  
Fomentar la combinación de mecanismos de financiamiento a la vivienda, que no deben quedar limitados a esquemas de crédito y subsidios.
Aportes en especie, en mano de obra y asistencia técnica son claves para el desarrollo de programas de construcción y mejoramiento de viviendas.

**Idea 74**

Establecer porcentajes mínimos de vivienda de interés social que deberán ser provistos en nuevos desarrollos inmobiliarios en áreas intraurbanas. Los subsidios a la vivienda pueden ser direccionados para favorecer este tipo de desarrollos socialmente integrados.

**Idea 75**

Generar opciones de financiamiento para la vivienda productiva, combinando las funciones de habitación con la posibilidad de instalar comercios y servicios de nivel barrial. Basado en un concepto DOTS, este esquema impulsa la economía local y fomenta la movilidad no crediticia.

No está contemplado

**Estrategia 3.3.** Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de acción 4**

Promover usos mixtos compatibles que apoyen la generación de empleos cercanos a la vivienda, fomenten el comercio local y disminuyan necesidades de movilidad.

**Estrategia 3.4.** Procurar que la vivienda se inserte en un entorno digno y contribuya al desarrollo de las personas.

**Línea de acción 4**

Promover que al interior de los desarrollos inmobiliarios se construyan y operen pequeños comercios que fomenten la actividad económica y el
motorizada.

**Idea 76**

Otorgar apoyos a la vivienda que vayan más allá de lo financiero a través de programas públicos de asistencia técnica en los que arquitectos, constructores e ingenieros asesoren a las familias en procesos de autoconstrucción y mejora de vivienda. Esto se puede traducir en una reducción de costos, en el establecimiento de mejores procesos constructivos, y en la edificación de viviendas que se relacionen de mejor manera con su entorno inmediato.

**Idea 77**

Recuperar la responsabilidad pública en la urbanización. La responsabilidad de la planeación de obras para la provisión de infraestructura y servicios como pavimentación, agua potable, drenaje y alumbrado público debe

consumo local.

**Estrategia 4.1.** Promover la oferta de soluciones habitacionales de calidad.

**Línea de acción 3**

Otorgar créditos para rehabilitar, ampliar o mejorar las viviendas.

**Línea de acción 5**

Otorgar líneas de crédito a desarrolladores de vivienda, que cumplan con los criterios necesarios de elegibilidad vigentes, cuando se observe astringencia crediticia.

Parcialmente cubierto. La mayor parte de los mecanismos de financiamiento se limitan a esquemas de crédito

No está contemplado
quedar en manos del sector público, debiendo ejecutarse de acuerdo a lo señalado por instrumentos de planeación territorial. En un esquema así, la participación del sector privado se limita a la ejecución de las obras. Esto implica establecer una secuencia en la urbanización del territorio urbano: primero la dotación de infraestructura, luego la lotificación y finalmente la edificación de viviendas y otros usos.

**Idea 78**

Privilegiar criterios de densidad más que de verticalidad en el otorgamiento de financiamiento a la vivienda. Considera el fomento a tipologías constructivas flexibles que faciliten la expansión de las viviendas y la densificación en sitio propio, las que no necesariamente pasan por la construcción en

**Estrategia 3.1.** Controlar la expansión de las manchas urbanas en coordinación con los gobiernos estatales y municipales.

**Línea de acción 4**

Fomentar una mayor densidad habitacional promoviendo el uso intensivo del suelo, evitando la especulación y subutilización del mismo. (Según el PSDATU: “Densidad neta se refiere al número total de viviendas entre la superficie habitacional de los nuevos desarrollos.”)

**Estrategia 3.2.** Orientar el financiamiento para la vivienda digna y sustentable con criterios territoriales que promuevan la densificación.

**Línea de acción 1**

Promover el financiamiento a viviendas cercanas a fuentes de empleo, equipamiento, transporte, vías de comunicación y con acceso a servicios básicos.

**Línea de acción 3**

Cubierto por el PSDATU. La estrategia 3.1 no se enfoca en financiamiento pero sí hace énfasis en la importancia de la densidad. Cuando se habla de financiamiento (estrategia 3.2), se hace énfasis en la verticalidad (línea de acción 3); sin embargo, considerando su definición de densidad neta, puede decirse que toman en cuenta también otras tipologías. Esto puede observarse también en la línea de acción 1 de la estrategia 3.2.
altura. Estimular la vivienda vertical para lograr el rescate de espacios urbanos y la redensificación que permita un crecimiento ordenado de las ciudades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilar 6: Revitalizar el Barrio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idea 79</strong> Transitar de políticas de vivienda a políticas de barrio, lo que implica pensar los planes y programas habitacionales en íntima relación con el entorno en que se desarrollan. Para ello deben establecerse estándares mínimos no sólo para la vivienda, sino para el barrio que ésta conforma junto a otras, el que a su vez debe estar plenamente integrado - física y socialmente- a un tejido urbano más amplio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estrategia 2.2.</strong> Controlar la expansión urbana fuera de los polígonos de crecimiento definidos, por medio de Desarrollos Certificados.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Línea de acción 1</strong> Incorporar a los Desarrollos Certificados los diferentes tipos de usos de suelo que permitan integrar el uso habitacional con actividades económicas compatibles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Línea de acción 2</strong> Generar en los Desarrollos Certificados, subcentros urbanos y centros de barrio con un sistema de movilidad conectado que brinde continuidad a la estructura urbana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estrategia 3.3.</strong> Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Línea de acción 5</strong> Fortalecer el tejido social y la seguridad de las comunidades mediante el rescate de espacios públicos en condiciones de deterioro o abandono.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estrategia Transversal Igualdad de Oportunidades y no Discriminación contra las Mujeres</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Línea de acción 5</strong> Vincular las acciones culturales con el programa de rescate de espacios públicos para convivencia familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Línea de acción 7</strong> Promover la construcción de espacios de convivencia comunitaria para mujeres y niñas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estrategia 3.3.</strong> Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Línea de acción 8</strong> Mejorar el entorno y las condiciones sociales en zonas urbanas en situación de pobreza y pobreza extrema.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estrategia 4.2.</strong> Fomentar la producción social organizada en los programas de vivienda popular.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Idea 80 Priorizar en planes metropolitanos y fondos federales los barrios con mayores carencias. Más del 10% de las familias urbanas en México no...
cuentan con servicios básicos en sus viviendas, estando muchas veces localizadas en zonas inadecuadas para el habitar humano. Los barrios en que estas familias viven deben ser prioridad en una estrategia nacional orientada a terminar con la marginalidad urbana, lo que implica un agresivo plan de mejoramiento físico -que puede incluir la relocalización- y acompañamiento social.

**Línea de acción 1**

Atender de manera prioritaria las necesidades de vivienda popular en los municipios de la Cruzada Nacional Contra el Hambre.

---

**Idea 81**

Integrar políticas de mejoramiento de vivienda y barrio. Los programas orientados a la dotación o mejoramiento de espacios públicos y equipamientos deben considerar también problemas como la vivienda deshabitada o en estado de precariedad. La revitalización del barrio debe partir por la habilitación de su condición de lugar apto para

**Estrategia 2.4.** Fortalecer, en coordinación interinstitucional e intergubernamental, la prevención de riesgos y la mitigación de los efectos de los desastres naturales (todas las líneas de acción).

**Estrategia 3.4.** Procurar que la vivienda se inserte en un entorno digno y contribuya al desarrollo de las personas.

**Línea de acción 7**

Profundizar en el diagnóstico del fenómeno de vivienda abandonada, para identificar bajo qué condiciones se puede revertir.
la habitación.  

**Idea 82**  
Crear una Agencia Nacional de Mejoramiento Urbano que concentre, coordine y priorice esfuerzos programáticos y financieros a nivel federal para el mejoramiento del espacio físico y el entorno social de los barrios.

**Idea 83**  
Definir visiones estratégicas para los barrios a través de la elaboración de planes metropolitanos y planes parciales dotados de una visión ordenadora de políticas públicas de impacto local. Estos planes deben ir más allá de la mera regulación del uso de suelo: tienen que definir una imagen futura deseada y establecer los instrumentos y mecanismos institucionales, financieros y normativos para plasmar estas visiones estratégicas de mediano y largo plazo.

**Estrategia 1.1.** Impulsar la coordinación interinstitucional e intergubernamental con autoridades locales y la sociedad para mejorar la planeación y el ordenamiento territorial.

**Línea de acción 1**  
Crear un Sistema Nacional de Planeación Territorial que priorice el diseño e implementación de políticas en materia de ordenamiento territorial.

Parcialmente cubierto por el PSDATU. No se contempla como tal la creación de una Agencia Nacional de Mejoramiento Urbano, se trata más bien de crear un Sistema Nacional de Planeación Territorial.

No se contempla
**Idea 84**
Incorporar a la ciudadanía en la planeación y gestión de sus barrios a través de la implementación de procesos de planeación participativa en los que la comunidad cuente con real poder de decisión en la identificación de necesidades y posterior definición de visión, desarrollo, implementación y gestión de iniciativas de mejoramiento del entorno físico y social en que viven.

**Estrategia Transversal Igualdad de Oportunidades y no Discriminación contra las Mujeres**

**Línea de acción 3**
Incorporar la participación de mujeres para mejorar las condiciones habitacionales y su entorno, en coordinación con los gobiernos locales.

**Estrategia 3.4. Procurar que la vivienda se inserte en un entorno digno y contribuya al desarrollo de las personas.**

**Línea de acción 6**
Promover la operación de observatorios urbanos para incidir en la formulación de políticas públicas y proyectos para fortalecer el desarrollo social y urbano.

Parcialmente contemplado. Cuando se habla de incorporar a la ciudadanía se hace alusión exclusiva a las mujeres y no al grueso de la población. Por otro lado, no se especifica que los observatorios urbanos vayan a estar compuestos principalmente (o parcialmente) por agrupaciones vecinales o barriales de la sociedad civil.

**Idea 85**
Incorporar en los órganos de participación comunitaria a quienes trabajan y estudian en los barrios, y hacerlos corresponsables en la planeación, desarrollo y gestión de programas de sociales y de infraestructura de impacto directo en el espacio barrial.

**Estrategia 4.1. Promover la oferta de soluciones habitacionales de calidad.**

**Línea de acción 7**
Priorizar el financiamiento a las soluciones

No está contemplado

**Idea 86**
Condicionar el financiamiento federal a

**Estrategia 4.1. Promover la oferta de soluciones habitacionales de calidad.**

**Línea de acción 7**
Priorizar el financiamiento a las soluciones

Parcialmente contemplado. No se habla de condicionamiento del financiamiento ni de estándares urbanos mínimos.
proyectos inmobiliarios vía créditos y subsidios al cumplimiento de lineamientos y estándares urbanos mínimos, referidos a localización, conectividad, provisión de servicios, equipamiento, criterios básicos de diseño urbano, acceso a redes de transporte público, heterogeneidad funcional, etc.

**Idea 87**

Fomentar formas de participación público privada en los barrios. Implica desarrollar mecanismos para atraer la inversión privada a proyectos de escala barrial con capacidad de detonar la economía y generar empleos de carácter local. Bajo este esquema, el rol de las instituciones públicas es proveer los incentivos adecuados y establecer una adecuada regulación de las inversiones para que éstas se habitacionales cercanas a transporte público decalidad. para proyectos inmobiliarios. Lo más que cercano a esto es la línea de acción 7 de la estrategia 4.1 que no se trata realmente de un condicionamiento de fondos.

**Estrategia 3.4.** Procurar que la vivienda se inserte en un entorno digno y contribuya al desarrollo de las personas.

**Línea de acción 7**

Promover líneas de crédito a desarrolladores de vivienda sustentable especializados en ecotecnologías y en disminución de daños colaterales al medio ambiente.

No está contemplado
enmarquen dentro de lo señalado por los instrumentos de planeación territorial, y así tengan un impacto positivo a nivel económico, social y ambiental en los barrios que las albergan.

**Idea 88**

Dotar de centralidades a los barrios. Comprende la implementación de programas para la construcción de espacios con capacidad para congregar a la comunidad y crear un sentido de pertenencia con el lugar que se habita. Entre estos espacios se cuentan bibliotecas barriales, sedes comunitarias, plazas, parques, canchas, etc. La construcción de estos lugares se debe complementar con programas de acompañamiento social para la gestión comunitaria de los mismos.

**Estrategia 2.2.** Controlar la expansión urbana fuera de los polígonos de crecimiento definidos, por medio de Desarrollos Certificados.

**Línea de acción 2**

Generar en los Desarrollos Certificados, subcentros urbanos y centros de barrio con un sistema de movilidad conectado que brinde continuidad a la estructura urbana.

**Estrategia Transversal Igualdad de Oportunidades y no Discriminación contra las Mujeres**

**Línea de acción 1**

Promover condiciones de movilidad segura, seguridad vial y peatonal, para niñas, mujeres y ancianas en los entornos comunitarios.

**Línea de acción 5**

Vincular las acciones culturales con el programa de rescate de espacios públicos para convivencia familiar.

**Línea de acción 7**

Promover la construcción de espacios de convivencia comunitaria para mujeres y niñas.

**Idea 89**

Reactivar los mercados públicos.

**Estrategia 3.4.** Procurar que la vivienda se inserte en un entorno digno y contribuya al desarrollo de las personas.

Parcialmente cubierto por el PSDATU. Si bien se enfatiza la necesidad de promover el comercio al interior de los
Considerarlos como equipamientos clave de la ciudad que puedan ser receptores de fondos federales. Para ello deberán establecerse herramientas normativas a nivel local que los protejan de grandes usos comerciales que destruyen el tejido del barrio sin beneficiar mayormente la economía local.

**Idea 90**
Territorializar el ámbito de representación de los regidores, quienes hoy no responden ante comunidades específicas. Esto ayudaría a canalizar mejor las inquietudes y necesidades ciudadanas relacionadas con el entorno físico y social en que habitan.

**Línea de acción 4**
Promover que al interior de los desarrollos inmobiliarios se construyan y operen pequeños comercios que fomenten la actividad económica y el consumo local.

Estrategia 3.3. Promover la mejora de la infraestructura, equipamiento, servicios, espacios y movilidad urbana sustentable en coordinación con gobiernos estatales y municipales.

Parcialmente cubierto. El programa hace énfasis en la necesidad de mejorar la coordinación interinstitucional y entre los distintos niveles de gobierno. Sin embargo, no se hace referencia alguna a la necesidad de promover la innovación.
facilitador de la innovación, más que como un gestor. Estas agencias intersectoriales deben favorecer un cambio de cultura al interior del sector público, ayudando a superar barreras de estandarización, verticalidad y reticencia al riesgo que dificultan el desarrollo de procesos para la innovación en las ciudades. Dotados de un margen adecuado de flexibilidad, estos espacios pueden funcionar como lugares de encuentro entre sociedad civil e instituciones públicas para el desarrollo de iniciativas conjuntas, o para el apoyo técnico y económico a proyectos ciudadanos.

**Idea 92**
Fomentar asociaciones público privadas para la innovación urbana. Implica involucrar a la iniciativa privada en el desarrollo

**Estrategia 3.5** Promover que las autoridades locales y municipales armonicen sus Programas de Desarrollo de acuerdo a la Política Nacional de Desarrollo Regional.

**Línea de acción 1**
Formar y consolidar equipos técnicos con capacidades para desarrollar las funciones de planeación y gestión regional del desarrollo

**Línea de acción 2**
Crear espacios interinstitucionales e intergubernamentales de diálogo, coordinación y de concertación, así como acuerdos de asociación horizontal voluntaria.

**Estrategia 2.2.** Controlar la expansión urbana fuera de los polígonos de crecimiento definidos, por medio de Desarrollos Certificados.

**Línea de acción 3**
Impulsar la concurrencia de acciones de los tres órdenes de gobierno y los sectores social y privado para fomentar la gestión del territorio.

**Estrategia 4.5.** Generar información de calidad para Parcialmente cubierto. El PSDATU menciona la necesidad de alianzas público privadas pero no se hace referencia explícita a la necesidad de promover la innovación.
de proyectos de alto impacto social, aplicando esquemas de riesgo compartido con instituciones públicas. A su vez, debe fomentarse coparticipación y financiamiento de la empresa privada en investigación académica de alcance urbano.

**Idea 93**
Desarrollar observatorios urbanos ciudadanos, compuestos por sectores académicos, empresariales y de la sociedad civil, para el desarrollo de propuestas específicas de impacto en la ciudad. Para potenciar su éxito, deben crearse los canales de comunicación y cooperación con instituciones públicas para facilitar la implementación de las iniciativas generadas.

**Línea de acción 3**
Acompañar esfuerzos del sector privado para generar información oportuna y de calidad que permita evaluar las condiciones de la vivienda en México.

**Estrategia 3.4.** Procurar que la vivienda se inserte en un entorno digno y contribuya al desarrollo de las personas.

**Línea de acción 6**
Promover la operación de observatorios urbanos para incidir en la formulación de políticas públicas y proyectos para fortalecer el desarrollo social y urbano.

**Estrategia Transversal Igualdad de Oportunidades y no Discriminación contra las Mujeres**

**Línea de acción 8**
Promover observatorios ciudadanos para el monitoreo, evaluación y rendición de cuentas para las acciones de género, hábitat y medio ambiente.

**Idea 94**
Crear el Fondo Sectorial “Innovar en la Ciudad” CONACYT-CONFINANCIATUR.
SEDATU, orientado a financiar la investigación, desarrollo y pruebas piloto de iniciativas relacionadas con vivienda, transporte público y movilidad no motorizada, planeación territorial, infraestructura urbana, medio ambiente, espacio público, etc. Estará abierto a universidades, centros de investigación, e investigadores independientes, pero también a la iniciativa privada y organizaciones de la sociedad civil.

**Idea 95**
Fortalecer la enseñanza de estudios urbanos en el país, impulsando un mayor número de licenciaturas en universidades, y aumentando becas para estudio de maestría y doctorado en universidades internacionales de alto nivel, exigiendo y garantizando trabajo en agencias de planeación urbana.

**Estrategia 4.5.** Generar información de calidad para una mejor toma de decisiones de actores públicos, empresas, organizaciones sociales y demandantes de vivienda.

**Línea de acción 2**
Apoyar a instituciones de educación superior para formar especialistas y realizar investigaciones sobre desarrollo urbano y vivienda.

Cubierto por el PSDATU.
Idea 96
Desarrollar programas para llevar profesionales a las comunidades —especialmente a las más carenciadas— para el desarrollo de proyectos ciudadanos. En un esquema así, se debe fomentar la participación de jóvenes recién egresados de las universidades para lograr un vinculo de largo plazo con el trabajo comunitario.

Idea 97
Impulsar ferias de ideas urbanas para alimentar planes de gobierno, en las que los ciudadanos puedan no sólo dar a conocer sus propuestas, sino también encontrar financiamiento, asistencia técnica y un espacio para contactarse con personas e instituciones con intereses afines.

Idea 98
Definir una cartera de desafíos urbanos a enfrentar al principio de cada periodo de

3. Diagnóstico del desarrollo urbano y la vivienda.

No cubierto por el PSDATU.

Parcialmente contemplado. El PSDATU incluye un diagnóstico de los principales problemas en materia urbana que enfrenta el país. Sin embargo, no se hace referencia en las estrategias del programa.
gobierno, estableciendo instrumentos financieros y técnicos para alcanzarlos en conjunto con la iniciativa privada, academia y sociedad civil.

**Idea 99**
Crear barrios para la innovación urbana que agrupen físicamente instituciones públicas y centros de generación de conocimiento públicos y privados. Esta estrategia comprende la creación y mejora de espacios públicos para la interacción social, como calles, plazas, parques y equipamientos comunitarios orientados a facilitar el contacto entre las personas y la organización comunitaria. Este programa debe insertarse en el contexto de una estrategia orientada a promover un desarrollo urbano compacto, conectado y de usos mixtos en concordancia con criterios DOTS.
**Idea 100**
Ampliar alcance de presupuestos participativos en los que la ciudadanía tenga voz y voto no sólo para decidir cómo se van a utilizar los recursos públicos, sino también para impulsar propuestas desarrolladas a nivel comunitario, las que pueden contar con un porcentaje garantizado de financiamiento.

No cubierto por el PSDATU.

**Referencias:**

8 Case Studies on Urban Reform
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**Introduction**

The cities in Mexico contain 78% of the population, and the urban population is rapidly growing in a disproportionate and fragmented way (Diaz, 2013). Mexico’s urban growth model is known as the 3D model: distant, dispersed, and disconnected. The problems around the 3D model are not economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. Mexican President Peña Nieto’s National Development Plan contains a road map to face urbanization challenges, as does the Urban Reform plan generated by EMBARQ Mexico, CMM, and IMCO.

Although the identification, development, and acceptance of the proposals for reform show substantial progress, the next challenge is implementation of the programs. The successful execution of such a large-scale program depends on many factors, including: the positive engagement of various stakeholders, contextual knowledge of the country, and expertise and experience in management and design techniques.

The research conducted in this literature review will present case studies from around the world with the lessons to be learned from international best practices. 51% of the world population lives in urban areas, and that number is growing. Many other cities encounter the same problems Mexico City faces, and capturing the lessons from other cities is increasingly valuable.

The first section will review the two types of problems Mexico City and Merida are both experiencing. The first type examines urban policy implementation challenges in both cities. The second provides an overview of the two cities’ urbanization problems for contextual background. This is followed by eight case studies that address some of the issues described, measures taken, and results. Finally, we close with the lessons to be learned from each of the cities that may be applicable for Mexico City and Merida’s urban reform policies and efforts.

**Background**

Mexico City’s el Distrito Federal (DF) population decreased by 2% from 1970 to 1990, but the population in the periphery grew by 6.1% in the same time period (OECD, 2007). Merida is also rapidly growing with 800,000 people living in the city, and over a million people when including the surrounding metropolitan areas. The large shift in the population from the city center to the periphery is rooted in problems related to insufficient public transportation, absence of clean and safe public spaces, lack of access to jobs and social services, and low quality homes.

Mexico City is home to 18 million people and 6 million cars (Mexico City, 2014). It ranks as one of the most congested cities and one of the world’s most painful cities for commuters (Licon, 2012). Although public transportation has improved with the bus rapid transit (Metrobus), rail, and even innovative bicycle sharing programs, the majority of these networks are inadequate in, or do not even reach, the peri-urban areas, in which most low-income citizens reside. With a growing urban population, the necessity to promote scalable, affordable, and high quality public transportation is increasingly urgent. In Merida, there has been virtually no change in operation and regulation of the transportation system since the 1950s, although it has grown dramatically. Although economic growth has led to increases in private cars and trucks, there are no serious plans to rethink mobility (such as new routes,
tariffs, and security issues) in Merida, particularly because the process belongs to the concessionaries (Alonzo, 2014).

Transportation problems contribute to deteriorating and abandoned communities. In some of the city’s periphery neighborhoods, up to one in four homes, or up to 600,000 homes across Mexico are vacant due to a lack of nearby work, violent and unsafe environments, and a lack of basic utility services (Learning, 2012 and Repogle, 2014). In Merida, many residents will move to the developments, only to find there is no electricity, access to clean water, or transportation. Rather than focusing on improving these homes, the government’s agenda prioritizes new developments (Alonzo, 2014). One resident in the outskirts of Mexico City, Jorge Arzave, told the CS Monitor that his ten-year old home is metaphorically and literally sinking into the ground. With scarce water sources, no health clinic, overcrowded schools, and a 90-minute commute to Mexico City, Arzave has the keys to 4 other neighbors’ homes that have left their homes to move elsewhere (Eulich, 2013). These examples illustrate some of the issues contributing to deteriorating neighborhoods.

There is still an urgent need for safe and clean public spaces on a scalable level. As recent as a few years ago, the public spaces in Mexico City were characterized with militarization by the police due to the public’s fear of crime. Many public areas are hostile for pedestrians and bikers, and while advertisements are banned from being posted on buildings, public and private buildings are still covered with them.

The Mexico City Metropolitan Area is also facing challenges such as lack of natural drainage for runoff from the surrounding mountains, and vulnerability to stormwater and flooding, especially in the western part. In the past years, the metropolitan area has been affected by severe storms, heat waves and drought. Innovative solutions such as green streets and eco-roofs could serve as green infrastructures to help solve these problems.

Many of the challenges to improving both sustainable transportation and revitalization of the neighborhood rely on resolving implementation challenges. Transportation and infrastructure policies create conflicts among various interest groups. According to Haroldo da Gama Torres, an urban planning expert, “[Transportation reform] mobilizes a complex set of individual and business interests, including developers, the construction industry, the auto industry, retailers, and landowners, as well as the middle and upper classes that demand more urban space and environmental quality” (Peters, 2012). Currently, Mexico City’s government does not provide adequate incentives or incorporate a process into its planning system that engages all interest groups from the conception of reform policies.

For all the mentioned challenges, public support for urban reforms is important for funding and continued sustainability. By listening to local citizens’ needs, and incorporating their ideas from conception and design stages, the government can eliminate social stigma and reduce resistance. Although it is costly and logistically difficult to coordinate discussions and forums, by listening, it increases incentives for all stakeholders to cooperate.

Across all cities in Mexico, the federal, state, and municipal governments would benefit tremendously from intra-governmental coordination on urban policies. Cases of conflicting interests in federal and state governments, preventing important transportation improvements, are prevalent. About 15 years ago, the federal government banned bus services from crossing state boundaries, which was designed to prevent intra-state competition. Disagreements between the state and city governments over financing joint transportation ventures limited
expansion of the metro line to solely within the city, even when it was evident that the state
needed the development most (Peters, 2012). Mexico City is in a unique situation in which
the Federal District (DF) encompasses the city center, while the State of Mexico (EM)
encompasses the semi-urban and suburbs in the surrounding states. Both have state-level
ministries, which can pose unique problems for coordination.

In terms of management, Merida shares similar challenges with Mexico City, including a lack
of governmental coordination among all three spheres at the federal, state, and municipal
levels, and limited participation of civil society. Insufficient autonomy is strongly felt in the
Yucatan state government and Merida’s municipal government, due to strong centralization
at the federal level. With a lack of fiscal autonomy and inflexible federal regulation, policy-
making will be limited until federal legislation provides a supporting framework.

The city of Merida suffers due to the incomplete participation of civil society in all parts of
the reform process, from prioritizing issues, designing policies, and implementation. NGOs
are not as involved with urban reform, and when excluding special interest groups, the pool
of participants shrinks even further. Many of Merida’s political officials lack the long-term
vision needed to build the infrastructure and framework for sustainable urbanization, which
highlights the necessity of a united and strong civil society. Collaboration among the private
sector, government, and civil society is an exception rather than the norm in Merida.
Academia and private sector often provide innovative technology transfer and expertise, and
without partnerships, shared knowledge is limited.

Many of the problems Merida and Mexico City face are challenges that many other urban
areas have confronted. In the next section, we will review 8 cases of best practices collected
from around the world. The first four case studies describe implementation and management
challenges in four different countries, and how various stakeholders are working together to
solve those problems through a participatory process. The first study describes how
stakeholders in Nairobi, Kenya were able to bring in the participation of the community to
transform an abandoned waste lot into a public community. In Sri Lanka, we explain how
shared information, special task committees, and training provided by the government and
United Nations Development Program (UNDP) helped improve urbanization policy
formation and implementation. In the city of Dar es Salaam, a consultative process helps
various stakeholders coordinate and manage conflicting interests to improve waste treatment,
public transportation, and other urban services. Liberia’s government has devised a strategy
to decentralize the federal government and strengthen the capacity of the local government to
meet urbanization needs of a rapidly growing population.

The last four cases studies shows how sustainable, innovative and cost-effective solutions
could be implemented in different contexts, and how private sectors and local communities
can be actively engaged in during such a process. More specifically, the case of Curitiba
shows how “people-centric planning on budget” has transformed the city into a sustainable
model by providing inexpensive, creative urban solutions. In Portland, green streets and eco-
roofs were designed to manage the urban stormwater issues in a sustainable manner. Private
sectors were encouraged to actively participate in these green efforts. The dominance of
public transportation in Freiburg demonstrates how incentives and disincentives can be
successfully used together to discourage the use of private vehicles, while promoting public
transportation as the public’s first choice. In Havana, there is evidence urban agriculture
could be a viable tool to solve urban food supply and employment issues. Currently various
forms of urban farming activities are on rise in both Mexico City and Merida. But
understanding how to make those efforts more sustainable to maximize its environmental and social economic value while minimizing its potential negative environmental impacts could be another challenge. The practices in Havana presented are an exemplary model and offers valuable lessons.

The case studies are starting points, not templates, for the potential changes that will help address urban development challenges in Mexico. Each case provides valuable lessons, but it is important to remember that local context must be considered when addressing issues in the cities of Mexico.

**Case Studies**

1. Nairobi, Kenya and Civil Society Participation

*Problem Addressed*

Limited participation of civil society and civil service independent of politics

*Background*

Although Kibera is in the center of a modern city and next to the economic capital of Nairobi, Kenya, it is one of the poorest and largest areas in Africa confronted with environmental degradation, lack of access to health services, and poverty. With high-density levels of up to 2,300 persons/hectare, the development of public spaces is often overlooked (Kounkuey, 2006). The little public space that is available is often used as unsafe waste areas. For example, two large riverbanks, Ngong Riber and Nairobi Dam, are used for all of the following activities: disposing waste, washing laundry, social gatherings, and play areas. The build-up of trash from these dumping grounds causes severe flooding in the area, leading to high risk of health problems for those exposed. A lack of local education and community engagement are challenges in creating and maintaining clean public spaces.

*Measures*

Kounkuey Design Initiative (KDI), a U.S.-based urban design non-profit, went into to Kibera to build low-cost and high impact environments by focusing on engaging local NGOs, regional institutions, and the local community. It transformed each polluted area into a productive area, with equal parts economic and recreational purposes.

KDI conducted workshops with community-based organizations and residents to determine priority needs and design solutions. KDI then provided local residents with the technical knowledge, design innovation, and other resources needed to implement the design. Once construction of a new public site was complete, local community groups became responsible for managing the operations and given an office on-site. A fee generated by small businesses or churches renting parts of the site is contributed to a maintenance fund. To manage waste, the community has established a microenterprise to conduct recycling and composting.

One of the first productive public spaces created includes a community center that serves as a market center for local businesses. Businesses that operate in the space are innovative, eco-friendly, and contribute the sustainability of the community. For example, a drying and weaving center sells baskets are woven from water hyacinth, an overgrown species that clog
the Nairobi Dam in the site. Organic waste is gathered from nearby homes and vegetable stands to create and sell fertilizer. Other projects include a poultry farm, community center for health clinics and schools, playground made with materials from lumber and recycled metal, and a drainage channel.

Results

The success of the first project alone brings in over $120 per week of profit to small businesses, and other public service benefit to several thousands in the community (Kounkuey, 2011). After the success of the first site, KDI has planned additional sites will create additional employment and economic opportunities along with a safe and clean recreational environment.

Lessons learned

KDI’s projects are self-sustaining because they are designed with the local communities from conception. This ensures services that are in high demand and able to be maintained with local capacity are developed. By incorporating the economic, social, and environmental aspects to the project, the space is multi-purpose and benefits everyone in the community. Educating members the value and providing the tools necessary to build the public spaces produce high impact value and ensure long-term feasibility.

2. Sri Lanka and Intra-government Coordination

Problem Addressed

Intra-government coordination at the federal, state, and municipal level and community based participation

Background

Sri Lanka is rapidly growing, with 60% of the country’s population expected to be living in cities by 2015 (Turning, 2012). There is a high demand for urban services, but the lack of efficiency and citizen responsiveness by local authorities is becoming more problematic. For example, although more efficient public transportation is urgently needed, there is no formal arrangement for integrated planning of the transportation sector. As a result, the problem of low-density urban dispersion is become exacerbated. In order to address the needs of the urban population, a stronger framework to integrate development at all levels is necessary, especially with connecting the local government with the state and federal government.

Measures

The Support to Implement the Sri Lankan Urbanization Framework (SISLUF) Program was created, with co-financing support from the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), to institutionalize the best practices learnt from other previous interventions. These included programs such as the Sustainable Sri Lankan Cities, Urban Governance Support, and Localizing Millennium Development Goal (MDG) Programs.

At a national level, an Urban Task Force is responsible for consolidating policies and legal reforms to build the capacity of local government training institutions. On a provincial level, the program promotes the partnership between various urban development agencies, by sharing development plans and budgets and resource coordination. They also provide
provincial training institutions with toolkits, training, and workshop modules for local elected leadership. Locally, a partnership has been created among the private sector, five local authorities, and the provincial and national level institutions aiming for a new Growth Center (outlined in the government’s Ten Year Development Framework from 2006-2016). A Growth Center Coordinating Committee to manage the implementation has been established, prioritizing key issues, reviewing resources, and inviting stakeholders to participate in workshops.

Some of the other resources developed and continuously being refined include a National Compendium of Good Governance Practices and a Guidance Manual on Provincial Strategic Frameworks to strengthen the links between local and provincial councils.

Results

The plan is already being used in the Eastern Province’s Growth Centre of Batticaloa and Dambulla, where post-tsunami rehabilitation is ongoing. In the Northern Provinces of Sri Lanka, the government has been able to more efficiently upgrade and reconstruct homes. Currently 14,800 homes have been built, 20,800 are in progress, and key community infrastructure has been constructed (Sri Lanka Strategy, 2007). Low-income settlements were upgraded and a National Guarantee Fund for credit enhancement was created, supporting 2,000 families (Sri Lanka Strategy, 2007).

Lessons learned

At the local, provincial, and federal levels, methods of intra-government links are strengthened through a variety of methods, including training, partnerships, and sharing best practices. The development of a Growth Center Coordinating Committee and Urban Task Force assigns responsibility to specific individuals, demonstrating the importance of the integration goals. By strengthening stakeholder participation at all levels of urban planning, the government is able to be more effective and responsive to its citizens.

3. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania and Stakeholder Coordination

Problem Addressed

Stakeholder coordination and conflict management

Background

Dar es Salaam is Tanzania’s largest city with 4.3 million people in its metropolitan area (Simbeye, 2013). As the commercial hub in the region, it has been experiencing rapid growth, which also led to rapid deterioration of living conditions. Some of the main development challenges include: land use conflicts, unplanned settlements, traffic congestion, lack of social services, and environmental degradation. An overall framework for the future growth and development of the city was needed. Although the official development plan, the Development of Dar es Salaam City, exists, it had not been reviewed since 1979 and expired in 1999 (Planning, 2009). It was not implemented successfully in the past due to several reasons, including: a controlled top-down approach, lack of participation from locals, lack of infrastructure design, and unaffordability due to a lack of initial research. Essentially cities lacked a mechanism in place to coordinate stakeholders and manage any conflicting interests.
Measures

The Sustainable Dar es Salaam Project (SDP) started in the early 1990s with the establishment of different groups to develop action plans covering issues of city expansion, settlement upgrading, air quality management, transport development, and public space enhancement. Group members are from the government, private sector, and community based organizations. Through stakeholder meetings and consultations, the most urgent issues are discovered and prioritized. The project started with smaller pilot projects. The participating actors then later presented their findings and future plans at a three-day stakeholders’ workshop.

These best practices led to the final plan that was implemented on a city-level, the Strategic Urban Development Planning Framework (SUDPF). All groups mapped out areas of agreement and areas of conflict, which were resolved through discussions. The SDP scaled-up two strategies, privatization of solid waste collection and participatory servicing of planned unsettlements. By implementing it in three phases, the collaborating partners had additional time to resolve problems at each stage.

Results

The success of the SDP has led to other city councils in Arusha, Moshi, and Morogoro to implement a similar strategy with consultations and pilot phases. Results have shown improvement in the quality and service of transport, waste management, and urban maintenance (Planning, 2009).

Lessons Learned

By collaborating with private, public, and other interest groups, the city’s capacity to develop urban planning have been strengthened and are more effective. Approaching all stakeholders and managing conflicts from the beginning of the process minimize resistance to reform policies. Starting with smaller pilot projects also allowed for gradual implementation with sufficient time to resolve issues as they emerged before full-scale execution. However there are challenges remaining, including: inadequate private sector participation in consultations and unsatisfactory in consultations, and many of the successes of the project have yet to be institutionalized in government policy.

4. Liberia and Local Government Capacity Strengthening

Problem Addressed

Decentralization and local government capacity

Background

Liberia’s urban population of 2.2 million has been growing at 5.6% each year, but over 50% of this population is dispersed (Country, 2008). There are many significant problems that have emerged due to rapid growth rates in urbanization, including 80% of housing has been destroyed or in need of repair, increasing poverty, crime, unemployment, and uncontrolled solid waste management (Country, 2008). Plagued with the constant lack of resources, the little available are misdirected. A highly centralized government structure with weak links between macroeconomic and spatial planning policies with feeble local capacities is not able
to address growing needs. UN Habitat and the government of Liberia recognize a need for improvement of local governance capacities, institutional frameworks and linkages between central and local governance structures.

**Measures**

The Liberian government, United Nations Mission, and UN-Habitat Training and Capacity Building Branch have been working to improve local government capacities since 2008. The program “Strengthening County Institutional Capacity for Service Delivery” focuses on training needs assessments focused on leadership, local economic development, and financial management. Initially piloting the development program in 3 cities, now 50 National Trainers are in all 15 counties of Liberia with the plan of a 2 year Capacity Building Strategy in the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

The government also adopted decentralization strategies in its Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS). Through the PRS, the Governance Commission, Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of Planning & Economic Affairs created the National Policy on Decentralization and Local Governance. It focuses on political harmony, inclusive socio-economic growth and rights-based and gender responsive development. The Commission conducted 15 formal decentralization county-to-county civic engagement discussions and contracted 14 National and local media institutions to inform the public on the National Policy on Decentralization and Local Governance. The plan will be fully implemented by 2017.

**Results**

The measures strengthened institutional capacities of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs, and the Liberia Institute of Public Affairs to deliver county level trainings for local administrations. Over 3000 government workers were trained in leadership and local economic development. Follow-up assessments have shown improved communication between county and local government officials and increased involvement of citizen participation.

The current success has led to the Liberia Decentralization Support Program to assist the implementation of the National Policy on Decentralization, and the EU has committed 5.5 million Euros to help support the Plan.

**Lessons learned**

By taking responsibility for developing a decentralization framework and using a wide range of capacity building interventions, the central government has empowered local governments to be effective in meeting growing urbanization needs. Using consultations encourages learning by decision-making, and encourages all levels of government to participate in the process. The training workshops support institutionalizing communication and coordinating strategies to improve urban service delivery.

5. **Curitiba, Brazil and Promoting Public Transportation and Eco-friendly Practices**

**Problem Addressed**

Urban sprawl and urban environmental degradation
Background

Curitiba, the capital of the southern state of Paraná, is one of the fastest growing cities in South America. Over the past 50 years, the city experienced an average growth rate of 4.6 and has transformed Curitiba from a small city to a metropolis, which now has nearly 2 million people live in the city (Gustafsson and Kelly, 2012). During such a process, Curitiba, like many other cities, have encountered various problems such as sprawl, congestion, environmental impacts and social inequality. To tackle these problems, Curitiba adopted a Master Plan since 1968, which stresses the link between integrated urban transportation, appropriate land uses, and environmental preservation and aims to create a livable city without spending top dollars. With years of sustainable design and development efforts, Curitiba was now recognized as a world sustainable city model.

Measures

A keystone of Curitiba’s master plan is the promotion of public transportation systems, which Curitiba provides primarily through a high-capacity bus system known as Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Unable to afford a rail system, and struggling to deal with rapid population growth, Curitiba developed the BRT system in order to offer its citizens high-quality transportation services at a fraction of the cost of rail-based systems. The bus rapid system uses triple section bendy busses. It carries two million passengers a day (ICLEI-Canada). The bus fare is the same wherever you go. This is called the “social fare”, alluding to the fact that shorter journeys subsidize the cost of longer journeys disproportionately taken by low-income residents. This was a deliberate choice on the part of the municipal government in implementing the BRT system, and it is in keeping with the principle that the system should be accessible to everyone, regardless of physical location or socio-economic status.

In addition to its Bus Rapid Transit system, Curitiba is known for its innovative use of parks and green space to improve the quality of life of its citizens and proactively address the effects of global warming. The city now has a network of 28 parks and wooded areas and now nearly one-fifth of the city is parkland (ICLEI-Canada). Unlike in many other cities, many parks in Curitiba were created from abandoned dumps and quarries. The municipal government use green zoning to safeguard open spaces and stiff regulations to protect very tree in the city. The city also encourages volunteers to plant trees. Over the years, volunteers have planted 1.5 million trees along the streets. Commercial Builders get tax breaks if their projects include green space. Except for its obvious aesthetic and recreational value, the park system is vital for controlling increased flooding, protecting Curitiba’s biodiversity and water quality, and limiting carbon emissions.

Like its transportation and park systems, the third prong of Curitiba’s environmental preservation efforts is its much-heralded recycling program, which combines sustainability, social inclusion, and good fiscal stewardship. Recycled materials were used to build Opera House and old buses are turned into classrooms, daycare centers and clinics. Curitiba’s recycling program employs both carrots and sticks. The city does not incinerate garbage, and residents must pay for garbage pickup (based on volume) as they would for electricity or water. But the city also encourages participation by ensuring ease of use. There is also a “green exchange” program. For low-income families living in shantytowns unreachable by truck, they can bring their trash bags to neighborhood centers, where they exchange them for bus tickets and goods. This means less city litter and less disease, less garbage dumped in
sensitive areas such as rivers and a better life for the undernourished poor. There is also a program for children where they can exchange recyclables for school supplies, chocolate, toys and tickets for shows. Except for the environmental benefits coming from recycle and reuse programs, the money raised from selling recycled materials goes into social programs, the city also employs the homeless and recovering alcoholics in its garbage separation plant.

Except for the above programs, the city also organized its industry around the idea of “Industrial Ecology” so that their activities can complement each other. Sharing heat and transport and forming a flow of materials, the waste of one industry could become the raw materials for another. In addition, the city provides public housings for low-income communities.

Results

Curitiba was given the Global Sustainable City Award in 2010. Curitiba exemplifies how the integration of land use planning, transportation infrastructure, and environmental sustainability efforts can enable a city to meet the needs of its expanding population and mitigate the negative effects of urban growth. By prioritizing smart transit, strategic land use, environmental protection, and social inclusion, Curitiba has effectively addressed the problems attendant in its fifty-year growth and paved the way for a less congested, ultra sustainable, and more equitable next half century.

Lessons

The BRT system in Curitiba demonstrated that developing new models that provide inexpensive, creative urban solutions and reflect local values are an alternative to standard, often-higher-cost approaches. The “Green Exchange” program is another example that innovative solutions could be explored to increase the existing programs’ take-up rates, minimize costs and promote social inclusion.

6. Portland, United States and Stormwater Management

Problem addressed

Natural drainage and urban stormwater management

Background

In a natural environment, soil and plants absorb rain. But when streets, buildings and parking lots cover the ground, and rain washes over these hard surfaces. The resulting stormwater runoff carries dirt, oil and other pollutants to rivers and streams and can also cause erosion and flooding that harm properties and wildlife habitat. Portland used to face all these problems but its uses green streets, eco-roofs, trees and other green infrastructure to manage stormwater, protect water quality and improve watershed health.

Measures

To solve the urban stormwater issues in a sustainable way, Portland has installed a number of green street projects green street projects and more are being planned as retrofits for existing neighborhoods. More specifically, the city has retrofitted a number of streets with landscaped
curb extensions, swales, planter strips, pervious pavement, and street trees to intercept and infiltrate stormwater. These Green Street projects demonstrate ways to address street runoff, which is an important source of stormwater, as streets comprise 35 percent of the City's impervious surface. In April 2007, the City Council approved a resolution to officially promote and incorporate the use of Green Street facilities in both public and private development (The City of Portland). Green Streets are recognized as an important in-flow control strategy to address combined sewer overflows, sewer backups, and other system deficiencies as well as watershed health needs.

Another program adopted in Portland is called eco-roofs. The City offers developers proposing buildings in Portland's Central City Plan District the possibility for floor area bonuses if an eco-roof is installed, allowing for additional building space than would otherwise be allowed. The City is now considering expanding this bonus Citywide. Additionally, Portland adopted a policy that directs City bureaus to incorporate green building practices into all facilities constructed, owned, or managed by the City. The policy specifically requires eco-roof design and construction on all new City-owned facilities and all roof replacement projects (Environmental Services of the City of Portland, 2006). Through these programs, a number of buildings and structures in Portland now have living, vegetated roof systems that decrease runoff and offer aesthetic, air quality, habitat, and energy benefits.

To make sure the green street and eco-roof programs are offering the best result, the city has a sustainable stormwater management monitoring system to quantify benefits of sustainable stormwater practices, improve the design and function of the existing and future applications, and lower maintenance costs by tracking performance and addressing maintenance needs as they arise.

Results

The City of Portland is now a recognized leader in green stormwater management. It has created a multi-faceted, highly successful program that achieves regulatory compliance, education, outreach, and community greening, and beautification.

Lessons Learned

The city needs leaders in both the public and private sectors to work together and the active participation of the private sector is a must to succeed. The city needs to develop attractive incentives for the private sector to make decisions that will benefit not only the business, but also the community and the citizens in general. The eco-roof program in Portland is such an example, which benefits both the developers and the local communities.

7. Freiburg, Germany and Promoting Public Transportation

Problem addressed

Urban sprawl and reducing automobile-based transportation

Background

Freiburg has 220,000 inhabitants and is the economic, cultural, and political center of the Black Forest region in southwestern Germany. In the past, Freiburg’s land-use plan used to
endorse geographic expansion of the city, based on automobile transport. Such policy has led to high private vehicle ownership, traffic jams, and polluted air. Seeing these problems, the city completed a policy turnaround in the 1970s, which have resulted in dramatic improvements for public transport, bicycling, and walking, while making car use more expensive, slower, and less convenient. In this way, public transportation has been greatly promoted in Freiburg.

Measures

To promote public transport in the city, a series of multi-modal policies have been taken include both incentives and disincentives. The first measure taken by the government is to integrate transport and land-use planning in the city. Freiburg’s most recent land-use and transport plans of 2008 were developed simultaneously and are fully integrated. Both plans reiterate the earlier goals of reducing car use, but they are more explicit about prohibiting car-dependent developments and actively support car-free neighborhoods. The city focuses its efforts on compact development along light rail routes, strengthening local neighborhood commercial and service centers, and mixing housing with stores, restaurants, offices, schools, and other non-residential land uses (Buehler and Pucher, 2011). For example, the city has identified 30 priority locations for small retail businesses in Freiburg’s neighborhood centers, with the goal of keeping trip distances short and assuring local accessibility on foot and by bicycle (City of Freiburg 2004).

Expanding and upgrading the light rail system was at the center of Freiburg’s multi-faceted strategy to integrate public transport and land-use planning. Since the opening of the first new light rail line in 1983, Freiburg has added four new lines with a total extent of 36.4 km in 2008. During the same period, the supply of light rail service almost tripled. In 2006, 65% of Freiburg’s residents and 70% of all jobs were located within easy walking distance (300 meters) from a light rail stop (Buehler and Pucher, 2011). Light rail, regional rail, and bus services and timetables are fully integrated in Freiburg. Real-time information is provided by digital displays at rail stations, light rail stops, and key bus stops. These measures were complemented with an attractively priced, unified ticketing system, which enables riders to use a single ticket for several trip segments and different types of service.

In addition, Freiburg has expanded its network of separate bike paths and lanes from only 29 km in 1972 to 160 km in 2007 (Buehler and Pucher, 2011). As a supplement, the city has been increasing the supply of bike parking over the past three decades, improving its quality, and integrating it with public transport stops. Between 1987 and 2009, the number of bike parking spaces in the city center almost tripled, rising from 2,200 to 6,040. There are now 1,678 bike parking spots at public transport bike and ride facilities (Buehler and Pucher, 2011).

Furthermore, many of the policies in Freiburg that promote public transport, bicycling, and walking involve restrictions on car use—such as car-free zones and traffic-calmed neighborhoods. Freiburg’s parking policy is also designed to make car use less convenient and more expensive. Parking garages are relegated to the periphery of the city center, thus forcing motorists to walk or take public transport to access their cars. In many residential neighborhoods, parking is reserved for residents only and requires a special permit. On street parking in commercial areas of the city becomes more expensive with proximity to the center. Almost all on-street car parking is limited in duration to prevent long-term parking by commuters. More importantly, building codes have reduced parking requirements for cars in
new residential developments at the same time they increased parking requirements for bikes (Buehler and Pucher, 2011).

**Results**

Over the last three decades, Freiburg’s coordinated transport and land-use policies have tripled the number of trips by bicycle, doubled transit ridership, and reduced the share of trips by car from 38% to 32%. Since the early 1990s, the level of motorization has leveled off, and per-capita CO2 emissions from transport have fallen, in spite of strong economic and population growth (Buehler and Pucher, 2011). Today, Freiburg is considered Germany’s ‘environmental capital’ and its most sustainable city.

**Lessons Learned**

Freiburg implemented most of its policies in stages; often choosing projects everybody agreed upon first and then spread them to other areas through good results demonstration. Based on changing situations, the government has also readjusted the plans and policies several times to make them flexible and adaptable. The experience in Freiburg also indicated that citizen involvement must be an integral part of policy development and implementation.

**8. Havana, Cuba and Food Security and Urban Unemployment**

**Problems addressed**

Lack of dietary diversity, lack of food security, and urban unemployment

**Background**

The city of Havana covers an area of 721 km2, 0.67% of the total area of Cuba. The City is now a world leader in urban Agriculture. Before 1989, urban agriculture was almost non-existent in Havana. There was no need, not even for the poorest residents, to grow food, as food was distributed by the State. However, with the collapse of former Soviet Union and the ensuing food crisis, urban agriculture emerged and today more than 50 per cent of Havana’s fresh produce is grown within the city limits, using organic compost and simple irrigation systems (Novo and Murphy, 1998).

**Measures**

To facilitate urban agriculture for the purpose of sustainable food supply in the cities, an urban agriculture department was formed in Cuba and it has played an important role in the organization of urban farming. To make full use of the unused land in the city, the government adapted the city law to make it not only legal, but free to adapt unused, public land into food production plots. The government also trained a network of extension agents, and community members to monitor, educate, and encourage gardeners in their neighborhoods. In addition, “seed houses” (agricultural stores) were created to provide resources and direct-sale Farmers’ Markets were established to help make those gardens financially viable (Danish Architecture Center, 2012).

To minimize the negative impacts urban agriculture might have on the city environment, the Havana City Government passed a law prohibiting the use of chemical pesticides in
agriculture within the city limits (Novo and Phurphy, 1998). Thus, the crops are grown almost entirely using active organic methods. The urban agriculture in Havana also involves efficient use of water; careful management of soil fertility, crops and animals, and close attention to environmental protection. City gardeners rely on organic fertilizers in the form of chicken or cow manure, compost from household food waste and occasionally vermiculture (the use of worms).

Farmers often maximize the use of land by cultivating multilayer crops, i.e. crops in the ground, on the ground and above the ground at the same time. A popular combination includes cassava (providing shade), sweet potatoes (providing good ground cover) and beans (fixating the soil with nitrogen).

**Results**

Such a practice not only have a visible impact on the food security of the city and in improving the Cuban diet, but also brings environmental benefits as many empty lots, which earlier were informal garbage dumps are now beautiful gardens that provide food to local communities which have improved neighborhood aesthetics and health as well. The development of urban agriculture has created new employment opportunities in the city, especially for new immigrants who just moved to the city from rural areas.

**Lessons Learned**

The success of Havana’s urban agriculture very much depends on the supportive role of the Cuban Government and its direct involvement in resolving concrete problems. Co-ordination of access to resources, as happens in Havana, avoids strong competition for and speculation on resources, as is the case in many cities around the world. Urban Agriculture, if developed in a sustainable way, could offer both environmental and social economic benefits, but strict measures must be taken to minimize its potential negative environmental impacts.

**Conclusion**

Our literature review and case studies show that many cities are facing similar challenges when trying to solve various problems such as traffic congestion, urban environmental degradation, urban poverty, and unemployment. To solve these problems, many innovative solutions have been proposed and implemented, including: the BRT system, public housing programs, community open spaces, green streets and eco-roofs, integrated solid waste management and sustainable urban agriculture, among many others. These solutions are playing important roles in improving people’s quality of lives in the cities, but its success are also hinged upon many other factors, such as a fully integrated planning process, the effective coordination among various levels of government agencies, the active participation of all stakeholders, and learning at the community level.

More specifically, the case studies demonstrated that an integrated planning process is essential to make sure that planners in all areas understand the overall strategy, have shared visions, and can develop their plans together. This way, many problems of unlinked development (e.g. urban sprawl, not enough provision for green space, etc.) can be avoided. Meanwhile, the relevant agencies must also effectively coordinate their efforts so that incongruences and overlapping efforts are minimized. The success story in Freiburg shows that land-use and transportation policy and efforts must go hand in hand.
Public-private partnerships are also very important in sustainable city efforts. In many cases, the city needs to develop attractive incentives for the private sector to make decisions that will benefit, not only the businesses, but also community and citizens together as demonstrated in Curitiba and Portland. International NGOs and local organizations also play important roles in stakeholder consultation, community engagement, conflict resolution, capacity building, and information sharing as seen in Nairobi, Dar es Salaam and Havana.

Overall, sustainable development are common goals shared by many cities all over the world. While there are many existing innovation solutions its real success would require the concerted implementation efforts from all stakeholders such as the government, the private sector, NGOs and local communities.
VII. Appendix IV: Ad-hoc implementation strategy

Our work aimed at identifying the main challenges that our client would face when implementing the Urban Reform in México. As we developed in section XX, there are four challenges: political will, institutional coordination, regulatory frameworks and funding issues. The purpose of this appendix is to offer a useful ad-hoc approach to gauge the feasibility of each idea of the Urban reform, while bearing in mind the four main challenges.

We scored the challenges that each idea would face on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being “The situation presents low difficulty/High attainability” and 5 being “The situation presents high-complexity/low attainability.” After grading each challenge, we averaged each the scores assigned to each of them. With the purpose of making it visually understandable, we did a heat-map with the scoring; green representing an average of 1 (highly attainable), and red one of 5 (low attainable). Figure I below shows the scoring for pillar “Putting the city in motion,” and figure II “Revitalizing the neighborhood.”

Finally, we classified urban reform ideas that scored from 1 to 3 points as possible to implement in the short-term (one year), from 3 to 4 points as middle-term (2 to 3 years), and 5 points as long-term. Figure 3 and 4 present the results of this study.

We acknowledged that this methodology requires further research. A more systematic, robust and informed procedure should be applied to score each idea. However, we consider it a useful first approach to determine the timing to push forward and implement the ideas contained in the two pillars under analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar 4: Ideas for moving the city</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Political Will</th>
<th>Institutional Coordination</th>
<th>Regulatory framework</th>
<th>Fundind</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea 46: Build a regulatory and legal framework at the federal level for mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 47: Establishing an official standard for Mexican public transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 48: Integrate mobility policies into the broader urban development programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 49: Plan mobility at the metropolitan level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 50: Provide clear mobility and transportation urban at the federal level with incentive programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 51: Redistribute resources for urban mobility instead of private automobiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 52: Develop indicators within an assessment systems for urban mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 53: Promote integrated urban transport systems supported with federal funding and technical assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 54: Change the public transportation concessionary system through legal mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 55: Ensure accessibility and road connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 56: Manage and discourage the use of private cars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 57: Promote mobility programs in the workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 58: Encourage the use of bicycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 59: Give priority to pedestrians in policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 60: Modify rules in Mass Transit (PROTRAM) so that resources can be channeled to small towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 61: Develop mechanism for financing public transport operations not covered by federal funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 62: Condition federal funds based on the creation of a public transport entity manager and work plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 63: Remove gasoline subsidies and use resources for urban mobility systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 64: Provide legal and financial regulation for private sector participation in urban mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 65: Plan and regulate freight policies and programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 66: Expand road safety policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 67: Ensure accessibility for disabled to all public buildings and spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Political Will</td>
<td>Institutional Coordination</td>
<td>Regulatory framework</td>
<td>Fundind</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Integrate housing policies with the physical and social environment, more on a district level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Prioritize metropolitan plans and federal funds to the most deprived neighborhoods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Integrate policies improving housing and neighborhoods, including public spaces</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Create a national entity that focuses on improved neighborhood spaces, and their physical and social environments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Define medium and long term strategies for neighborhoods regarding institutional instruments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Engage citizens in participatory planning and management in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Create community organizations for neighborhood planning and management of social programs and infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Condition the federally funded real estate projects to comply with minimum standards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Foster public-private partnership in neighborhoods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Provide shared community space in neighborhoods by building libraries, parks, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Revive public markets in neighborhoods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Ensure neighborhood representatives are elected by the neighborhood’s constituents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Medium-term</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Build a regulatory and legal framework at the federal level for mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Establishing an official standard for Mexican public transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Integrate mobility policies into the broader urban development programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Plan mobility at the metropolitan level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Provide clear mobility and transportation urban at the federal level with incentive programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Redistribute resources in urban mobility instead of private automobiles</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Develop indicators within an assessment systems for urban mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Promote integrated urban transport systems supported with federal funding and technical assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Change the public transportation concessionary system through legal mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Ensure accessibility and road connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Manage and discourage the use of private cars</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Promote mobility programs in the workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Encourage the use of bicycles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Give priority to pedestrians in policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Modify rules in Mass Transit (PROTRAM) so that resources can be channeled to small towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Develop mechanism for financing public transport operations not covered by federal funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Condition federal funds based on the creation of a public transport entity manager and work plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Remove gasoline subsidies and use resources for urban mobility systems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Provide legal and financial regulation for private sector participation in urban mobility</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Plan and regulate freight policies and programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Expand road safety policies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Ensure accessibility for disabled to all public buildings and spaces</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 79: Integrate housing policies with the physical and social environment, more on a district level</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Medium-term</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 80: Prioritize metropolitan plans and federal funds to the most deprived neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 81: Integrate policies improving housing and neighborhoods, including public spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 82: Create a national entity that focuses on improved neighborhood spaces, and their physical and social environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 83: Define medium and long term strategies for neighborhoods regarding institutional instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 84: Engage citizens in participatory planning and management in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 85: Create community organizations for neighborhood planning and management of social programs and infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 86: Condition the federally funded real estate projects to comply with minimum standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 87: Foster public-private partnership in neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 88: Provide shared community space in neighborhoods by building libraries, parks, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 89: Revive public markets in neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea 90: Ensure neighborhood representatives are elected by the neighborhood's constituents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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