

September/Oktober 2017

# RaumPlanung

Fachzeitschrift für räumliche Planung und Forschung



## Habitat III – eine neue Agenda für die Raumplanung?

Weitere Themen:

Umnutzung von Marinearealen in den USA

193 / 5-2017

# Habitat III

---

## Schwerpunkt

---

- 6 Peter Ache, Wolfgang Scholz:  
Habitat III
- 8 Sabine Drees, Hilmar von Lojewski:  
Neue Urbane Agenda
- 14 Fabian Thiel:  
Bodenrecht und Habitat III
- 22 Eva Dick, Benjamin Schraven:  
Urban governance of forced  
displacement
- 30 Knut Unger:  
Nachhaltige Stadtentwicklung  
ohne globalen Fahrplan
- 36 Rene Hohmann:  
National Urban Policies: a policy  
lever to foster a New Urban Agenda?

- 44 Gotelind Alber:  
Wie gegendert ist die New Urban  
Agenda?
- 48 Dylan van Dijk, Yvonne Keijzers:  
A home based on the ideas of the  
Circular Economy

---

## Weitere Themen

---

- 54 Dirk Schubert:  
Umnutzung von Marinearealen in  
den USA

---

## Rubriken

---

- 3 Editorial
- 62 Notizen
- 65 Campus
- 68 IfR Intern
- 73 Kalender
- 74 Impressum



17



22



44

---

*Hinweis: Aus Gründen der Lesegewohnheit und der sprachlichen Vereinfachung wird bei Personen die männliche Substantivform verwendet, wenn keine geschlechtsneutrale Formulierung möglich ist. Gemeint sind immer beide Geschlechter.*

---

# Habitat III

Die Neue Urbane Agenda wurde während der Habitat III Konferenz im Oktober 2016 in Quito verabschiedet und im Dezember 2016 von der UN Vollversammlung angenommen. Die Agenda dient als "handlungsorientiertes Dokument, das globale Maßstäbe für eine nachhaltige Stadtentwicklung setzt und die Art und Weise, wie wir Städte bauen, verwalten und in ihnen leben formuliert. Dabei ist eine Zusammenarbeit von städtischen Akteuren, allen Ebenen der Regierung sowie der Privatwirtschaft erforderlich" (<https://habitat3.org/the-new-urban-agenda>). Die Neue Urbane Agenda beinhaltet Verpflichtungen, benennt Verantwortlichkeiten und fordert Maßnahmen vor allem auf der kommunalen Ebene.

Dieses Themenheft der Raumplanung und seine Beiträge setzen sich mit den wichtigen Fragen der Habitat III Konferenz und der Neuen Urbanen Agenda auseinander: Wie sollte sich die urban governance für zukunftsfähige Städte verändern? Welche materiellen Zielsetzungen sollten für zukünftige Stadtentwicklungen prioritär verfolgt werden?

Obwohl vielfach die Neue Urbane Agenda allein als wichtig und leitend für die Raumplanung im sogenannten Globalen Süden angesehen wird, hat sie eine universelle Geltung. Wie positionieren sich Vertreter von Städten, Gemeinden, NGOs in Deutschland hinsichtlich der Neuen Urbanen Agenda? Wie gehen wir mit nachhaltiger Entwicklung zukünftig um? Welche weiteren Schlüsse können wir aus der Habitat III Konferenz in Quito im vergangenen Jahr hinsichtlich einer unveränderten Agenda für die Raumplanung ziehen?

Für viele deutsche Planer ist die Neue Urbane Agenda noch unbekannt und ihre Tragweite nicht ausreichend erkannt. Das Themenheft möchte daher die Neue Urbane Agenda vorstellen und gleichzeitig zu einer Diskussion anregen.

Sabine Drees und Hilmar von Lojewski diskutieren aus Sicht der deutschen Städte und des Städtetages in dem Beitrag „Neue Urbane Agenda – Piccolo-Flöte oder erste Geige im Konzert der großen Klima- und Nachhaltigkeitsagenden?“ die spezifische Rolle der Kommunen bei der Erstellung des Dokuments. Auch wenn es vor allem ein UN Dokument unterzeichnet von Nationalstaaten ist, so „bekennen sich die UN-Mitgliedstaaten dazu, Städte stärker in ihre Politik einzubeziehen und die Bedingungen zur Verwirklichung einer nachhaltigen und integrierten Stadtentwicklung zu verbessern.“ Vor dem Hintergrund der Nachhaltigkeits- und Klimaziele des UN-Gipfels (Agenda 2030) zur nachhaltigen Entwicklung 2015 und der UN Klimakonferenz 2015 sehen die Autoren die Agenda gleichrangig, auch wenn sie keine klaren Zielvorgaben formuliert sondern eher Grundsätze und Anforderungen. Der Beitrag diskutiert daher ausführlich die Frage geeigneter Nachhaltigkeitsindikatoren auf kommunaler Ebene. Als besondere Themen für eine globale Stadtentwicklung sieht der Beitrag die Frage der Bodenwertsteigerungen und des Gemeinwohlprinzips, integrierte Mobilitätskonzepte und kommunale Investitionen.

Fabian Thiel bezieht sich in seinem Beitrag „Bodenrecht und Habitat III: Was kann der Globale Norden vom Globalen Süden in der Neuen Urbanen Agenda lernen?“ vor allem auf die stadtplanerisch wichtige Frage des Bodenrechts und der Bodenpolitik. Während es in Deutschland um die Debatte zu Bodenpolitik eher still geworden ist, zeigt der globale Süden eine große Dynamik in der Diskussion. Er appelliert daran, dass der Globale Norden, also auch Deutschland, durchaus von der bodenrechtlichen und bodenpolitischen Vielfalt im Globalen Süden lernen kann. So wie während der Kolonialzeit rechtliche Normen vom Norden in den Süden als *legal transplants* transportiert wurden, so könnten heute innovative oder auch traditionelle Formen des Bodenrechts aus dem Globalen Süden durchaus die Debatte im Globalen Norden befruchten und neue Elemente einbringen. Er zeigt ausführ-

lich Elemente des Bodenrechtes in arabischen Staaten unter Schariarecht, traditionellen Bodenrechten in Afrika und Bodenrechtssystemen in Asien, vor allem China auf.

Eva Dick und Benjamin Schraven beleuchten in „Urban governance of forced displacement: Premises, requirements and challenges in the light of new humanitarian trends“ das aktuelle Thema von Flucht und Migration, das auch in der Agenda eine prominente Rolle spielt. Für die Autoren spielen Städte dabei eine wichtige Rolle durch die Nähe zu den Menschen, dem Vorzug eher von pragmatischen Ansätzen und der Tatsache, dass die meisten Migranten und Flüchtlinge weltweit in Städten leben und nicht in Flüchtlingscamps. Sie zeigen die Probleme und Herausforderungen für Städte auf und die erforderlichen Rahmenbedingungen auf nationaler und internationaler Ebene.

Knut Unger widmet sich in seinem Beitrag „Nachhaltige Stadtentwicklung ohne globalen Fahrplan“ dem Prozess zum Entstehen der Neuen Urbanen Agenda. Er sieht den politischen Prozess sehr kritisch und vermisst klare Aussagen zur Marktregulation der Immobilienwirtschaft, um adäquate Lösungen zur Wohnraumfrage zu erhalten. Der Beitrag gibt einen guten Einblick in die zahlreichen Treffen von Initiativen und Bündnissen im Rahmen der Vorbereitung des Abschlussdokuments und zeigt detailliert und fundiert positive und negative Aspekte der Formulierungen der Agenda auf. Zum Abschluss wünscht er sich eine „andere Agenda“, da die New Urban Agenda, so Unger, wenig zur Lösung der globalen Urbanisierungs- und Wohnungsfragen und noch weniger zur Einhegung der finanzialisierten Immobilienmärkte beiträgt.

Rene Hohmann richtet sich in seinem Beitrag „National Urban Policies: a policy lever to foster a New Urban Agenda?“ auf Nationale Stadtentwicklungspolitiken, also auf gesamtstaatliche Strategien. Sie gelten als das wichtigste politische Instrument, durch das die Neue Urbane Agenda begleitet und umgesetzt werden soll. Basierend auf einer Typologie werden vorhandene Stadtentwicklungspolitiken aus 19 Län-

dern kurz dargestellt und eingeordnet. Ein Clustering wird deutlich, zum einen in sozial-inklusive Strategien für die öffentliche Hand, zum anderen ökonomische Initiativen zur Stützung der Wirtschaft in Städten. Seine Schlussfolgerungen lauten schließlich: Nationale Stadtpolitiken sind notwendig aber keine ausreichenden Strategien für nachhaltige Städte; Nationale Stadtpolitiken sollten Raum für lokale Innovationen lassen.

Gotelind Alber richtet sich in ihrem Beitrag „Wie gegendert ist die New Urban Agenda?“ auf den Genderaspekt, soweit sichtbar in verschiedenen Dokumenten. In den Zielsetzungen für eine nachhaltige Entwicklung wurde Geschlechtergerechtigkeit als sogenanntes SDG 5 festgelegt. Allerdings stellen sich die Fragen, wie stark konnte sich dies durchsetzen, ob es in den jüngeren Dokumenten sichtbar ist und ob es tatsächlich zu einer geänderten Praxis auf städtischer Ebene führt. Gotelind Alber wirft hier einen kritischen Blick auf die Dokumente und kommt eher zu einer nüchternen Bilanz: die New Urban Agenda bringt keine wirklich neuen Aspekte ein; die wenigen Beispiele kommunaler Praxis zeichnen noch keinen deutlichen Weg zur Geschlechtergerechtigkeit.

Die Neue Urbane Agenda ist ein Generationenvertrag und aus dieser Perspektive bietet der Beitrag „A home based on the ideas of the Circular Economy: The Green Capital Nijmegen Experience“ von Dylan van Dijk und Yvonne Keijzers einen Einblick in die Initiativen, die vor allem junge citizens mit ihrer Stadt verbinden. Nijmegen wird in 2018 ‚Green Capital of Europe‘ sein und ruft unter den Einwohnern zur Mitarbeit auf. Der Beitrag stellt den dazu gehörenden Prozess vor und wendet sich schließlich einem Projekt zu, das für die Raumplanung zentral steht: wie kann Wohnen und Bauen aus einer Perspektive der zirkulären Ökonomie entwickelt werden? Denn die Neue Urbane Agenda fordert mit Recht gerade von den Städten, die die größten Konsumenten von Umweltdienstleistungen sind, deutlich auf Nachhaltigkeit orientierte Entwicklungsstrategien.



**Peter Ache**, 1960, IfR, Professor für Raumplanung, Radboud Universität in Nijmegen, Redaktion RaumPlanung



**Wolfgang Scholz**, 1964, IfR, Dr.-Ing., Lehrstuhlvertretung International Planning Studies, Fakultät Raumplanung, TU Dortmund



*The urban governance of forced displacement is becoming an increasingly important issue in many cities, like in the Colombian capital of Bogotá, © Andrew Hyde (Wikimedia)*

Eva Dick, Benjamin Schraven

# Urban governance of forced displacement:

Premises, requirements and challenges in the light of new humanitarian trends

*In academia and policy circles, there is a growing awareness about the important role of cities and urban governance in the context of forced displacement. At least two trends have played in the hands of this development: The first is a paradigm shift in humanitarian action 'from relief to development' due to which durable approaches for local and urban integration become increasingly pertinent. Second, refugee-supporting policies and practices in cities of (mostly) OECD-countries have nurtured a debate on distinct advantages and functions of local authorities as compared to actors on other levels of governance.*

**Eva Dick**, 1970, Dr., Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin im Deutschen Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Abteilung Governance, Staatlichkeit, Sicherheit



**Benjamin Schraven**, 1978, Dr., Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter im Deutschen Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Abteilung Umweltpolitik und Ressourcenmanagement



The recognition of the importance of cities and urban governance in forced displacement situations was prominently reflected in the Habitat III preparatory process (United Nations, 2015) and Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development in 2016. Its principal outcome document, the New Urban Agenda (United Nations, 2016), commits the parties to fully respecting the human rights of migrants and refugees, promoting their access to basic infrastructure, services and livelihood opportunities and to supporting local governments in strengthening dialogue in highly diverse local or urban settings.

Several responsibilities for the urban governance of forced displacement can be derived from the New Urban Agenda (NUA): The first is the provision with life-saving emergency goods like clean water, food, health and shelter (§28). But also the provision of basic infrastructures and services like access to electricity, water and sanitation, safe housing or public transport is mentioned (§34). A further and rather longer-term responsibility the Agenda points to is the support for the social and economic integration of refugees and migrants, which includes the access to local and regional labour markets and educational infrastructure and the representation and participation of "newcomers" in local social and political structures (§48). Another important dimension lies in the consideration of refugees' and migrants' translocal or transnational social networks which contribute to the flow of knowledge, goods or money between areas of origin and destination (§28). Finally, the NUA calls for the promotion of dialogue between different societal groups, amongst these refugees, as a prerequisite for social cohesion at the local urban level (§42).

This paper offers a conceptual reflection on the institutional and operational conditions for (good) urban governance in light of forced displacement. It draws from the literature on urban governance of forced displacement and mobility, studies

on urban refugees and related policy documents. A specific emphasis is placed on cities and municipalities in countries of the Global South, home to a large part of global refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). By focusing on urban forced displacement, our understanding relates to substance rather than law (Landau & Duponchel, 2011, p. 3): people deprived of their human and socio-economic rights as a result of their respective national governments' neglect (Betts, 2013, p. 2 f.). Related to this, we are aware of the fact that the line between the forcibly displaced and economic migrants is often blurred. The reason is the highly diversified and 'mixed' nature of flows in many places (Adepoju, 2016; Oucho, 2009; Chimni 2009: 12; Angenendt & Koch, 2017, p. 7).

In the following section, we outline current trends in forced displacement and related policies. On this basis, we pinpoint important premises and requirements for the urban and local governance of forced displacement. Subsequently we assess key challenges for effective implementation on the local and other levels of governance. In the conclusion we propose starting-points for the improved management of forced displacement in cities and by other levels of governance.

### Trends in forced displacement and related policies

Forced displacement is among the huge challenges of our time. This particularly applies for Africa and other regions of the Global South, since an estimated 86 percent of those who forcibly left their homes are staying in developing or emerging countries (Dick & Schraven, 2016). Contrary to public perceptions in Germany and other OECD countries, most refugees and IDPs in the global South do not live in designated camps but rather in self-organised housing arrangements (free or rental co-housing in apartments, houses or informal settlements) in existing towns and cities (IOM, 2015a, p. 92). According to the UNHCR, this is true for more than 60 percent of the World's refugees (UNHCR, 2016, p. 55) and over 80 percent of IDPs (id., 2017); according to the World Bank these shares amount to 75 and 88 percent, respectively (World Bank 2017, p. 27). Not surprisingly, there are significant regional variations. In Sub-Sahara-Africa camps provide accommodation to a relatively large proportion of more than 50 percent of refugees (id., p. 26 f.), whereas in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, it is estimated that about 88 percent of forcibly displaced persons live outside of them (UNHCR, 2016a, p. 1).

The urbanization of forced displacement mirrors global trends of the growth of cities and towns: "[I]f more than half of the world's population is urbanized, it is unsurprising that the displaced follow suit" (Landau, 2014, p. 139). But there is also an inverse relationship in that displacement itself has come to constitute an important driving factor for urbanization (ibid., p. 139; World Bank, 2017, p. 27). This being said, empirically the presence of refugees and IDPs in cities of the Global South is not entirely new. As all migrants, they are

attracted to cities due to existing economic and educational opportunities, for seeking anonymity and protection as well as services for potential onward journeys (Jacobsen, 2006, p. 277; Marconi, 2009, p. 11; Landau, 2012, p. 219). What is rather new is the prominence of the topic in global policy discourses and agendas (Kihato & Landau, 2016, p. 5), reflected for example in the diverse UNHCR policies on urban refugees (e. g. id., 2009, 2012 and 2014) and, as mentioned, the NUA of the Habitat III Conference (UN, 2016).

The latter fact can be attributed to at least two policy trends:

- **Local turn in humanitarian aid:** Historically, the humanitarian aid field focused on short-term 'relief' responses in the context of which camps were established as temporary shelter for the population in need. In this standardized proceeding rather disconnected from local environments and (political) processes, the cooperation with local or urban stakeholders was rather unusual (e. g. Meininghaus, 2016; Kihato & Landau, 2016). However, prolonged conflict or post-conflict reconstruction processes and resulting protracted displacement, imposed a humanitarian policy shift 'from relief to development' in which local authorities are perceived as increasingly crucial intermediaries and addressees (UNDP, 2016, p. 7; Bohnet, Mielke, Rudolf, Schetter & Vollmer, 2015, p. 27 f., Landau 2012a: 565). With repatriation and resettlement into third countries becoming often unrealistic or politically unviable, enhancing refugees' local integration and self-reliance appears as the most practicable durable response (Landau & Duponchel, 2011, p. 19; Kreibaum, 2016, Bohnet et al. 2015). Since most refugees live in cities, these constitute a "de facto, part of a durable solution" (Landau & Duponchel, 2011, p. 14, also Jacobsen, 2006, p. 283) albeit as yet rarely proactively pursued by local authorities (Box 1).
- **Local turn in migration and integration policies:** In the last decade or two, particularly in OECD countries, larger and smaller cities have come to formulate migrant and refugee integration policies as part of their urban or municipal plans (Gesemann & Roth 2009; Beider, Fauser & Özmal 2011). As the governmental level closest to the people, cities tend to be most directly impacted by the opportunities and challenges of (forced) immigration and best informed about their constituencies, migrant and non-migrant. In some instances, cities and municipalities have thus more proactively responded to displacement and migration-related pressures than national-level actors. The sanctuary cities movement in the USA is a case in point (Box 2), moreover transnational networks and initiatives such as Eurocities or Solidacities constitute city-led approaches towards the societal inclusion of refugees and migrants (Eurocities, 2017; NGL, 2016). Also in the non-OECD world with hitherto less awareness for the importance of local or urban governance of forced displacement, local authorities and actors have much to win and to lose from dealing with displacement regarding local stability and economic opportunities.



The municipality of Gaziantep of 1.3 million inhabitants is located in Southeastern Turkey at the Turkish-Syrian border. As of 2015, the city hosted 225,000 forcibly displaced Syrians of whom only about 15 percent were living in camps. The rest is provided housing and other support through family and other networks, not least against the background of existing trans-local ties spanning Syrian and Southern Turkish communities. With the support of the local population the city has developed a wide-ranging Social Support Programme for displaced people from Syria including emergency services, health and education provision and facilitation of legal work opportunities. It includes targeting of vulnerable groups such as refugee minors and entails collaboration between public and private stakeholders e.g. the Gaziantep Chamber of Commerce and CBOs. (IOM 2015: 94)

Box 1: Inclusionary refugee policies in Gaziantep

The Sanctuary Cities movement in the United States already dates back to the late 1970s. At that time Los Angeles and San Francisco, among the first sanctuary cities in the country, passed formal laws for the protection of displaced people from civil war-torn El Salvador and Guatemala who were not granted refugee status by the US government. It later evolved into a generalized protection for all immigrants. As of today, their example has been followed by more than 200 jurisdictions in the US. Measures typically involve the prohibition to local police and service providers to enquire into immigrants' legal status and report a person's undocumented status to federal enforcement agencies. By way of the 2014 Trust Act the entire State of California has become a sanctuary. While also being replicated by pilot municipalities in neighboring Canada, the approach has come under severe strain by the current US administration. (IOM 2015: 169, Scruggs 2017)

Box 2: Sanctuary cities in the United States



© Ridvan (Foto1a)

Figure 1: Trust created by long-standing cooperative relationships with (migrant) CBOs is crucial in situations in which undocumented refugees seek anonymity.

## Premises for the urban management of forced displacement

In light of current humanitarian pressures and some promising practices from (predominantly) Northern cities, the urban and local governance of forced displacement in the Global South should be built on the following premises:

- Efforts must reach “beyond the [current] boundaries of humanitarianism” (Landau, 2014, p. 146). Prolonged displacement periods and complex processes of return and (re-) integration (Bohnet et al. 2015, p. 5) call for a multiplication of actions as much as actors. In terms of actions,

these must span from short-term emergency responses to long-term measures geared at sustaining and strengthening livelihoods and communities. Regarding actors, humanitarian agencies should align their interventions with local governments and other stakeholders around priority concerns in areas such as housing, employment and health improvement (Kihato & Landau, 2016, p. 7; Landau, 2012, p. 564).

- Programmes and initiatives for improving access to public services, housing or employment should not only focus on refugees or other displaced population groups. They must also provide benefits to the established popu-

lation ('do no harm'), a principle increasingly highlighted in development cooperation programmes (BMZ, 2017). Although facing specific vulnerabilities and physical and mental health challenges due to the causes and trajectories of flight, economically urban-based refugees and IDPs are not necessarily more vulnerable than the established or other migrant population; research in African cities suggest a more complex picture (Landau & Duponchel, 2011, p. 13).

- Place-based support schemes are useful for providing start-up assistance to urban refugees and IDPs. Due to existing networks in the city and to income- or other constraints people displaced in urban areas are likely to (first) cluster in specific neighbourhoods (Jacobsen, 2006, p. 282). Against this background, the spatial targeting of immediate assistance for refugees or IDPs can be useful, e.g. in the form of "urban service nodes" (Dick & Schmidt-Kallert, 2011, p. 32). While such start-up services - providing information about housing and employment, health assistance, immigrant rights etc. - are vital in situations of disruption going along with displacement (Bjarnesen & Vigh, 2016, p. 12, Jacobsen), they should also be open to other groups.
- Current territorially based definitions of citizenship and related access rights to socio-economic and political participation need to be revisited. These definitions as well as protection or (housing) development schemes predispose the existence of both spatially and temporally stable communities (Bakewell, 2015; Landau & Duponchel, 2011; Landau, 2012). Against the background of dynamic movements (in- and out-of cities, as well as inside of them) and translocal/-national life realities (Bohnet et al. 2015, p. 43) in many cities and countries of the Global South, place-based identities can however not be taken for granted (Yankson & Bertrand, 2012; Landau & Duponchel, 2011, p. 17; Blaser & Landau, 2016).

### Requirements for local governments and the interplay with other levels and institutions

In order to effectively respond to forced displacement at the urban and local level, the internalisation of these premises is important. Beyond this, local authorities and institutions can be prepared for the better or the worse to mainstream displacement into existing policies and programmes. According to Blaser and Landau (2016; also Landau, 2014, p. 146; Landau & Duponchel, 2011, p. 19) the following are key conditions for effective local response across sectors: 1. Municipal officials regard human mobility as an essential part of their responsibility; 2. Data collection and management systems capture mobility dynamics and transfer them into sectoral policy and planning procedures; 3. Budgeting systems respond to rising or decreasing numbers of forcibly displaced as well as their varied service and infrastructure

needs; 4. Participatory processes are designed in an inclusive way, permitting involvement of refugees and IDPs; 5. Central or provincial/regional governments provide incentives for local performance with regard to managing displacement and mobility; and 6. Social cohesion approaches consider displacement-related challenges and conflicts.

Local and urban governments constitute increasingly important arbitrators of access to goods and services for forcibly displaced persons. However, their influence is also delimited by the interplay with other governance levels and sectors. Table 1 gives an overview concerning ideal roles of different institutions involved in the urban governance of forced displacement.

The concrete forms of interaction as well as the capacities and freedom of discretion of cities and municipalities regarding displacement are determined by available resources and political and institutional factors of the respective host country (Jacobsen, 2006, p. 278). These comprise of: the level of ratification of international refugee and IDP-norms, national refugee- and migration-related legislation and bureaucracy, the political weight of displacement in the context of wider domestic interests, the form of decentralization in a country, the overall degree of (fragile) statehood and bureaucratic traditions or cultures that are more or less in favor with the inclusion of immigrants.

### Implementation-related challenges

Despite increased policy attention and substantive arguments supporting the local and urban governance of forced displacement, programmatic and implementation shifts are only slowly coming by.

Current challenges regarding implementation are related to limited awareness, low political interest and capacity constraints on different levels of governance:

- Local level: With regard to the requirements pointed out above, many local governments and administrations are poorly prepared for protecting and integrating forcibly displaced persons. In large part this is due to limited technical and financial capacities; for example, in many cities of the global South with high refugee and immigrant influx, urban or local offices for refugee reception and support are not up to the task (Jacobsen, 2006, p. 281; Landau & Duponchel, 2011, p. 16 f.). Such situation also enhances the potential for xenophobic aggressions by the police and general public (id., 17; Carciotto & Orsi, 2017, p. 24). Politically, in environments where the established population is also highly vulnerable the integration of refugees, forcibly displaced and also returnees is often a low priority (Bohnet et al. 2015, p. 29; Jacobsen, 2006, p. 283). Moreover, local authorities are likely to refrain from measures which are unpopular to their voting constituencies (Kihato & Landau, 2016, p. 7 f.).

Institution/Actor	Sub-type	Role
National government institutions	Institutions in charge of ensuring national local coordination and dialogue	Sharing of information and data, coherence between national and local policies
	Ministries/departments in charge of displacement and sectoral policies	Devising implementation approaches and resources, i.a. on settlement and integration
	Legislation bodies	Ratification of international refugee and IDP norms, definition of refugee and relevant sectoral rights (residence, health and education, employment etc.)
Local government institutions	Government/councils/etc.	Responsible for the regional/municipal policies and the coordination of urban and governance of displacement
	Technical bureaucracy and services, including policing	Responsible for the implementation of refugee reception policies as well as protection services.
Refugees/IDPs	Displaced people in the concerned locality	Self-organisation and -help, link between home and host locality
Civil Society	Local, regional, national and international CSOs	Advocacy, expertise, service provision, consultation, fundraising
Private Sector	Various (including media)	Support of employment and training, funding, communication
Academia	Academic institutions and training institutions	Data collection and analysis, capacity building, awareness raising
International actors	International, regional and bilateral organizations	Formulation of international refugee/IDP norms and approaches for refugee settlement and integration, funding and capacity-building, facilitation of transnational cooperation.

© Own compilation (adjustment of IOM, 2015b, p. 24)

Tab. 1: Idealtypical roles in urban and local governance of forced displacement

- National level: Due to a common perception of refugees as threats to domestic security and social stability as well as a social and economic burden, most governments do not promote their societal and urban integration. Rather, many governments in the Global South pursue encampment policies which imply enhanced levels of control by state or humanitarian actors. For example, in the Horn of Africa region in all countries except Uganda governmental assistance to refugees is only provided in camps (Kreibaum, 2016; for Kenya Betts, 2013, p. 147; Jacobsen, 2006, p. 283). Nor do national governments tend to provide political, financial or capacity-related support or incentives for the local management of displacement reinforcing a lack of political will and resources.
- International level: Despite a longstanding focus on encampment, the topic of urban refugees as well as reflections on an adequate urban refugee policy has been on the agenda of UNHCR for more than a decade (Jacobsen, 2006, p. 273 f.). Advantages of urban areas for advancing

forcibly displaced persons' self-reliance and promoting integration are recognized in several recent policy frameworks (UNHCR, 2014, 2012 and 2009). However, strategies and instruments for implementation in an urban and local context as well as working through local authorities are still wanting (Landau & Duponchel, 2011, p. 19). Inversely, in development cooperation the sustainable integration of refugees and IDPs in urban and other local areas is only beginning to emerge as an activity focus (BMZ, 2017).

## Recommendations

In line with general agenda setting, also the New Urban Agenda has defined comprehensive normative targets for the management and better protection of forcibly displaced people and migrants in urban areas. For the effective operationalization of these targets, matters of awareness, political interests and resources of different actors at different levels and in various sectors are relevant and need to be addressed:

- Awareness: Humanitarian agencies must be sensitized that effective humanitarian or developmental engagement at the urban or local level requires intensive consultations with local actors, both formal and informal. National and local governments need to be made aware on the possible social and economic benefits – “expanding markets, importing new skills, creating transnational linkages” (Jacobsen, 2006, p. 283) - of well-managed integration processes of refugees and displaced people.
- Political will: Both among national governments and local authorities, refugee and IDP policies tend to be of low profile on their political agendas. International humanitarian and development agencies need to promote refugees and IDP’s rights, but also try to ‘stealthily’ (Landau/Kihato 2016) enhance protection by lobbying for improved employment, education and housing on the local level. Moreover, raising awareness about the possible economic and social contributions of refugees and displaced, as well as communicating the risks of ignoring issues of displacement is important.
- Resources: UN organisations such as UNHCR need to intensify their efforts towards a more effective cooperation with local and urban actors and institutions. For this to happen, new forms of inter-agency cooperation with development organisations (UNDP, Worldbank, NGOs etc.) experienced in place-based urban development and planning processes is important. While (territorial) community-based approaches are instrumental for start-up assistance to recent arrivals among the displaced, they are of limited use for longer term protection and integration schemes. An enabling legal and funding environment on the national level is also key. ■

## References

- > Adepoju, A. (2016): *Migration within and from Africa. Shared policy challenges for Africa and Europe. Research overview 5.* Stockholm: Delmi.
- > Angenendt, S. & Koch, A. (2017): ‘Global Migration Governance’ im Zeitalter gemischter Wanderungen. *Folgerungen für eine entwicklungsorientierte Migrationspolitik. SWP-Studie 8, April 2017.* Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik.
- > Beider, H., Fauser, M. & Özmal, L. (2011): *Integration in Deutschland, Spanien und Großbritannien – ein Vergleich.* In: *RaumPlanung* 155, 88-93.
- > Betts, A. (2013): *Survival migration – Failed governance and the crisis of displacement.* Cornell University Press: Ithaca, London.
- > Bjarnesen, J. & Vigh, H. (2016): *Displacement and emplacement. Introduction: The dialectics of displacement and emplacement.* In: *Conflict and society: Advances in research* 2, 9–15.
- > Blaser, C. & Landau, L. (2016): *The governance of multiple elsewhere: Evaluating municipalities’ response to mobility.* *Trialog* 116/117 (1-2), 33-38.
- > Bohnet, H., Mielke, K., Rudolf, M., Schetter, C. & Vollmer, R. (2015): *Protected rather than protracted: Strengthening displaced persons in peace processes.* BICC-Working Paper 3. Bonn: Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC).
- > Chimni, B.S. (2009): *The birth of a ‘discipline’: From refugee to forced migration studies.* In: *Journal of Refugee Studies* 22 (1). Doi: 10.1093/jrs/fen051
- > Dick, E. & Schraven, B. (2016): *Die globale Flüchtlingskrise: Die zentrale Rolle der Städte. Die aktuelle Kolumne, 02.05.2016.* Bonn: Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE).
- > Dick, E. & Schmidt-Kallert, E. (2011): *Understanding the (mega-) urban from the rural: Non-permanent migration and multi-locational households.* *disP – The Planning Review*, 187 (4), 24-36.
- > Gesemann, F. / Roth, R. (Hrsg.): *Lokale Integrationspolitik in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft. Migration und Integration als Herausforderung von Kommunen.* VS: Wiesbaden, 71-88.
- > IOM (2015a): *World Migration Report. Migrants and cities.* Geneva.
- > IOM (2015b): *White paper: Mainstreaming migration into local development planning and beyond.* Geneva, New York: International Organization for Migration (IOM) Joint Migration and Development Initiative & United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
- > Jacobsen, K. (2006): *Refugees and asylum seekers in urban areas: A livelihoods perspective. Editorial introduction.* In: *Journal of Refugee Studies* 19 (3). doi:10.1093/jrs/felo17
- > Kreibaum, M. (2016): *Build towns instead of camps: Uganda as an example of integrative refugee policy.* Briefing Paper 19/2016. Bonn: Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE).
- > Landau, L. (2014): *Urban refugees and IDPs.* In: Fiddian-Quasmieh, E., Loescher, G., Long, K. and Sigona, N. (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies.* Oxford University Press. Unpublished proof version.
- > Landau, L. (2012): *Communities of knowledge or tyrannies of partnership: Reflections on North-South research networks and the dual imperative.* In: *Journal of Refugee Studies* 25 (4). Doi:10.1093/jrs/fes005
- > Landau, L. & Duponchel, M. (2011): *Laws, policies, or social protection? Capabilities and the determinants of effective protection in four African cities.* In: *Journal of Refugee Studies* 24 (1). Doi: 10.1093/jrs/feq049
- > Marconi, G. 2009: *Migrants stranded at the border of their dream: Learning from transit cities in Mexico and Turkey.* In: *Trialog* 2. 8 – 12.
- > Meininghaus, E. (2016): *Humanitarianism in intra-state conflict: aid inequality and local governance in government and opposition-controlled areas in the Syrian war.* *Third World Quarterly*, 37 (8), 1454-1482.
- > Oucho, J. (2009): *Voluntary versus forced migration in Sub-sahara Africa.* In: Fischer, C. & Vollmer, R. (Ed.): *Brief 39 Migration and Displacement in Sub-Saharan Africa. The Security-Migration Nexus II.* Bonn: Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC), 11-19.
- > United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2016): *Global Trends: Forced displacement in 2016.* Geneva. In: <http://www.unhcr.org/statistics/unhcrstats/5943e8a34/>

- global-trends-forced-displacement-2016.html
- > United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2016a): *UNHCR Diagnostic tool for alternatives to camps. 2016 results in the Middle East and North Africa*. Geneva. In: <http://www.unhcr.org/576bc1f67>.
  - > United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2014): *Policy on alternatives to camps*. Geneva.
  - > United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2012): *The implementation of policy on refugee protection and solutions in urban areas*. Geneva.
  - > United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2009): *Policy on refugee protection and solutions in urban areas*. Geneva.
  - > Yankson, P. W. K. & Bertrand, M. (2012): *Challenges of urbanization in Ghana*. In: Schandorf, E. A., Yankson, P. W. K. & Bertrand, M. (Ed.): *The mobile city of Accra. Urban families, housing and residential practices*. Dakar: CODESRIA, 3-46.
- ### Internet links
- > Bakewell, O. (2015): *The changing face of social protection in African cities*. University of Oxford Podcasts. Website: <http://podcasts.ox.ac.uk/changing-face-social-protection-african-cities>
  - > BMZ (2017): *Cash for Work*. Website: [http://www.bmz.de/de/themen/Sonderinitiative-Fluchtursachen-bekaempfen-Fluechtlinge-reintegrieren/cash\\_for\\_work/index.jsp](http://www.bmz.de/de/themen/Sonderinitiative-Fluchtursachen-bekaempfen-Fluechtlinge-reintegrieren/cash_for_work/index.jsp)
  - > Eurocities (2017): *Working group Migration and Integration*. Website: [http://www.eurocities.eu/eurocities/working\\_groups/Migration-and-integration-@tpl=home](http://www.eurocities.eu/eurocities/working_groups/Migration-and-integration-@tpl=home)
  - > Kihato, C. & L. Landau (2016): *Stealth humanitarianism: Negotiating politics, precarity and performance management in protecting the urban displaced*. *Journal of Refugee Studies*. Website: <https://academic.oup.com/jrs/article/doi/10.1093/jrs/few031/2567208/Stealth-Humanitarianism-Negotiating-Politics>
  - > NGL (2017): *Solidacities – a meeting of citizens for the right to asylum and refuge*. Website: <http://www.guengl.eu/news/article/events/solidacities>
  - > UNHCR (2017): *Urban refugees*. Website: <http://www.unhcr.org/urban-refugees.html>
  - > Scruggs, G. (2017): *Canada experiments with U.S. ‘sanctuary city’ model*. *Aus Citiscope*. Website: <http://citiscopes.org/story/2017/canada-experiments-us-sanctuary-city-model>
  - > United Nations (2015): *Migrants and refugees in urban areas*. *Habitat III Issue Papers*. Website: [http://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/Habitat-III-Issue-Paper-2\\_2\\_Migration-and-Refugees-in-Urban-Areas-2.o.pdf](http://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/Habitat-III-Issue-Paper-2_2_Migration-and-Refugees-in-Urban-Areas-2.o.pdf)
  - > United Nations (UN) (2017): *Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 23 December 2016. 71/ 256*. *New Urban Agenda*. Website: <http://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/New-Urban-Agenda-GA-Adopted-68th-Plenary-N1646655-E.pdf>
  - > United Nations (2016): *New Urban Agenda. As adopted by the UN General Assembly*. Website: <http://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/New-Urban-Agenda-GA-Adopted-68th-Plenary-N1646655-E.pdf> (last accessed 27 July 2016)
  - > UNDP (2016): *Local governance in fragile and conflict-affected settings: Building a resilient foundation for peace and development*. Website: [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Democratic%20Governance/Local%20Governance/Guide\\_Local\\_Governance\\_in\\_Fragile\\_and\\_Conflict\\_Settings.pdf?download](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Democratic%20Governance/Local%20Governance/Guide_Local_Governance_in_Fragile_and_Conflict_Settings.pdf?download)
  - > UNHCR s.a.: *Convention and protocol relating to the status of refugees. 60 years of UNHCR*. Website: <http://www.unhcr.org/protect/PROTECTION/3b66c2aa10.pdf>
  - > World Bank (2017): *Toward a development approach supporting refugees, the internally displaced, and their hosts*. Website: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/25016/9781464809385.pdf?sequence=11&isAllowed=y>

Schlüsselwörter: Städtische Governance, Flucht, Vertreibung, humanitäre Hilfe, urban refugees  
Keywords: Urban governance, forced displacement, humanitarian aid, urban refugees

Zusammenfassung: Die Rolle von Städten und Kommunen im Umgang mit Flucht und Vertreibung erfährt aktuell wachsende internationale Aufmerksamkeit. Dies spiegelt sich auch in der New Urban Agenda, dem Ergebnisdokument der Habitat III Konferenz, wider. Basierend auf Literaturrecherche und der Analyse von Politikdokumenten untersucht der vorliegende Beitrag Voraussetzungen und Herausforderungen für städtische und Mehrebenen-Governance von Flucht und Vertreibung. Den Autoren zufolge setzt eine erfolgreiche Umsetzung voraus, dass Bewusstsein, politischer Wille und Ressourcen für die lokale Dimension von Flucht und Vertreibung erhöht werden. Zudem ist ein Mainstreaming von Fluchtbelangen in verschiedenen Sektoren der Stadtplanung und -entwicklung notwendig.

Abstract: Alongside general international policy trends, the New Urban Agenda, key outcome document of the Habitat III process, places strong emphasis on the role of cities and municipalities in the governance of forced displacement. Based on the review of literature and policy papers and the assessment of current humanitarian and urban governance approaches, this paper assesses requirements and challenges for local/urban governments in the management of forced displacement, as well as issues arising in their interaction with other government levels and societal sectors. The authors argue that for an effective implementation, enhancing awareness, political will and available resources on all levels of government will be instrumental.