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INTRODUCTION

In 2008, some 50 percent of the world’s 6.7 billion people were estimated to be living in urban areas for the first time in history. Approximately 30 percent of these urban dwellers are living in ‘slums’. By 2030, 40 percent of the world’s population are expected to be rural dwellers and 60 percent urban (El Sioufi, 2009). By 2050, the world’s population is expected to be 9.2 billion, of which more than six billion people will be living in urban areas. By this time, the population of urban areas will outstrip those living in rural areas.

In all parts of the world, the growth of towns and cities is being subject to new and influential forces which are requiring stakeholders to rethink how best to manage the urbanisation process. The current millennium, especially the post 2005 period, has seen the elevation of new drivers of urban change in the Pacific Region, specifically climate change, natural disasters and the global economic financial crisis (Jones, 2010). These drivers have amplified and further highlighted the adverse symptoms of the urbanisation process, including food insecurity, increasing informality, resource depletion, a declining law and order situation and environmental decline.

As seen in the diversity of towns and cities in the Pacific Region — from the region’s largest city of Port Moresby in Melanesia, to the smaller atoll and island towns and cities in Micronesia and Polynesia, such as South Tarawa, Apia and Rarotonga — the form of the development impact and how it is expressed at the city and town level, is strongly shaped by national and local factors. The parameters affecting such development in Pacific Island Countries (PICs), includes not only rates of economic growth, but also governance arrangements, implementable policies and plans, public sector capacity and leadership (National Research Institute, 2010). Addressing these and other urbanisation concerns all need to figure strongly in renewed efforts by policy makers to better manage the urbanisation process, especially if (i) towns and cities are to be sustainable;¹ and (ii) sustainable urbanisation and its benefits are to be achieved (see Annex A).

At the Pacific Region level, a key first step for policy makers in managing the urbanisation process should be the setting of regional urbanisation development goals and indicators. These are building blocks necessary to provide a solid foundation for trend identification to underpin more effective policy and project formulation and implementation in urban areas, both regionally as well as within PICs. Although global development goals and indicators have been set based on thematic and policy lines, such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and the UN-Habitat having developed global urban indicators to monitor the Habitat Agenda, the Pacific Region has fallen through the gap in not having any systematic regional urban indicator data.

While there have been calls for improvement in the quality and coverage of Pacific regional development statistics (SPC, 2009), moves to up-scale the collection and analysis of urban data remain absent. Such information is necessary for policy
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makers to: i) monitor and understand the condition and performance of growing Pacific towns and cities; (ii) strengthen current and proposed Pacific regional and national urban policies, projects and programs; and (iii) contribute to the credibility and robustness of national, regional and overarching global development indicators.

Prominent regional development agencies such as AusAID and the ADB have provided strong analysis of economic trends and development performance at the regional and PIC level. For example, the AusAID 2009 report on tracking development and governance in the Pacific region found that collectively, PICs were off target to meet the MDGs by 2015 (AusAID, 2009a). Others, such as the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), have collated PIC census population data, including demographic projections, while the Commonwealth Local Government Forum (CLGF) Pacific Project has gathered governance indicators from urban local level government at the PIC level in Fiji.

Despite such efforts, and noting that some 50 percent of the population of the Pacific Region live in towns and cities, there has been no comparable work carried out on understanding the regional and national condition and performance of urban areas. The potential for getting more out of development efforts in PIC towns and cities is being foregone. Pacific regional data collection, analysis and reporting on national, city and town level urban issues based on agreed Pacific urbanisation goals and indicators, is an essential step towards monitoring trends in town and city development and their contribution to national and Pacific regional development (Storey, 2010).

In this context, the purpose of this report is to:
  i) overview the unique nature of Pacific urbanisation, the diversity of Pacific towns and cities and major urban growth challenges arising at the PIC and Pacific Regional level;
  ii) outline the position on Pacific Region development indicators, including the status of Pacific urbanisation goals, indicators and performance levels;
  iii) develop the arguments for the development of a set of Pacific urbanisation development goals and indicators which can be applied by policy makers at the PIC level and collated at the Pacific Regional level; and
  iv) suggest a framework of Pacific urbanisation development goals and indicators, which policy makers can build upon at both the PIC and Pacific Regional level.

A key feature of Pacific urbanisation is the diversity of towns and cities in terms of population, geographical setting, the urban issues arising and factors affecting their evolution. Throughout the paper, the urban condition of Port Moresby and Papua New Guinea (PNG) is highlighted. The key reason for this is that Port Moresby is the Pacific Region’s largest city, whilst PNG contains the largest number of urban residents (1 million persons) and the highest number of cities and towns in the Pacific Region. (twenty, comprising three formally declared cities and seventeen provincial towns) Furthermore, in 2010, PNG completed the most recent national urbanisation policy in the Pacific Region, namely, the National Urbanisation Policy for PNG, 2010–2020.
SECTION 1: UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE AND DIVERSITY OF PACIFIC URBANISATION, TOWNS AND CITIES

The Physical Setting

Understanding the varying physical setting and scale of PICs is essential to understanding the diversity in island settings, including urban growth. The Pacific Region contains some 7,500 scattered islands of varying origins including coralline islands (either as low atolls or raised islands), islands of volcanic derivation and 'continental' islands. The islands have great diversity and complexity, resulting in their delineation into three geographic divisions — Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia. These sub-regional areas describe the three main social, cultural and geographical areas of the Western, North-Western and Central-Eastern Pacific, as first used by Europeans in the 1800s (Jones, 1997).

Melanesia means the 'black islands' and is derived from the word melanin, which is the blackish or brown pigment which is characteristic of the dark-skinned peoples of Melanesia. This area covers the larger islands closer to the east coast of Australia such as PNG, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands and Fiji, and includes the indigenous coastal dwellers of the South-West Pacific. These islands dominate both the land mass and populations, including urban, in the Pacific Region. Micronesia, meaning the 'small islands', is a collective term for the 2,000 plus islands and atolls to the north of Melanesia, and a narrow Polynesian corridor linking the Society Islands with South-East Asia. Polynesia, termed the 'many islands', includes the scattered islands in the Central Pacific such as Tonga, Samoa, Niue and the Cook Islands (ibid., 1997).
The Nature of Pacific Urbanisation

Urbanisation is the process of transition associated with the movement of people from rural areas to towns and cities, and the major economic, social and environmental change that accompanies this process. In the Pacific Region, urbanisation is a recent and cross-cutting phenomenon (ibid., 2007). The growth of urban areas in the Pacific Region has been characterised by population movement, growing urban based economies and demographic change, all set in the context of generally mediocre PIC economic performance. Pacific urbanisation has seen pronounced changes in:

- physical patterns of towns and cities;
- behaviour, including values, norms, attitudes and expectations;
- consumption patterns;
- shift from community control systems to State rules and regulations; and
- lifestyle — family and social changes including use of customary land as a commodity.

The definition of urbanisation in the Pacific context is unique, and understanding its evolution and how it plays out in PICs is essential to responding to Pacific urban growth issues. The urbanisation of Pacific cities and towns accelerated in the post colonial era after PICs gained independence. The colonial administrators, such as the Germans, British and Australians, oversaw well laid out service towns based on survey plans and the provision of basic infrastructure and services, including roads and ports.

The administrators were strict in dealing with rural urban migrants who did not have authorisation to travel. Anyone without formal permission to work and live in a town was sent back to their village. After independence, the regulatory approach to restricted movement was downgraded, and the tide of free and uncontrolled movement commenced. The fabric of towns and cities was slowly transformed, with urban villages, towns and cities becoming a melting pot of modern and traditional ways (Jones, 2010).

As PICs have become urbanised, the towns and cities have grown faster than rural areas. As PIC economies have developed, an increasing share of national wealth; that is, gross domestic product (GDP), has been produced in urban areas. Urban economic activities have strengthened the viability of rural economic development by providing markets, processing centres and trans-shipment points for rural produce and goods. In this context, urbanisation in PICs can be viewed as the spatial translation of the production structure of their economies across varied geographical island settings. In some PICs, this has been characterised by a relative declining share of primary (rural agricultural) production sectors and an increased share of secondary, industrial and tertiary service sectors, all primarily located within urban areas. Both rural and urban areas remain economically and socially connected, and one cannot understand the condition of urban areas without understanding the economic and social underpinnings of rural areas, and vice versa (Government of Fiji, 2004).

The symptoms of the urbanisation process in PIC towns and cities have led to increasing pressure on urban services and infrastructure, such as local road
networks, water supplies, sanitation, land supply and garbage collection and disposal, as well as governance and institutional arrangements (Jones, 2005). The unlocking and mobilisation of land for urban development, primarily customary lands such as in the case of PNG, continues to be a major cross-cutting theme which distinguishes the Pacific urbanisation process from urbanisation in other world regions. Other features of PIC urbanisation, such as income inequality and poverty, growing peri-urban areas, rising youth numbers and limited institutional and technical capacity, are now commonplace in all less developed countries (UN-Habitat, 2009).

The Rural Village in the City

Central to the process of Pacific urbanisation is understanding the dynamics of the varying PIC socio-cultural orders and how they play out in the urban setting. The socio cultural order comprises those norms, values, attitudes and aspirations that glue or bind, to varying degrees, households, kin and other societal groups within PICs. The socio cultural order (not discrete factors) constrains or promotes the way islanders participate in their economic, social and political way of life, including resolving, coping and adapting to urban management issues (Jones, 1997).

As rural urban migration to towns and cities has continued, the concept of the ‘rural village in the city’ has become a key feature of the urban form of Pacific towns and cities. The author defines the notion of the ‘rural village in the city’ as the expansion of squatter and informal settlements, which exhibit the physical, social and cultural characteristics of rural villages, including ethnic and kinship groups, but within an urban setting. It has been recognised for some time that more and more people are moving to towns and cities, but think, live and behave like rural villagers within the urban context (see, for example, Connell and Lea, 2002).

This trend is common in all Pacific towns and cities, and is most pronounced in the patterns of urban growth as seen in the larger towns and cities of Melanesia. As a result, the fabric of Pacific towns and cities are now a mix of (i) permanent and semi permanent villages, comprising informal settlements, formal settlements and traditional villages, such as in Port Moresby, Suva or Apia, for example, and to a lesser degree, (ii) planned residential areas with housing of various standards, increasingly masked with security grills and fencing to address urban security concerns. Where informal settlements, formal settlements and traditional villages continue to expand rapidly in terms of number and size, such as in Port Moresby, then ‘village cities’ will become the future urban form and structure of major Pacific towns and cities.

In Port Moresby, for example, settlements cater for just under half of the urban population, namely, 200 000 persons, who are spread over 99 settlements and have been characterised as carrying out a traditional way of life (UN-Habitat, 2004; UN-Habitat, 2008). In the Pacific Region, the urban villages and settlements, illegal or otherwise, have strong kinship and ethnic ties to rural areas and, or outer islands. Port Moresby settlements have been described as ‘cosmopolitan networks of tribal groupings or anarchical sub-cultures, which have been defined by ethnicity and regionalism within an urban context’ (Muke, Mangi and Kimbu, 2001:7).

---

Settlements are now a permanent and increasingly dominant feature emanating from the urbanisation process in the Pacific Region. The robust social, cultural and economic connectivity between urban and rural areas, including affiliation to ethnic and kinship groups, land, outer islands and the like, reinforces the perspective that the urban-rural divide is best viewed as a continuum, rather than a rigid dichotomy.

The blending of the socio cultural order into the urbanisation process shaping Pacific cities and towns, including the control systems, processes and mechanisms that apply in the rural village context, has been termed the cultural permeation of urban areas (Office of Urbanisation, 2010). This concept, developed in the PNG setting to explain how 'traditional' norms and values interface within the urban setting, is fundamental to understanding the patterns of Pacific urbanisation.

Within the context of a myriad lifestyles applying in rural and urban areas, the manner in which such changes associated with the urbanisation process are played out in day to day life in PIC towns and cities are summarised in Table 1. The features of the socio cultural order will vary for each PIC. The manner in which such features are expressed and played out, not only within urban areas but also within the rural setting, will be different for ethnic, kin and other groups. As such, it is important that the categorisation into rural and urban, as shown in Table 1, is seen as a continuum, rather than separate and discrete entities.
Table 1: Pacific Urbanisation — Modifying Rural Urban Lifestyles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIC Socio-Cultural Feature</th>
<th>Features as Expressed in the Contemporary Rural Setting</th>
<th>Features as Expressed in the Urban Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marriage</td>
<td>• can be prearranged – no say in choice of husband or wife;</td>
<td>• larger choice of partner;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• may involve ‘bride price’ payment;</td>
<td>• women especially have greater freedom from village – family socio cultural ties and restrictions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• large ceremonial obligations involving family, village, clan, tribe and so on; and</td>
<td>• choice of venue and ceremony; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• marriage restricted to being within similar island – geographic group, tribe, clan or cultural group.</td>
<td>• marriage within or outside of settlement and urban village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Births and Deaths</td>
<td>• large ceremony on reaching one year of age;</td>
<td>• mourning for a death can be over a lengthy and extended period;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• death is mourned by family and clan – all work stops;</td>
<td>• burial can occur over extended period;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• burial within 2–3 days; and</td>
<td>• mortuary allows longer period while waiting for family members; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• burial place can be next to house.</td>
<td>• use of public cemetery for burial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Language</td>
<td>• own dialect in homogenous groups; and</td>
<td>• exposure to English;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• dialect not physically recorded.</td>
<td>• use of pidgin;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• English training centres;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• exposure to range of dialects; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• *exposure to a range of languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Economic Activity and Development</td>
<td>• development based on subsistence and or cash farming of varying commercial scale;</td>
<td>• greater need for cash for survival;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• for some, work only carried out as needs have to be met;</td>
<td>• varying levels of informal and formal sector;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• informal sector employment; and</td>
<td>• employment and opportunities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• *little regulation.</td>
<td>• residents have some or no gardens;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• reliance on local produce and imported goods;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• rules and laws impact on business; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dress and Appearance</td>
<td>• traditional dress reflects importance and seniority; and</td>
<td>• dress modern style anytime;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• dresses and ceremony on special occasions.</td>
<td>• dancing and recreation anytime; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• no peer group pressure on style – type of dress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Housing</td>
<td>• traditional design;</td>
<td>• permanent and semi-permanent materials used;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• traditional materials mixed with permanent materials (roofing iron, blocks, etc);</td>
<td>• modern house provides many functions; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• special built structures reflect functionality; and</td>
<td>• connected to modern services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• accommodates extended family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kinship Arrangements</td>
<td>• strong kinship arrangements handed down through generations;</td>
<td>• concerned with only immediate social and biological kin;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• social and biological basis;</td>
<td>• can mix with any group;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• socialise within kinship group;</td>
<td>• breakdown of parental and wider family care;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• strong family and wider clan care and control of children; and</td>
<td>• heterogeneous communities – migration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• homogeneous communities based on unity of families and clans.</td>
<td>• maybe individual rather than whole of family; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• urbanisation impacts on children including dietary changes, abuse, exploitation, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Land</th>
<th>9. Settlement Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• primarily in customary ownership;</td>
<td>• dwellings in contained village;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• family and wider group such as clan involved in land distribution;</td>
<td>• arrangement or dispersed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• land rights oral – not recorded in writing;</td>
<td>• traditional layout of buildings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• land use rights can be fluid and not definitive; and</td>
<td>• low density, minimal or no reticulated;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• lands associated with families, clans and tribes.</td>
<td>• services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• land can be freehold, lease or customary arrangement;</td>
<td>• village occupants associated with clear land areas for gardening and farming; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• land has greater economic use and value;</td>
<td>• limited transport systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• land ownership endorsed by Courts and recorded in registers;</td>
<td>• planned and unplanned settlements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• land used as a commodity;</td>
<td>• varying degree of services and infrastructure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• individual title can be given to land; and</td>
<td>• high density;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• informal arrangements on use and ownership.</td>
<td>• western style architecture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• environmental degradation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• access to airports and ports – greater flexibility of movement; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• high urban security, law and order concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from the Office of Urbanisation, 2010.

Urban Population Trends

In the Pacific Region, the 2010 midyear population estimate by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) was 9.8 million persons, with growth showing two main trends (see Table 2). Firstly, there are those PICs whose growth is low, being below one percent (Marshall Islands, Samoa, Tonga and Tuvalu), or who exhibit negative growth due to emigration and lower fertility rates (Niue and Tokelau). Secondly, there are those PICs that are growing rapidly at around approximately two percent or higher (PNG, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Nauru and Kiribati). The overall regional population remains predominantly rural, mainly because of the impact of the larger Melanesian countries, especially PNG. These countries are comparatively rich in biodiversity and land mass, and well endowed with renewable and non renewable resources (Wickham, Kinch and Lal, 2009).

In the context of overall population trends, the growth of towns and cities continues to rise. Based on the last census populations of PICs, the average percentage share of urban populations in PICs was approximately 50 percent.\(^3\) In terms of actual persons living in Pacific towns and cities, just over 2.5 million persons (26 percent) were residing in urban areas, based on the 2010 Pacific Region population of 9.8 million persons. However, for reasons outlined later, the actual number of persons living in PIC urban areas is greatly under enumerated, and regionally is likely to be much higher.

While the number of Pacific islanders living in urban areas is skewed by the impact of the larger populations of PNG, Solomon Islands and Fiji, towns and cities right across the Pacific Region are now home to an increasing number of urban dwellers. Urban growth in the region is strong, with some 17 of the 21 PICs in Table 2 having 20 percent or more of their populations residing in urban areas, while some nine of

\(^3\) This is the average of the urban population share in all PICs. Estimate excludes Wallis and Futuna, and Tokelau.
the 21 PICs have 50 percent or more of their populations living in urban areas. Urbanisation rates have been highest in Micronesia. Significantly, in nearly all PICs, urban growth rates outstrip national growth rates. Urbanisation would be higher in some PICs if not for emigration, which has capped population growth rates in PICs such as Samoa, Tonga and Cook Islands, while others have had negative population growth such as Niue and Tokelau.

### Table 2: Key Population Indicators for Pacific Island Countries, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country and Pacific Sub-Region</th>
<th>Mid-Year Population Estimate (2010)</th>
<th>Population Growth Rate (%)</th>
<th>Capital City or Town</th>
<th>Last Inter-Census Annual Urban Growth Rate (%)</th>
<th>Urban Population (%)</th>
<th>Land area (km)</th>
<th>Last Inter-Census Annual Growth Rate Rural (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melanesia</td>
<td>8,641,883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji Islands</td>
<td>847,793</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Suva</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18,271</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>6,744,955</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Port Moresby</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>462,824</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Is.</td>
<td>549,574</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Honiara</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28,370</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>245,036</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Port Vila</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12,190</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>254,525</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Noumea</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18,576</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polynesia</td>
<td>663,795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>15,708</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Rarotonga</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>183,123</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Apia</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>103,365</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Nuku'alofa</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>11,149</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Funafuti</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>65,896</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Pago</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57,291</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokelau</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>Nukunono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallis and Futuna</td>
<td>13,256</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>Mata-Utu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,445</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>268,767</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Papeete</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>259,706</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitcairn Is.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td>547,345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>111,364</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Kolonia</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>100,835</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>South Tarawa</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Is.</td>
<td>54,439</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Majuro</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>9,976</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Yaren</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>20,518</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Koror</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>187,140</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Hagatna</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>154,805</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mariana Is.</td>
<td>63,072</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>Saipan</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69,221</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from SPC Pacific Island Population Estimates and Projections, September, 2010.*

Most Pacific island urban residents are to be found in the larger PICs comprising Melanesia — 1 608 959 million persons out of a total sub regional population 2010 estimate of 8 641 883 million. The largest proportions of urban populations are found
in Micronesia, followed by Polynesia and Melanesia (see Figure 1). In Micronesia, four out of seven PICs feature urban populations in excess of 60 percent. The difference in scale between the largest PIC land mass, PNG, and the remainder of PICs — PNG having some 6.7 million people or 68 percent of the regional population of 9.8 million persons — is reflected in the fact that the largest urban populations and the largest city in the Pacific Region are to be found in PNG. Based on the last PNG Census in 2000, the urbanisation rate for PNG was 13 percent or some 674 802 persons in PNG towns and cities (National Statistical Office, 2003). In 2010, it is estimated the urban population of PNG was approximately one million persons (Office of Urbanisation, 2010). This PNG urban population is more than the entire 2010 populations of the Pacific sub regions of Polynesia (663 795 persons) and Micronesia (547 345 persons).

**Figure 1: Urban Share (%) by Pacific Subregion**

![Image of bar chart showing urban share by Pacific subregions]

**Insights into Port Moresby — the Largest City in the Pacific Region**

While PNG may have one of the lowest rates of urban growth in the Pacific Region — some 13 percent in 2000 — it has the largest number of urban residents. PNG also has the highest number of towns and cities in the Pacific Region, namely, three formally declared cities (Port Moresby (the primate city), as well as Lae and Mt. Hagen) and 19 provincial towns (Office of Urbanisation, 2010). According to the 2000 Census, the population of the capital Port Moresby was 254 158 persons, or just over one third of the then total PNG urban population of 675 403 persons (National Statistical Office, 2003). In 2008, the population of Port Moresby was estimated at approximately 410 000 persons (UN-Habitat, 2008), and in 2010 is estimated to account for approximately 45 percent of the national urban population of one million persons.4

Port Moresby sits within the National Capital District (NCD), a province of some 240 km², and while classified as urban, contains peri urban villages and a rural hinterland. Between 1980 and 2000, the annual average growth rate of Port Moresby

---

4 Per conversation with Office of Urbanisation, Port Moresby, November, 2010.
was four percent, with some 58 percent of the NCD population being migrants from other provinces. The 2000 Census estimated 90 percent of these migrants had moved to Port Moresby in the 1990–2000 period, with most migrants taking up occupation in the settlements (Chand and Yala, 2008). This population movement has created a landless class of migrants living in squatter settlements in and around Port Moresby (Government of PNG, 2004). The situation has been exacerbated by a wider PNG housing sector which is ‘in crisis’ and in need of urgent attention, including (i) increasing the availability of land for housing; and (ii) adopting measures to attract greater private sector investment in land development and housing construction (Gouy, Kapa, Mokae and Levantis, 2010).

In Port Moresby, the population growth tends to be focused in the settlements, which continue to expand and develop in PNG cities and towns without adherence to any formal rules and regulations (Alaluku, 2010). Settlements are now a permanent feature of the fabric of all Pacific towns and cities, and Port Moresby is no exception. The Port Moresby settlements are effectively ad hoc housing areas, often illegal and containing squatters, and are located on both State and customary land. Approximately 40 percent of land in Port Moresby is customary. The remaining 60 percent is alienated land, and comprises a mixture of freehold and State lands (UN-Habitat, 2008). The customary land is owned by the coastal dwellers, the Motu Koitabuans, and in 2006, customary land in Port Moresby accounted for some 37 settlements (National Capital District Commission, 2006). Except where there is occupation by earlier generations, the Motu Koitabuans charge rental fees, or ‘sell’ the use of their customary land for attractive cash payments to enable occupation. The settlements are characterised by little planning, poor quality housing and minimal infrastructure, primarily water, sanitation and power (Chand and Yala, 2008).

Photo 2: Port Moresby Central Business District (CBD) from Hanuabada Village
In 2008, it was estimated that 45 percent of Port Moresby’s population, namely, around 185,000 persons, lived in 99 settlements comprising 20 planned and 79 unplanned settlements (UN-Habitat, 2008). This accords with earlier estimates that nearly 50 percent of the population of Port Moresby live in squatter settlements scattered throughout the city (UN-Habitat, 2004). In 2000, there were only 55 settlements, and thus by 2008, settlements had been expanding at a rate of around five to six new settlements per year. Some researchers, such as those at the National Research Institute of PNG, suggest the number of new settlements is as high as twenty per year in Port Moresby (Anis, 2010). Planned settlements can be defined as essentially low cost self help settlements, containing basic services provided after the development (National Capital District Commission, 2006). In other words, the planned settlements are a form of ‘retro planning’, with services and infrastructure occurring after the initial development.

A major advantage of settlements is that for some individual and households, they are not relatively powerless as kinship, wantok and ‘friend’ systems playing a crucial support role for people and households experiencing hardship. This system is more effective where settlements grow along tribal and ethnic origins, with settlements becoming enclaves, or a series of enclaves, of kinship support (Mawuli and Guy, 2007). Low income and poor households dominate the settlements of Port Moresby, with the stereotype profile of low income inhabitants slowly changing, as some middle and higher income workers move in, due to shortages of formal housing (Anis, 2010). Life in the settlements remains hard and for many there is little opportunity of escaping urban hardship.

The growing population of Port Moresby is synonymous with rising rates of urban poverty. Urban poverty in Port Moresby has been recognised as an issue for some time, and increasingly acknowledged as a major development challenge in the new millennium (see, for example, Mawuli and Guy, 2007; Chand and Yala, 2008; Muke, Mangi and Kimbu, 2001; National Capital District Commission, 1996 and 2006; Office of Urbanisation, 2010; Storey, 2010). Poverty and hardship in Port Moresby
has been historically associated with households that comprise the city’s settlements (National Capital District Commission, 1999 and 2006; Mawuli and Guy, 2007; Anis, 2010). Housing comprises the most extensive land use in the settlements, with most houses constructed of traditional, semi permanent and permanent materials. Although there are new permanent houses being built in some settlements, most settlers reside in self help temporary houses, or run down vacated buildings of varying standards (UN-Habitat, 2008). Backyard gardening supplements household diet and food purchases in some settlements.

In the longer established settlements, there are churches, community halls and recreation areas. Water is supplied to those who can afford a connection fee with Eda Ranu, the NCD water supplier. Others break water pipes and connect their dwellings, while others share a standpipe through illegal connection. As most of the settlements are outside of the NCD sewerage system, settlers use pit toilets, septic styled systems, or where location allows, the sea or bush. Only a few have flush toilets. All settlements have roads, mainly unsealed, and a reliable system of Public Motor Vehicles — small buses — ensures ready access to all parts of the city, including the informal markets. Approximately one third of settlements have access to reticulated electricity, with Easipay (prepaid electricity) being common in the settlements (National Capital District Commission, 2006).

Photo 4: Free public water supply, Four Mile Settlement, Port Moresby.

Combined with unemployment, rising prices and minimal opportunities to progress in life, settlements in Port Moresby exhibit a plethora of urban social safety issues, including law and order problems. These include alienated and unemployed youth, HIV, violent crime, raskol gangs, inter-clan and tribal disputes and, especially on customary land, unresolved land tenure disputes (UNESCAP and UN-Habitat, 2010). Levantis (1997) in his work on unemployment in PNG urban centres cited a 1995

---

5 Raskols have been defined as young unemployed men, primarily city and town based, who engage in robberies, rape, alcohol related violence and murder. Source: CEDAW Shadow Report, PNG National Council of Women, 2010.
survey which found that over 32,000 people in PNG towns and cities depend on crime as their main source of income (or 14.8 percent of the urban workforce at that time). Prostitution accounted for 13.6 percent of the female urban workforce. The survey found that the earnings of criminals do not differ significantly from the comparable high wages of unskilled labour in the formal sector, thus making crime an attractive option for income generation (ibid., 1997).

In October 2010, it was publicly reported that crime in Port Moresby had reached epidemic proportions, with “thugs mugging people at bus stops and public venues, and prostitution and HIV infections having become rampant and widespread in our society” (PNG Post-Courier, 2010). The occurrence of some crime in Port Moresby has been described as seasonal, with the October to December Christmas period known as the ‘Mango Season’. Increased criminal activity in this pre-Christmas period is driven by needs of raskols seeking a vehicle for transport back to the rural village, monies for Christmas feasts, airfares, school fees and the like (Coffey International, 2010).

In this context, it is not surprising that Port Moresby has the dubious reputation of being amongst the most dangerous cities in the world, with crime and law and order problems linked to patterns of inequitable economic and social development (World Bank, 2004). In 2010, Port Moresby was ranked as the world’s third worst city in which to live (no. 137), only marginally better placed than Algiers and Dhaka (equal at 138), and Harare (140), (Economist, 2010). In this setting, Pacific towns and cities such as Port Moresby are not immune to the range of urban growth challenges being experienced by other world cities. However, the goals and indicators by which to manage and monitor the condition of such major urban areas do not exist in the Pacific Region.

**Under-Enumeration of Urban Populations**

Defining urban areas in the Pacific Region is problematic, and official PIC census figures hide the fact that the proportion of people living in contiguous built up urban areas is far higher than shown in national censuses (Jones, 2005). There are two main reasons for this trend. Firstly, the conservative manner in which PICs determine their urban boundaries, such delineations being commonly based on narrowly defined local government areas, and secondly, the reality that most urban growth in Pacific towns and cities is now occurring in peri-urban areas which are not classified as urban. Aside from the take up of infill development within existing built up urban areas, primarily on customary land, these peri-urban areas are the main focus of growing informal and un-serviced settlements. The inhabitants of the unplanned settlements are often well organised, developing their own arrangements and protocols for governance, undertaking trade in ‘land titles’, providing options for cheaper accommodation, as well as mobilising service and infrastructure provision.

The trend is that in nearly all major Pacific towns and cities, urban boundaries exclude their adjoining and rapidly growing peri-urban areas (Jones, 2007). Apia’s expansion into North West Upolu in Samoa, the greater Navua-Suva-Nausori corridor in Fiji and the overflow of urban South Tarawa’s residents into North Tarawa in Kiribati are good examples of the latter. Not surprisingly, PICs feature larger urban
than rural populations than officially recorded, such urban populations being up to 25 percent greater than those residing in the census classified urban areas.

Estimates also exclude the daily working population, who travel from the rural hinterlands, and use urban services and infrastructure, including urban markets. These transit urban dwellers contribute strongly to the formal and informal urban economy. All these definitional anomalies strengthen the view that the urban footprint of Pacific towns and cities is far greater than officially recorded and disseminated via national census information. It also means that estimates of key urban issues such as urban poverty are under enumerated, and higher than shown in published reports (Jones, 2010).
SECTION 2: PACIFIC URBAN ISSUES AND CHALLENGES — NATIONAL AND REGIONAL RESPONSES

Regional Collaboration on Urbanisation Issues

Issues and concerns associated with urbanisation and urban development have been well documented in the Pacific at the regional and national levels since the mid-1990s, and especially in the new millennium. In 1996, UNDP, Fiji and the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS) published a regional report — *The State of Human Settlements and Urbanisation in the Pacific Islands* (Jones, 1996b) — and delivered this report to the UN Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II), held in Istanbul in 1996. Building on the momentum gained from this conference, a draft Pacific Habitat Agenda and Regional Action Plan for PICs was prepared in 1999 and subsequently considered by the Economic Planning Ministers representing the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) at a meeting held in July 1999. In 2001, the Habitat+5 Conference gave further weight to the preparation of a Pacific Regional Plan of Action to address rising urbanisation, urban development and related urban management issues (Jones and Lea, 2007).

The inaugural Pacific Region Workshop on Urban Management, with participants from 10 PICs, was held in Nadi from 1–4 December 2003, facilitated by ESCAP, the UN-Habitat and PIFS. It was also supported by other key stakeholders including the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and UNDP. Building on this meeting, the second Pacific Urban Workshop on Urban Management was held in Nadi from 23–25 April 2007, jointly facilitated by PIFS, the Commonwealth Local Government Forum (CLGF), ESCAP and UN-Habitat so as to review regional and national progress. At this meeting, PIC planners and urban decision makers collaborated on prioritising urbanisation issues and challenges, including national ‘good practice’ approaches to urban management.

In this setting, urbanisation in the Pacific has been documented as being characterised by (see, for example, Connell and Lea, 2002; Storey, 2006; Jones, 2007).
- growing urban towns and cities where rural to urban migration is high;
- urban growth rates being faster than rural and national growth rates;
- a backlog of demand for services and infrastructure;
- little or no formal serviced land to cater for urban and peri-urban population growth;
- rising squatter and informal under-serviced settlements;
- increasing rates of poverty compared to rural areas, including adverse impacts on children;
- escalation of land disputes and conflicts, with individuals and/or select groups of customary landowners selling their lands;
- increasing impacts of climate change focused in towns and cities on low-lying atolls and narrow coastal hinterlands;
- constraints in governance, human resources and capacity building;
- poor understanding of what is urban management and how to make cities more efficient and effective engines of economic, social and environmental growth;
- limited resource allocation in national budgets and limited consideration of the urban sector in National Sustainable Development Plans (NSDPs); and
• a slowly growing recognition of the importance of urbanisation as a major and potentially positive driver of socio economic change in the Pacific.  

Photo 7: Informal activities are an important contributor to GDP produced in urban areas — the sale of firewood at Waigani market, Port Moresby.

The Impact of the Global Economic Crisis

Since the second Pacific Workshop on Urban Management in 2007, urbanisation and urban growth in the Pacific Region has been taking place within the context of the worst global economic recession in 2008–2009 since the 1930s (Jones, 2010). The implication of ongoing urbanisation within a weakened PIC economic setting has had a profound impact upon the precarious economic, social and environmental fabric and well-being of Pacific towns and cities. The mosaic of urbanisation issues elevated by the global economic recession in the Pacific Region is reflected in reduced and deferred national funding for improvements in urban infrastructure and services, higher rates of unemployment and contraction of livelihoods, an increasingly active informal sector, volatile food and fuel prices, an increase in child malnutrition and maternal health issues, pressure on natural resources and rising human rights challenges.


7 There are important gender dimensions to the operation of the informal sector in PICs, as women are highly represented and are often in the activities which give the lowest profit returns. Source: The National Urbanisation Policy for Papua New Guinea, 2010-2030, Office of Urbanisation, Government of Papua New Guinea, May, 2010.


The global economic recession has also resulted in an increase in law and order problems. This includes the burning and looting of property, street riots and violence against Asian business operators, as has been seen in Port Moresby in PNG and Honiara in Solomon Islands. Cities and towns that were making gains in the above, including a reduction in crime and violence, have now further declined with the advent of the global economic recession. Some towns have resorted to employing private security firms, so they can work side-by-side with police to maintain law and order.\(^{10}\)

**Settlements**

A key visible physical feature of hardship in Pacific towns and cities has been increasing urban informality, and includes the expansion of settlements, including squatter villages, both within the existing urban fabric and in peri-urban areas (Duncan and Voigt-Graf, 2010; Jones, 2010). In all PIC towns and cities, especially Port Moresby, Suva and Honiara, rural and semi rural villages on the urban fringe continue to be urbanised, putting undue pressures on landowners and families, some as unwilling partners, as they are consumed into the growing urban footprint. Pressures include land speculation and opportunism, leading to the ‘sale of lands’, often without the consent of clan and family members. In this setting, informal and formal land dealings are being used as a conduit to appease short term poverty and day-to-day hardship concerns (Chand and Yala, 2008).

---

\(^{10}\) In Lae City, north coast of PNG, the Menyamya Morobe Security Services (MMSS) has been working with the Lae City Authority Policing Unit to keep the town’s central business district free of rascals and vigilantes. The MMSS uses guards with bows, arrows, bush knives and clubs to police the streets, a move welcomed by shoppers and business people. The National Newspaper, 26 January, 2010, p.6. Port Moresby.
Adequately responding to urban hardship, especially in settlements, requires an appreciation and understanding beyond qualitative measures of insufficient income. It includes understanding the processes that lead to inadequate access to services and infrastructure, the vulnerability of livelihoods and the lack of capabilities that contribute to their exclusion from a ‘full’ economic, social and political life (Storey, 2010). It also requires an understanding of how settlers engage in the political process and what this ‘political patronage’ means (see Chand and Yala, 2008). Life in the settlements remains hard, and for many residents there is little opportunity of escaping urban hardship (see Box 1 on the challenges of surviving in the settlements of Port Moresby).

**Box 1 — Life’s Not Getting any Better**

**Letter to the Editor, Sunday Chronicle, 5 September 2010, Port Moresby**

I am a middle management officer and I live in a squatter settlement in Port Moresby. I am married and have three children and we are very poor. I have a degree from the University of PNG. My pay usually finishes in week 1 of the fortnight and it makes me sad. There is nothing I can do. My wife and children are hungry all the time and I cannot pay the school fees. I work hard in my job and I am poor.

Our squatter settlement has plenty of people who work in government and businesses. Some came here in the last year because rents went up and they could not pay the money to live in a house. My daughters are teenagers and are given plenty trouble by raskol boys in the settlement. We have no wantoks to protect us as I come from the north coast. There are fights every week. Raskols stole our goods in the first week we came here.

Now rent is going up in the houses and people are coming to settlements. Rent on the wood slab houses is going up too. We have one water point in the settlement and my wife has to wait an hour or more to get a container of water for the house. I am always angry when I see senior officers in departments living in apartment houses and driving cars worth more than K150,000 each. They get the money by stealing from the government. People who are rich are the ones who steal most money. The senior ones write their own contracts on top of their wages.

I cannot go back to the village as all the land has been taken by my cousin brothers. I was away too long and I think I will live in the city all my life. Life will be bad once the Liquid Natural Gas (LNG) workers come and drive every PNG man and woman into being poor. We will all live in squatter settlements.

Sebastian Orovae — Port Moresby
Growing Urban Poverty

Recent poverty line estimates and analysis undertaken in the Pacific Region indicates that the average incidence of the basic needs poverty for PICs is around 25 percent. This excludes PNG which has a higher rate and skews the data. That is, one in four households and approximately one in three Pacific islanders are below their respective national poverty lines in terms of having sufficient income and expenditure to meet a basic minimum diet, as well as having sufficient monies to meet priority non food items (Parks and Abbott, 2009).

In other words, one third of the Pacific Region's 2010 population of 9.8 million persons; namely, 3.23 million persons, including urban dwellers, fall below national poverty lines.

Concurrent with rising informality in the Pacific Region has been the growth in urban poverty. The national poverty line estimates for urban and rural areas in PICs, plus the date of the source data, are shown in Figure 2. The Figure shows that eight out of the 12 PICs (where data are available), have greater urban populations below the basic needs poverty line (BNPL) than rural populations. Only four PICs — Timor Leste, Palau, Fiji and Kiribati — have greater rural populations below the BNPL than urban areas.

While the poverty incidence figures for PNG are dated and estimates since that time have been questioned, the incidence in 1996 was 16.1 percent BNPL in urban areas and 41.3 percent BNPL in rural areas. All the Melanesian countries — PNG, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands and Fiji — have the greatest number of people in urban poverty. Importantly, the proportion of those living below the BNPL in urban areas in all PICs would be higher and in rural areas lower, if PIC censuses were properly
enumerated to reflect the existing built up urban areas, including peri urban areas. The trend reinforces the growing urbanisation of poverty now being seen in Pacific cities and towns.

Figure 2: Pacific Region — Urban and Rural National Basic Needs Poverty Incidence


National Urban Policy Initiatives

At the PIC level, various initiatives have been undertaken by PICs so as to develop urban policies, strategies, projects and programs, in order to address growing urban issues and challenges at the national, city and community levels. The national experience of PICs in urban reform has not been uniform as PICs are constrained by limited human and technical resources, institutional capacity and community and political support. An absence of varying urban management practices, skills and commitment to comprehensively tackle urban problems have been commonplace (Jones, 1996a).

Key PIC urban initiatives that have been undertaken with varied success in the new millennium include the establishment of the Planning and Urban Management Agency (PUMA) in Samoa (2002–2003) and accompanying national urban policy and legislation, the Urban Policy Action Plan for Fiji (2004), the Kiritimati Island Growth Centre Project (2004–2006), the Informal Settlements Scoping Study, Fiji (2007), the Urban Renewal Program Scoping Study and Sustainable Towns Program for Kiribati (2007), the Vanuatu National Urban Forum (2008), and in 2010, the National Urbanisation Policy for Papua New Guinea, 2010–2030.11

---

Better Managing the Performance and Condition of Pacific Towns and Cities

rule, these initiatives have occurred in partnership with the assistance of development agencies, as part of bilateral and multilateral programs that include technical assistance.12 Such activities are generally part of a wider planning process, such as the project cycle, which lead to the roll out of urban development projects in PICs via a loan or grant or a combination of both from development partners. These activities are often supported by institutional strengthening and capacity building projects and programs in urban management. Collectively, these all add value in one form or another to the urban development activity being proposed and brought online, such as water supply, sanitation, drainage, land development, and the like.

The National Urbanisation Policy for PNG, 2010–2030

The most recent and innovative national PIC urban initiative is the National Urbanisation Policy for Papua New Guinea, 2010–2030, which was endorsed by the Government on 21 June 2010. The National Urbanisation Policy is a framework and plan designed to strengthen the economic, social and environmental fabric of PNG's towns and cities by better managing the urbanisation process and urban growth challenges. The National Urbanisation Policy is the start of renewed efforts by the National Consultative Committee on Urbanisation, the Ministerial Urbanisation Committee and the Office of Urbanisation to bring together national, district, provincial and local government, as well as town and city stakeholders, to discuss, review and make decisions on the future of PNG towns and cities (Office of Urbanisation, 2010).

The endorsed National Urbanisation Policy outlines the vision for PNG towns and cities for the next 20 years to 2030, the urban issues and challenges to be faced and, importantly, details an implementation plan to be followed to address these challenges. Implementation is based around a program of projects in PNG cities and towns, funded by an innovative concept termed the PNG Urbanisation Challenge Fund, which meets the following five core policy components (see detail in Annex B):

- the provision of primary and trunk infrastructure and services in towns and cities such as water supply, power, roads and sanitation;
- the development of sites and services on customary, freehold and State lands, including upgrading of unplanned settlements, in towns and cities;
- the development, rejuvenation and strengthening of provincial and district service centres, especially investments enhancing the economic base of the towns;
- building local and community capacity to better manage urbanisation, urban management and urban development at national, district, provincial and local levels; and
- the development of local urbanisation, urban management and urban development policies, plans and programs, including elevation of physical planning functions (Office of Urbanisation, 2010).

---

12 This includes AusAID, NZAID, Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS), Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), Commonwealth Local Government Forum (CLGF), UN-Habitat, UNESCAP, Asian Development Bank (ADB), World Bank, Planning Institute of Australia (PIA), and the Pacific Island Planners Association (PIPA).
The National Urbanisation Policy is an initiative that is strongly linked to ongoing reforms in land administration, customary land registration, and efforts to upscale the amount of customary and other land available for development, including urban development. PNG via its National Land Development Program is leading the way in land reform in the Pacific Region through a suite of institutional, policy and legislative changes, including a focus on urban areas (Yala, 2010). These reform initiatives need to be seen within the wider policy context of the Government’s long term development objectives contained in Vision 2050 and, importantly, as detailed in the Papua New Guinea Development Strategic Plan, 2010–2030, and the recently endorsed Medium Term Development Plan, 2011–2015 (Government of PNG, 2010).

With other sectoral strategies, the Papua New Guinea Development Strategic Plan, 2010–2030, seeks to increase national land usage to over 20 percent within the 2010–2030 timeframe, given 97 percent of land is under customary land ownership and three percent is alienated land primarily owned by the state. The reforms have been matched with a range of pilot projects concerning customary and state lands in selected towns and cities, including Port Moresby and Lae, while concurrently incorporating lessons learned into the National Urbanisation Policy, as well as the annual plans of the National Land Development Program (Office of Urbanisation, 2010; Yala, 2010).
Regional Initiatives — The Pacific Urban Agenda and Pacific Regional Action Plan

At the regional level, a key initiative evolving from the first Pacific Region Workshop on Urban Management in December, 2003, was the development of a plan of action known as the Pacific Urban Agenda (PUA). The PUA was developed and adopted at the regional workshop and endorsed at ESCAP’s 60th session in Shanghai in April 2004 — Resolution 60/7 (UNESCAP, 2004). At the second Pacific Region Workshop on Urban Management in April 2007, the PUA was reviewed and the workshop concluded with renewed enthusiasm and expanded support from regional organisations such as AusAID, the World Bank, ADB and NZAID. There was unanimous agreement to better coordinate and synergise development partner support to assist PICs to implement the PUA in a systematic and structured approach through a regional support program.

The updated PUA was reviewed and discussed with regional and bilateral agencies at a meeting in Suva on 23–24 July 2007, and by island planners at the inaugural Pacific Island Planners Association (PIPA) meeting and workshop, which was a joint UN-Habitat and AusAID supported initiative in October 2007, in Brisbane, Australia. A main outcome of the latter was the development of the PUA’s Regional Action Plan (RAP) which identified ten priorities over five themes to be addressed during the next five years by PICs (see Table 3). Improving Pacific and PIC urban information and data systems to support urban policy formulation and decision making was a key task (no. 5), amongst the priority action areas.

Table 3: PUA’s Regional Action Plan (RAP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK: URBAN POLICY DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish and strengthen institutions to develop and implement effective urban policy, and regulatory and legislative frameworks linked to national planning and budgetary processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adopt participatory approaches to develop strategic plans to guide urban policy development and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Establish effective coordination between all levels of government, across sectoral agencies, and with development partners, to guide implementation of urban policy and plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING CAPACITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Build capacity in planning and related agencies and professional groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improve information and data systems to support policy formulation and decision making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVOCACY AND POLITICAL COMMITMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Communicate the rationale for the importance of urban issues to governments and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Improve access to land with secure tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Improve provision of affordable housing in urban settlements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Maintain and enhance urban infrastructure and services through improved partnerships with key stakeholders, including the private sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITY OF LIFE: ENVIRONMENT, HEALTH, SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Manage the urban environment to deliver quality of life outcomes through climate resilient communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The PUA was integrated by the PIFS into the Pacific Plan, which is an overarching regional institutional framework under Initiative 13.5, by the Forum Island leaders in October 2005. The Pacific Plan was revised in October 2007, with the Forum Island Leaders re-endorsing the PUA and requesting its implementation be undertaken as part of the recently endorsed RAP, coordinated by PIFS and the SPC, in order to assist member countries to address the growing challenges posed by urbanisation (PIFS, 2007). As the key regional agencies taking the lead in implementing the PUA in cooperation with PICs, the PIFS and the SPC are required to report back to Forum Island Leaders on the PUA and the RAP implementation via the Pacific Plan Action Committee. This is a monitoring committee which meets twice a year to oversee the implementation progress on the Pacific Plan.

Because of limited technical and human capacity, the PIFS and the SPC have not been able to initiate action on the coordination and implementation of the PUA and RAP with the PICs. The lack of specific resources to implement the priorities in the Pacific Plan continues to be a challenge for agencies such as the SPC (SPC, 2009). The Pacific Plan Annual Progress Report 2009 makes no reference to the PUA, the RAP, and any action required to address Pacific regional and national programs on urbanisation, urban management, urban development or urban growth (PIFS, 2009).

The second Pacific Region Workshop on Urban Management was also significant in forging a stronger regional coalition of support for urban change, challenging key regional development partners, such as AusAID, the SPC and the PIFS to support a more coherent Pacific regional urban support program to improve town and city management and performance. This push has been led by UN-Habitat, with support from Fiji-based UNESCAP and CLGF, and included a submission in 2010 to the World Bank-funded Cities Alliance for a modest regional program of support to assist PICs in addressing squatter settlements and preparation of city development strategies.13 The PUA and the RAP were also reaffirmed at ESCAP’s 66th session in Seoul, South Korea, in May 2010, where ESCAP called on its Pacific members to continue implementation of the PUA and the RAP, including provision of technical and financial support.

Despite all this good work to improve the management of both the process and impacts of urbanisation, and noting the ambivalence of PIFS and SPC to embrace addressing urbanisation, no systematic regional action has been undertaken on the PUA and RAP. It is not surprising therefore that the development of baseline information on urbanisation goals and indicators to identify trends and better target urban management responses at both the Pacific regional and national levels, remains noticeably absent. This is a fundamental gap in attempts to improve Pacific regional and national responses to urbanisation, to better management of towns and cities, and to understand PIC development generally.

The Drivers of a Lack of Regional Support for Urban Change

Despite regional initiatives in the new millennium and strong PIC national work on urban reform, for example, the National Urbanisation Policy for PNG, 2010–2030, there has been a failure at the Pacific Region level to place urbanisation issues on the regional development agenda. While there is strong interest by a range of

13 Per conversation with the UN-Habitat Regional Office of Asia and the Pacific, September 2010.
development partners in PICs including AusAID, New Zealand Aid, ADB and the World Bank, the amount of development assistance given to improving the planning, management and development of towns and cities in PICs remains minimal and insignificant. The drivers for the non interest and apathy in the Pacific Region and PIC urban issues have been identified earlier (Jones, 2007) and can be summarised as follows:

- by their nature, urban development and urban management are cross sector and multi disciplinary, requiring people and agencies to work together and be strategic over a number of cross cutting areas. These actions must inevitably address the policy and institutional and regulatory systems underlying urban areas in a coordinated and orderly manner. Such urban programs are often at odds with national sector led PIC national development plans, which are sector orientated addressing mainstream health, education, agriculture, tourism, construction and other key economic sectors.

- the benefits and gains of improved urban planning and management in growing Pacific towns and cities has not been clearly articulated by policy makers. This is partly driven by the reality that human resources in urban development and planning are limited, and that local champions willing and able to promote the cause for better urban outcomes are few. The fact that some urban areas in PICs contribute in the order of 50–70% of national GDP and could be made more efficient and effective is not visible to economic policy planners.

- politicians in PICs are acutely aware that any attempt at improved urban development and urban management is likely to involve addressing land issues, often on customary land such as in PNG. Land underpins many of the urban issues in Pacific towns and cities (see Yala, 2010). While planning involves achieving short and long term gains, the tenure of many politicians is often short term. Any approach to improving urban outcomes is often met with extreme caution and friction, especially when land is involved. When urban populations are underrepresented nationally — for example, South Tarawa in Kiribati has nearly 50 percent of the national population but only five of the 43 members of the national Parliament - then it is hard to get urban issues consistently dealt with at the national level and strongly promoted at the regional level (Jones, 2007).

- urban issues must be balanced with rural and outer island concerns. For many PICs and the urban populations within them, the reality is that day to day family and household survival tasks take priority. Issues such as security of land, shelter and ensuring adequate monies are available to pay for household clothing, food, electricity, gas and school bills, take on greater significance than short, medium and long term urban development plans.

- PICs cannot tackle the challenges of urban management and urban development alone — all urban projects are done in partnership in one form or another with international development banks, aid agencies, NGOs and other development partners. Development agencies and banks come to the negotiating table with PICs with their own set of caveats for improved urban outcomes. These are often based on externally defined processes and
institutions and include conditions regarding ‘better’ governance, accountability, transparency and gender equity. These are often at odds with the norms and values of PICs.

- addressing urbanisation issues requires sustained national and Pacific regional leadership promoting a framework for change. The trend of a stop-start approach to getting urban development and management consistently onto the PIC development agenda has now become the norm (Jones, 2007).

*Photo 11: Informal activity in the township of Mendi, Southern Highlands Province, PNG. The linkages between rural and urban areas, including the need for urban markets to support the rural economy, must be clearly spelt out in the debate on urbanisation.*
SECTION 3: GLOBAL AND PACIFIC REGION INDICATORS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PACIFIC TOWNS AND CITIES

Evolution of Global Indicators

Two main approaches have been used globally to develop indicators:

(i) a policy-based approach which has its origins in the social indicators movement of the late 1960’s, subsequently modified by the World Bank and UN-Habitat; and
(ii) a systems approach originally promoted by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and used widely in support of reporting for Agenda 21, the ‘State of the Environment’ assessments (UN-Habitat, 2009).

The common generic approach has been to develop policy aims with respect to specific concerns, and integrate the indicators with the process of policy development, monitoring and evaluation. Each policy or thematic area has indicators attached, and the number of indicators is generally minimised to reduce complexity. Some indicator studies have concentrated on combining indicators to produce indices which represent, in a single figure, the performance over a whole range of outcomes and which permit the comparison of cities or countries. These indices include the UNDP Human Development Index (HDI), which was developed in 1990, and the more recent 2002 UN-Habitat City Development Index (CDI) (UN-Habitat, 2002).

The overarching global development goals are the MDGs, which were adopted by the 191 UN member countries in 2000. The MDGs represent a global agreement to reduce poverty and human deprivation which are now occurring at unprecedented rates (Hulme, 2009). The MDGs set targets for agreed goals as well as indicators to monitor progress of the goals and attainment of the targets by the year 2015. There is a list of 18 targets and 48 indicators. One of the three targets of Goal 7 “Ensure Environmental Sustainability”, Target 11, is ‘By 2020, to have achieved significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers’. Of the 48 indicators, two focus on urban areas: Indicator 30, ‘Proportion of the population with sustainable access to an improved urban and rural water source’, and Indicator 31, ‘Proportion of the urban population with access to improved sanitation’. All the other 46 indicators address national issues and concerns.

Global Initiatives on Urban Indicators

A number of initiatives have been taken in developing global urban indicators over the past two decades. A key question to ask is whether such indicators add any value to a better understanding of the condition and performance of Pacific towns and cities. The initiatives that have been undertaken have been led by UN-Habitat and more recently, supported by the World Bank and the ADB. The Habitat Agenda

---

14 Indicators need to be realistic. In 2005, there were approximately one billion slum dwellers, of which approximately 41 percent were in developing countries in urban areas. Thus, the target in 2010 was less than 10 percent of current slum dwellers. By 2020, there is expected to be 1 392 slum dwellers, which is only seven percent of the MDG target. Source: Urban World, UN-Habitat, Vol 1, Issue 4, p.9, October, 2009.
and Resolutions 15/6 and 17/1 of the UN Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS) required the development of an indicator system which was adequate to monitor changes in the conditions of human settlements, post-Habitat 11. The then UNCHS developed an indicator system that contained a set of 23 key indicators and nine lists of quantitative data. These are the minimum data required for reporting on shelter and urban development, consistent with the five Chapters and 19 Habitat Agenda Goals. The five Chapters or thematic areas in the Habitat Agenda which collectively contain the 19 Habitat Agenda Goals are:

- shelter;
- social development and eradication of poverty;
- environmental management;
- economic development; and
- governance.

In 1991, the UN-Habitat initiated the Housing Indicators Program to monitor shelter performance. This was consumed into the Urban Indicators Program in 1993, which considered human settlements in a far wider perspective than just housing. The Urban Indicators Program produced the first Global Indicators Database in 1996 in order to provide information on urban conditions and trends for the Habitat 11 Conference, in Istanbul (UN-Habitat, 2004). The second Global Indicators Database was produced in 2001 for the Istanbul+5 Conference and included data for 151 cities worldwide. One product of the latter database was the world city profiles, which provided an overview on the condition of the world's major cities. Cities were analysed in terms of their context such as location, geography and population, and the condition of shelter, social development, environmental management, economic development, governance and international cooperation.

In 1999, UN-Habitat launched the Global Campaign on Urban Governance to support the implementation of the Habitat Agenda and contribute to the eradication of poverty through improved urban governance. As part of this program, the Urban Governance Index (UGI) is being developed by the Global Urban Observatory (GUO) in line with the campaign’s advocacy and capacity building strategies, utilising a two-fold purpose. At the global level, the index will be used to demonstrate the importance of good urban governance in achieving broad development objectives, such as the MDGs and those in the Habitat Agenda. At the local level, the UGI is hoping to catalyse local action to improve the quality of urban governance. Collaborating with the GUO would be a feature of developing a set of Pacific urbanisation and development goals and indicators.

Urban indicators are regularly collected by UN-Habitat in a sample of cities worldwide, in order to report on the progress in the twenty key areas of the Habitat Agenda at the city level. Data collection is conducted through local and national urban observatories as well as through selected regional institutions. The second Global Indicators Database (2001) contained policy-oriented indicators for more than 200 world cities. Its results were analysed and incorporated into the *State of the World's Cities Report 2001*, noting that it contained minimal information on PICs.

In the new millennium, UN-Habitat has developed the Rapid Urban Sector Profiling for Sustainability (RUSPS) program. This is based on an accelerated action-oriented
assessment of urban conditions in a town or city, as a precursor to city development strategies and associated tools, such as urban investment programs and feasibility studies. The RUSPS entails undertaking a rapid analysis of the current urban situation across seven thematic areas, working hand in hand with relevant stakeholders. These themes include assessing the condition of shelter, urban governance, gender, urban safety and the urban environment. The studies focus on identifying priority needs, the capacity gaps and how existing institutions at the local and national levels respond or otherwise to resolving urban issues. In 2008, the RUSPS commenced in the Pacific Region, targeting a number of PICs for profiling support, including PNG, Fiji and Solomon Islands (UN-Habitat, 2007). In PNG, RUSPS has recently been completed for Port Moresby, Kokopo and Goroka, and form the starting points for more detailed development planning, including funding of priority town and city infrastructure by the PNG Government and development partners (UN-Habitat, 2010).

In 2008, UN-Habitat launched a further initiative, the Monitoring Urban Inequities Program (MUIP), which is a review of social inequities within human settlements. The MUIP focuses on access to essential services such as water, sanitation, shelter, living space and security of tenure. The program also assesses additional indicators including conditions in health, education, employment and access to credit. Concurrent with the Urban Indicators Program and other UN-Habitat monitoring activities, the MUIP aims to provide globally representative knowledge on the actions taken by governments to improve the lives of slum dwellers and to measure the

Photo 12: the Rapid Urban Sector Profile completed for Kokopo in East New Britain, PNG.
impact of these actions by monitoring the magnitude of urban inequities. The MUIP aims to develop capacity among national stakeholders on policy analysis, and on implementing multi-stakeholder program frameworks which support the urban poor (UN-Habitat, 2009).

All of the UN-Habitat urban databases produced to date fall under the wider umbrella term of the ‘Global Urban Observatory Databases’, and are contained from time to time in annual UN-Habitat publications. Data are published and disseminated through a compendium of human settlements statistics, and are annexed to the State of the World’s Cities Report which is produced annually by UN-Habitat. One of the major functions of the GUO is to assist cities and developing countries in using their own indicator systems for monitoring city development and municipal performance. The GUO also promotes and supports the establishment of ‘Local and National Urban Observatories’ as the institutional home for urban monitoring systems in cities and national institutions.

In 2008, the World Bank initiated the Global City Indicators (GCI) project. While the GCI promotes itself as suitable for all cities, the project targets cities with more than one million inhabitants on the basis that a population ‘critical mass’ is required to monitor its set of themes and indicators. The GCI project is based on two broad categories, city services and quality of life, with a number of thematic areas assessed by indicators under each of the categories. The city services thematic areas, for example, include education, energy, finance, safety, recreation, transportation, governance, health and water. Themes in the quality of life category include civic engagement, economy, shelter, environment, social equity and technology and innovation. The project is managed by the Global City Indicators Facility, which is based at the University of Toronto, Canada, and assists cities to join the project and oversees the development of indicators (Bhada and Hoornweg, 2009).

Global Urban Indicators — Implications for the Pacific Region

A review of global urban databases indicates that there is little or no information provided on the urban condition of PICs. The exception is the data derived and mainstreamed from the MDG process, primarily the two indicators on improved access to water supply and access to sanitation, and generally readily available information concerning national urban populations (which are under-enumerated). This information includes existing population, population projections, urban share, number of households, and national, urban and rural growth rates.

Where there are publications that specifically address indicators for small states, such as the annual Economic Review and Basic Statistics report which is published by the Commonwealth Secretariat, the same trend applies. Apart from information on population, data on the urban condition of PICs such as the condition of urban dwellers living in slums and informal settlements are absent. Such publications use existing data sources, collated from international agencies such as the ADB, International Monetary Fund and the European Union, and, where available, national sources. The data focuses on selected economic, social development and environmental indicators, as well as characteristics of the major sectors of small economies (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2008). The urban dimension is excluded
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from such analysis for a range of reasons; one main reason being that where censuses do exist, they provide little accurate data on the condition in informal settlements where problems are worst (Satterthwaite, 2005).

Analysis of the global urban databases and accompanying reports provide minimal insight into the state of Pacific towns and cities. This trend expresses itself in the databases and analysis in a number of ways:

- the Pacific Region is excluded from data tables all together, for example, tables on ‘Access to Services in Selected Cities’. Cities in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean are shown, but the Pacific Region is absent. Likewise, it is absent in the textual discussion on regional urban trends and analysis;¹⁵
- where the Pacific countries are identified along with other world countries, no data are provided;
- where the Pacific countries are identified along with other world countries, only some data are provided, for example, more readily available information such as population estimates, water supply and sanitation coverage;
- the Pacific Region is included under Oceania, and only the developed Oceania countries (Australia and New Zealand) and their data are shown. The PICs are not included, and where they are mentioned, no data are provided;
- the Pacific Region is included under the wider ‘Asia Pacific’ terminology, but the data and the textual description and analysis relate only to Asia. The Pacific Region is there in name only.

The absence of attention to the PICs in global urban indicators is understandable in one sense. PIC populations are insignificant in relation to world population and, importantly, are minuscule when compared to other less developing countries. In relation to global population, PICs in 2010 represent 0.14 percent and compared to other less developing regions, PIC populations marginally increase to 0.17 percent.¹⁶

The combined population of the world’s small island developing countries (2010) is 60 411 000 persons of which the PIC share in 2010 is 16 percent. While the scale and contexts of urban diversity in other world regional populations are in stark contrast to the Pacific Region, the reality is that PICs still have their growing and pressing national urbanisation and urban growth issues which need to be addressed. Nationally and regionally, PIC towns and cities are vitally important as recently recognised in the National Urbanisation Policy for PNG, 2010–2030, for example, but globally, their problems pale into insignificance (Jones, 2007).

Furthermore, urban challenges and issues are more acute in less developed countries, such as PICs, whose governance systems and public institutions are least able to cope and respond to the demands of urban growth (Jones, 2010). These include the ability to provide urban services and infrastructure, coordinate an orderly land supply (often requiring the mobilisation of customary landowners to allow formal access to customary lands), address governance, law and safety issues, and the ability of residents to pay for basic day-to-day services. As well, PICs are the first

¹⁵ In Planning Sustainable Cities: Global Report on Human Settlements, UN-Habitat, 2009, the Pacific Region does not feature in the textual discussion or analysis.

¹⁶ The world’s population is estimated as 6.9 billion in 2010 of which less developing countries comprise 5.7 billion. Source; Planning Sustainable Cities: Global Report on Human Settlements, UN-Habitat, 2009, p.226.
countries to be impacted by climate change, including a rise in sea level, as well as natural disasters. This all adds weight to a Pacific regional initiative to address shortcomings in the availability of urban data, based on developing urbanisation goals and indicators.

**Pacific Region Development Indicators and Implications for Pacific Towns and Cities**

At the Pacific Region level, information on development indicators is produced at both the regional and national level by key bilateral and multilateral organisations working with PICs. These agencies include the ADB, AusAID, the World Bank and major regional organisations including PIFS, the SPC and CLGF. In summary, there is a wealth of quality information available to policy makers which address specific policy and thematic areas. At the national level, the ADB, for example, provides Country Partnership Strategies and Country Operation Business Plans for its member PICs, as well as producing country and regional economic data. The UNDP produces National Human Development reports and statistical fact sheets for PICs. AusAID produces joint PIC and Australia development cooperation strategies, which outline the partnership directions agreed for implementation between the two parties. These are supplemented by country overviews for most PICs. Also, UNDP reports on the progress of efforts towards the MDGs, which are available for respective PICs.

The key bilateral and multilateral organisations, especially AusAID and ADB, produce regional thematic reports addressing growth and development in PICs. These assessments include issues such as economic and human development, governance, poverty, land and general Pacific regional development performance. In collaboration with PICs, all key agencies have produced regional strategies outlining their areas of program support for PICs over the next five to ten years. Many regional assessments are geared towards the improvement of development assistance in the Pacific Region, including highlighting the interrelationships between economic development, governance, population, human development and globalisation in PICs. In September 2009, AusAID released the second annual report on the economic performance of PICs and Timor-Leste (AusAID, 2009a). Agencies have also highlighted the progress of PICs towards the achievement of the MDGs. In August 2009, AusAID produced the well-regarded report, *Tracking Development and Governance in the Pacific*, which found that most of the PICs are significantly off track to meet the MDGs by 2015 (AusAID, 2009b).

Like AusAID, the ADB produces from time to time, regional reports via regional technical assistance on issues and themes of major PIC significance, including economic growth, poverty and women in private sector development. In Asia, the ADB has provided regional technical assistance to facilitate the development of urban indicators for the better management of Asian cities, but not in the Pacific region (ADB, 2001). Key regional organisations, such as the SPC, via its Statistics and Demography Program, are the region's leading source of national and regional demographic and socio-economic information, much of which is used by national, regional and major bilateral and multilateral organisations. Other specialist agencies which are project focused, such as the CLGF Pacific Project based in Suva, Fiji, have collated governance indicators from urban local-level governments for Lami
and Sigatoka town councils in Fiji. However, such sub-national work is specifically targeted at urban governance indicators, such as the status of recurrent and capital budgets, revenue per capita, civic associations and the like. They do not address the wider indicators of urbanisation including the status of urban development (CLGF, 2008).

Despite these shortcomings, the clear overarching trend in all Pacific regional and national initiatives on assessing and supporting development progress is that, while there have been many advances in development analysis, significant gaps continue to exist at the PIC town and city level in understanding their development condition and performance. Basic urban information has not been generated for policy makers at a town and city level and collated nationally and regionally, by any rigorous and systematic approach. Pacific regional indicators do not add value to the condition and performance of PIC towns and cities. This has occurred despite the major emphasis by key development agencies in the Pacific Region on the need for improved development performance and coordination in the Pacific Region, including water supply, sanitation, poverty reduction and improved governance (AusAID, 2009a).
SECTION 4: TOWARDS A FRAMEWORK FOR PACIFIC REGION AND NATIONAL URBANISATION DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND INDICATORS

Conceptual Approach

There are two common approaches to developing a framework for urban goals and indicators, namely, top-down and bottom-up. The top-down approach involves the design of a conceptual framework and the identification of indicators that fit. The shortcomings of such an approach are that it can oversimplify reality, identify irrelevant or impractical goals and indicators, be difficult to sustain, and not be relevant nationally or locally. A modified top-down approach involves manipulating a comprehensive goal and indicator data-set, and combining and recombining individual indicators to determine which combination most accurately reflects the urban situation at hand, such as in the Pacific Region (UN-Habitat, 2009).

The bottom-up approach promotes stakeholder participation and local ownership of the process, to help ensure the goals and the data which are collected are locally relevant and can be realistically used in decision making (UN-Habitat, 2000). In the formal development of Pacific urbanisation goals and development, the PIPA as well as research institutions would be a key conduit in this process, as well as being a ‘check and balance’ in integrating top-down and bottom-up approaches.

In the Pacific Region and at the PIC level, such as PNG, for example, the generic stages involved in such an approach could be developed with stakeholders based on the following:

- agree on Pacific and PIC urban thematic issues, policy goals, ‘issue’ areas and overall outcomes, including timelines and institutional arrangements;
- select indicators to monitor thematic areas and goals;
- agree on definitional concerns such as what constitutes ‘urban’;
- gather baseline data on the current Pacific situation and analyse results and implications;
- share results with planners and policy makers — locally, city wide, nationally, regionally and globally;
- mainstream results at the local, city, national and regional levels, and determine ‘best means’ to achieve, and integrate the results into Pacific knowledge management, development policy and program development; and
- monitor targets and priorities and learn from PICs including ‘good practice’. For example, regional sharing of the National Urbanisation Policy for PNG, 2010–2030, and its process for formulation, outcomes and implementation program.

As reflected in the urban databases that have been developed by UN-Habitat, the ADB and the World Bank, urban indicators vary depending upon the project outcomes and the nature of the urban areas that are being assessed. While the diversity of Pacific urban contexts suggests that there should be no single set of standard and agreed global indicators to be applied to varying urban contexts, they should, as far as possible, be robust and add value, and complement existing functional roles that are relevant to improving Pacific urbanisation outcomes (see Table 4).
Table 4: Key Functions of Urban Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Describe conditions, problems and concerns (such as water supply, sanitation, squatters, unplanned settlements and climate change 'hot spots').</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplification</td>
<td>Simplify complexity, provide a representative picture with significance applying across a wider area of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>Measure characteristics of the social, economic, environmental and governance dimensions of urban life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend Identification</td>
<td>Establish baseline data and analyse trends and patterns. This can be a past orientation showing how a trend or phenomena has changed, or can be looking forward, predicting various scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>Clarify analytical issues and areas or concern or improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Translate findings into media for wider dissemination while sharing knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst for action</td>
<td>Use for advocacy and as a tool for leveraging specific change via policy, program, projects and monitoring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Pacific urbanisation indicators should, as far as practicable, be supporting and augmenting the information base of higher order goals and indicators, such as the MDGs and the Habitat Agenda. This is important, given the MDGs and indicators which comprise them have been elevated to the pinnacle of international goals, whilst having been criticised that they cannot be adequately measured (Attaran, 2005). Pacific urbanisation indicators should complement other Pacific analysis, such as the AusAID work on tracking development and governance in the Pacific, the ADB’s national urban development projects, and UN-Habitat’s work on Rapid Urban Sector Profiles (RUSPs) being undertaken in selected PICs.

Importantly, the urbanisation goals and indicators should support and enhance national initiatives in urbanisation. This includes clarifying whether adopted plans and policies are being implemented and importantly, whether such plans are being translated into improved quality of life outcomes. In the case of the National Urbanisation Policy for PNG, 2010–2030, the policy identifies seven cross sector themes which urbanisation projects and programs must make gains in. These cross sector themes are:

- population distribution and employment;
- transport and infrastructure;
- urban environment and climate change;
- urban land supply;
- housing and social change;
- urban security, law and order; and
- institutions and governance arrangements.

It is essential therefore that any Pacific urbanisation goals and indicators must strengthen national initiatives, especially PNG, which will continue to have more towns, cities and urban residents than any other PIC (Office of Urbanisation, 2010).
Collectively, urbanisation goals and indicators must contribute to addressing the major urban challenges which characterise the development of towns and cities in the Pacific Region. This includes those priority areas which are identified in the overarching regional PUA and RAP, whilst also adding value to enhancing PIC national urban initiatives which target poverty reduction, economic development, climate change, unplanned settlements, land security, access to basic services and infrastructure and governance.

A Framework for Pacific Urbanisation Goals and Indicators

Building on (i) key urbanisation functions and (ii) major thematic issue areas at the Pacific Regional and PIC level, including those identified in the recent National Urbanisation Policy for PNG, 2010–2030, Table 5 suggests a framework of possible Pacific urbanisation goals and indicators. The goals are policy-based, such as improved urban services and infrastructure, as well as thematic topics such as urban management and good governance. The first goal in Table 5 applies at the national PIC level, and seeks to present a background and overview of the level of urbanisation at the individual PIC level. All the other goals relate to the better understanding of trends and conditions of the main towns and cities within each PIC.  

---

17 Definitional issues including what constitutes an urban area, poverty line, human rights and the like will need to be determined.
Table 5: Towards a Framework for Possible Pacific Urbanisation Goals and Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actions — Strategy</th>
<th>Range of City — Town Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balanced National Urbanisation</td>
<td>*Provide an accurate picture of overall urbanisation trends within each PIC, as well as at the Pacific regional level.</td>
<td>• national land area;                                                                                                                                  • urban land area (individual towns and cities and collectively);                                                                • national population;                                                                                         • national population percent growth rate;                                                     • annual urban population percent growth rate;                                                   • urban population and percent share;                                                                 • population and area of census defined urban areas;                                                      • population and area of peri-urban, non-urban census areas;                                                • name of capital city or town;                                                                 • annual growth rate percent;                                                                                  • rural national and urban populations projections; and                                                                 • number of towns and cities with over 5 000, 10 000 and 100 000 persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>*Establish a strong urban economy that creates job opportunities in both formal and informal sectors, reduces unemployment, and attracts business and investment. *Promote and develop competitive strengths of towns and cities.</td>
<td>• urban-rural employment share;                                                                                                                      • urban employment share by sector;                                                                                         • annual urban employment rate;                                                                                         • town-city GDP estimates;                                                                                     • town-city GDP per head;                                                                                          • urban investment by sector;                                                                                     • number of registered businesses and licences granted by LLG;                                                   • number of women participating in formal employment;                                                                 • number of tourists annually and per month;                                                                 • number of micro-finance institutions;                                                                 • size of the informal sector, number of vendors;                                                                 • number of vendors residing in cities and towns;                                                                 • number of women-men vendors in informal activities;                                                                                                                                 • number of informal sector licences granted;                                                                 • types of informal sector activities; and                                                                 • number of persons below the poverty line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5 (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actions — Strategy</th>
<th>Range of City — Town Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Urban Services and Infrastructure | • Increased coverage and access to water, sanitation and power.  
• Affordable services.  
• Improved reliability of services.  
• Adequate drainage. | • Number of registered household connections to water and power;  
• Estimate of number of illegal connections;  
• Number of households that pay  
• Sources of water supply and percentage;  
• Quality of water sources;  
• Quality of water connections;  
• Type of sanitation service and coverage;  
• Formal and informal means of septic disposal—coverage;  
• State of drainage systems — formal and informal;  
• Extent of annual flooding and damage;  
• School coverage and enrolments;  
• Health clinic and hospital coverage;  
• School coverage and enrolments per capita;  
• Health clinic and hospital coverage per capita; and  
• HIV per capita. |
| Land and Shelter | • Adequate supply of land to meet demand for housing and business, and whilst underpinning economic development.  
• Adequate and affordable levels of housing with secure tenure. | • Area and percentage share of developed customary, freehold and state lands;  
• Area and percentage share of vacant customary, freehold and state lands available for development;  
• Share and number of planned settlements;  
• Share and number of unplanned settlements including squatter settlements;  
• Share of town — city land and housing ‘informality versus formality’;  
• Percentage take up of freehold and state land versus customary land;  
• Percentage customary land taken up with services and infrastructure;  
• Number of private land developments approved;  
• Number of state/government land developments approved;  
• Number of formal state land schemes in place on customary, freehold and state lands;  
• Number of settlement upgrading schemes in place;  
• Number of evictions per year in unplanned settlements;  
• Degree and type of land security and land tenure in unplanned settlements;  
• Cost of formal housing per m²;  
• Cost of informal housing per m²;  
• Housing density in planned and unplanned areas;  
• Number of housing and business planning approvals per year;  
• Number of houses that are constructed per year, but not formally approved;  
• Percentage estimate of ‘adequate housing’ stock; and  
• Percentage of land used for food gardens. |
### Table 5 (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actions — Strategy</th>
<th>Range of City — Town Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td><em>Adequate levels of biodiversity are maintained and improved.</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Domestic and business waste is properly managed.</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Natural disaster plans are in place.</em></td>
<td>• formal public open space area;&lt;br&gt;• tree cover in urban areas;&lt;br&gt;• area of formal public open space per capita;&lt;br&gt;• type of domestic waste collection systems;&lt;br&gt;• coverage of formal waste collection systems for business and domestic;&lt;br&gt;• user satisfaction with waste systems;&lt;br&gt;• cost of waste systems;&lt;br&gt;• informal waste disposal methods;&lt;br&gt;• number of recycling schemes;&lt;br&gt;• waste water standards in place;&lt;br&gt;• level of environmental enforcement;&lt;br&gt;• level of city non-renewable resource extraction such as sand, gravel, tree and ground cover;&lt;br&gt;• water quality in creeks, streams and inshore harbour;&lt;br&gt;• number and type of natural disasters;&lt;br&gt;• number of active environmental NGOs;&lt;br&gt;• urban water source impact on local environment;&lt;br&gt;• area and type of food production in urban and peri-urban areas;&lt;br&gt;• erosion risks (graded per town); and&lt;br&gt;• flooding risk (graded for town.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Transport</strong></td>
<td><em>Transport infrastructure is maintained.</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Adequate levels of public transport are available.</em></td>
<td>• mode of transport;&lt;br&gt;• extent of sealed and unsealed road infrastructure;&lt;br&gt;• car-vehicle ownership;&lt;br&gt;• number of new cars per year;&lt;br&gt;• vehicle accidents, deaths;&lt;br&gt;• expenditure on road infrastructure;&lt;br&gt;• public expenditure on public transport;&lt;br&gt;• extent of air pollution; and&lt;br&gt;• level of traffic enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law, Order, Security and Human Rights</strong></td>
<td><em>Safe cities with minimal levels of crime and social disruption.</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Promotion and protection of human rights.</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Effective public institutions supporting safer cities and maintenance of human rights.</em></td>
<td>• number of reported crimes (murder, robberies, break and enters, rapes, domestic violence and so on);&lt;br&gt;• main causes of crime and violence;&lt;br&gt;• main target groups for crime and violence;&lt;br&gt;• spatial pattern of reported crime;&lt;br&gt;• number of car jacking;&lt;br&gt;• number of reported crimes per capita;&lt;br&gt;• estimate of non-reported crimes;&lt;br&gt;• estimate of street safety;&lt;br&gt;• estimate of institutional effectiveness (police and courts);&lt;br&gt;• estimate of vulnerability of children by abuse, exploitation, violence, etc; and&lt;br&gt;• estimate of human rights violations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actions — Strategy</th>
<th>Range of City — Town Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>*Minimise climate change through measurable programs on adaptation and mitigation.</td>
<td>• degree of vacant land cleared of forests and major ground cover;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td>• proportion of mangroves cleared;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• exposure to tropical cyclones;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• extreme rainfall and precipitation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• recorded sea level rise;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• number and type of climate change ‘hot spots’;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• source of carbon emissions in urban areas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• number of urban vulnerability and adaptation assessments that have been completed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• number of formal adaptation and mitigation projects in place including renewable energy sources; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• electricity consumption per capita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Management</td>
<td>*Efficient and effective policy, institutional and legislative setting.</td>
<td>• existence of national urban policy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td>• implementation status of national urban policy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• existence of town and city policy and implementation status,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• institutional status of lead planning agency (for example, stand alone, autonomous, integrated with Lands section and so on),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• existence of urban local-level governments or national government arrangements,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• urban management capacity and trained staff,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• rating of resource and capacity of LLG for urban management and urban development projects,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• status and relevance of urban management and urban planning legislation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• level-number of urban land disputes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• turnaround in land disputes/land courts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• adequacy of land registration records;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• extent of stakeholder involvement and participation (NGOs, international partners and so on);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• active urban programs with international development partners and type;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• level and rating of political support-advocacy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

Collectively, the goals and indicators as outlined are intended for policy makers so as to look at the health of Pacific cities and towns, both individually and collectively in a holistic manner. The indicators would measure progress towards the goals which are effectively a collation of PIC urban concerns and associated policy objectives and strategies. These are supported by indicators which could be mainstreamed into regional and national policy and program development, monitoring and review, such as national development plans at the PIC level, the Pacific Plan at the regional level as well as the plans of regional agencies. The thematic goals may not be directly associated with an existing policy or strategy and may be multidimensional. The goals and indicators would be a basis for policy and program development and/or revision of existing policies, at both the regional and national level.
The framework as outlined, seeks to represent the major concerns, issues and main policy objectives that are necessary for ascertaining the level of functionality of Pacific towns and cities. To reflect the true nature of Pacific cities and towns, such as the region’s largest city, Port Moresby, for example, goals have been kept at a basic and fundamental level, notwithstanding the complexity and inter-relatedness of the urban sector.\(^\text{18}\) The goals and indicators can be extended or reduced, depending on the issues to be addressed, and how policy makers and stakeholders perceive their PIC urban needs and relevance.

All the goals and indicators may not be fully applicable in their entirety for all PICs and the range of towns and cities within them, such as the 20 towns and cities in PNG. The major objective is to obtain a balanced regional and PIC urban indicator framework that allows meaningful comparisons on performance, over time and across the varying fabric of PIC towns and cities. In this setting, the urbanisation goals and indicators in Table 5 are best viewed as a starting point for regional and PIC adaptation, prioritisation and development with Pacific stakeholders and policy makers who are committed to better urban and national PIC outcomes.\(^\text{19}\)

**Conclusion**

Like Asian cities, but arguably to a greater degree in the Pacific Region, managing the urbanisation process and its consequences has not taken a central or even mainstream position in regional and national policy debate (ADB and Cities Alliance, 2006). At both the Pacific regional and PIC level, there is a preoccupation with

\(^{18}\) This contrasts with more developed countries where urban goals and indicator frameworks address policy matters to do with liveability, competition and globalisation, sustainability and innovation. The process must be step by step and in line with resources and capacity.

\(^{19}\) An additional step would be to develop an index for Pacific cities and towns such as similar to the Human Development Index (HDI), or the City Development Index (CDI).
focusing on sectors rather than addressing the total picture of what is happening in towns and cities, including rural linkages. This is reinforced in national development plans and their sectoral approach, which has only been recently augmented by thematic analysis, and only recently included reference to addressing growing urbanisation problems and issues.\(^\text{20}\)

Despite the recognition that urbanisation and the need for effective urban management will become one of the most significant development issues for PICs in the current millennium, the importance of towns and cities to Pacific national social and economic development is still not adequately recognised (Jones, Taule’alo and Kohlhase, 2002; Jones, 2007; Storey, 2010). Only the recent National Urbanisation Policy for PNG, 2010–2030, acknowledges the important role that urbanisation can play in the social and economic development of the country, where urbanisation has been equated with ‘the modernisation of our villages, districts and towns’ (Dekena, 2010: 2).

Urban issues in the Pacific Region continue to have a low priority in the development agendas of bilateral and multi-lateral agencies, especially AusAID.\(^\text{21}\) There is a preoccupation with the ‘health’ of the economy, including economic development, as well as governance and poverty alleviation without consideration of their spatial dimension \(^\text{22}\) (see, for example, AusAID, 2009b). Sector and theme analysis — excluding the urban dimension — dominates in regional and national development trend and data analysis. At the PIC level, as documented in the National Urbanisation Policy for PNG, 2010–2030, urban decision making and management have become increasingly fragmented and absent between ministries and departments. Institutions are preoccupied with, and constrained by, a narrowly defined set of responsibilities and a culture of blame avoidance; that is, ‘It’s not my business’ (Office of Urbanisation, 2010). As reflected in the overarching regional policy document, the Pacific Plan, towns and cities and an understanding of the wider urbanisation process are not seen as a priority on the Pacific regional development agenda.

Effective regional and national initiatives in urbanisation, urban management, urban development and strategic and sector planning need to be anchored in reliable and accurate information on urban conditions and trends. There are good arguments supporting the development of comprehensive Pacific regional and PIC urbanisation goals and indicators so as to:

\(^\text{20}\) See the draft Medium Term Development Plan for PNG, 2011–2015, which discusses need for adequate land for urban expansion and concurrent implementation of the National Urbanisation Policy for PNG.

\(^\text{21}\) In October 2010, AusAID, as part of a review of the AusAID - Government of PNG Technical Assistance Program, withdrew its technical support to the Office of Urbanisation as urban service and infrastructure delivery and planned town development was not considered a priority national function. Source: per conversation with the Director, Office of Urbanisation.

\(^\text{22}\) Defined as the physical outcomes including built form of the social, economic and environmental development process. This could be broken down into national, regional, provincial, district, local, urban versus rural and urban unplanned versus urban planned. For a discussion on dimensions of disaggregation, see ‘Linking Climate Change Policies to Human Development Analysis and Advocacy’, Human Development Report, UNDP, November 2009.
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- improve regional and national urban decision making in terms of a better understanding of the diversity of the existing urban condition and trends in Melanesia, Polynesia and Micronesia;
- develop more targeted and effective national and regional urban responses, such as poverty reduction, coverage of basic infrastructure and services, and addressing law and order issues, and
- build capacity, awareness and share knowledge of the urban dimension with policy makers at all levels. This includes ‘planning’ practice, whether it is targeting policy makers in sector, cross-sector or local government agencies, such as urban managers, town planners, economists, civil engineers, social development, and so on.

The overarching rationale is the development of information on Pacific urbanisation goals and indicators, which will lead to improved policies and programs and hopefully these will result in better urban and national development outcomes. Thus, Pacific urbanisation goals and indicators will be an important strategic planning tool to achieve this aim, supporting national initiatives such as the recent National Urbanisation Policy for PNG, 2010–2030.

The symptoms and consequences of urbanisation and growing Pacific towns and cities are harder to ignore (Jones, 2005; Storey, 2006). The condition of the region’s largest city, Port Moresby as outlined earlier in the paper, is testament to this. In terms of solutions, the diversity of Pacific towns and cities means there is no one size that fits all. Experience indicates that approaches will vary between PICs and their towns and cities, depending on their rate of national development, political commitment and underlying social, economic, governance and environmental setting (see, for example, work done on understanding the development performance of PNG by the National Research Institute of PNG, 2010). The structure, implementation components and proposed outcomes of the recent National Urbanisation Policy for PNG, 2010–2030, is one good example of the latter in addressing urbanisation issues and concerns. A pragmatic starting point to complement such national as well as regional development initiatives is to develop Pacific urbanisation development goals and indicators to address priority concerns in urbanisation, urban development and urban management. In the absence of such regional policy and contextual baseline data on the comparative urban condition and trends across the range of Pacific towns and cities, the sustainability and appropriateness of current national and regional development approaches remains questionable.

---

23 An option after regional agreement of the goals and indicators is to trial the goals and indicators as a pilot in one city or town in an agreed PIC and then develop and complete regionally, and concurrently, a Pacific urban indicator toolkit. This would allow the indicators to be replicated within PICs for smaller towns and cities.
Key Terminology used in this Paper

Cultural permeation of urban areas — terminology first used in PNG in 2009 and defined in the National Urbanisation Policy for PNG, 2010–2030. The terminology refers to the varying interface and assimilation of rural norms, values, attitudes and aspirations, including those of ethnic and tribal groups, into the day to day way of life in Pacific towns and cities.

Customary land — customary lands are those held in accordance with specific customs and usage, and within the laws relating to such custom and usage. Customary lands are characterised by families, clans, tribes and individuals within these groups, having varying interests, rights and obligations in the use, management and development of such lands. This contrasts with more definitive land ownership rights, as occurs on alienated land, such as freehold and state lands. While customary land systems vary significantly in the Pacific Region and are invariably complex, they have all been based on custom — namely; practice rather than written law — and have been passed from one generation to the next (Crocombe, 1968). Most PICs now recognise in their own laws and legislative frameworks the rights and interests of customary landowners, and the institutions and processes by which customary lands are shared and distributed (including mechanisms for dispute resolution).

Peri urban — areas of contiguous urban settlement growth on the edge of Pacific towns and cities. They are often unplanned and under serviced, outside the boundaries of urban local level government jurisdiction.

Physical planning — a tool used to assist in the management of urban and rural growth. It includes the process of making and implementing plans and policies to manage the physical growth of towns and cities, such as peri urban areas, unplanned settlements and rural service centres.

Primate city — a single city, usually the capital, such as Port Moresby, PNG, which is more populated and more important politically, financially and economically than other towns and cities in the country. A primate city dominates all other towns and cities in terms of population and key functions.

Rural village in the city — the expansion of squatter and informal settlements which exhibit the physical, social and cultural characteristics of rural villages, including ethnic and kinship connections, but within an urban setting.

Settlement — areas comprising unplanned urban development, which may be within or outside a designated urban local level government boundary on state, freehold or customary land. They are often illegal developments and are also termed squatter developments. Planned settlements are those where services and infrastructure has followed after the initial development. Settlements in PICs are often associated with populations having the highest rates of urban poverty.

Socio cultural order — the prevailing norms, values, attitudes and aspirations that shape the behavior of respective PIC populations. The PIC socio cultural orders are influenced, amongst other matters, by westernisation, globalisation, moniterisation and urbanisation. The norms and values will vary between groups, individuals and
urban and rural areas. The features of the PIC socio cultural orders are strongly interconnected, and they are firmly anchored to affiliations with land, localities, kin and ethnic groups.

Urban areas — include towns and cities, including smaller rural towns, larger rural and provincial centres. Urban includes the concept of ‘built up’ areas containing a central area surrounded by growing settlements (planned and unplanned), and can be classified according to administrative criteria. These include functions, population size, density, economic characteristics and level of infrastructure. Urban areas include built up areas as well as peri urban areas outside a designated urban local government boundary. In PNG, for example, the formal definition in the 2000 PNG Census defines an urban area as “a settlement having a minimum of 500 persons and minimum population density of 195 persons per square kilometer.” Each PIC has their respective definition of ‘urban’.

Urban development — a term encompassing initiatives in water supply, sanitation, power, health, education, roads, drainage and the like, all aimed at improving the social, economic and environmental well being and condition of urban areas.

Urban management — a holistic and integrated approach to managing the existing and future demands of population and urban growth, including their social, environmental, governance, infrastructure and service dimensions. Urban management can include the concept of urban planning. The first urban management plan for the Pacific Region was prepared in 1995; namely, ‘The Urban Management Plan for South Tarawa, Kiribati.’

Urban poverty — defined as an inadequate level of sustainable human development underpinned by a lack of access to (i) basic services and infrastructure; (ii) a lack of opportunities to participate fully in community life; and (iii) a lack of access to productive resources and income to meet the basic household needs in an urban setting. In its most basic form, poverty is the denial of opportunities, hope and choices needed to underpin human development.

Urbanisation — the process whereby people move from rural areas to towns and cities including rural service towns and settlements. Urbanisation is the spatial translation of the production structure of the economy, normally characterized by relative declining shares of primary (agricultural) production sectors and increasing shares of secondary, industrial and tertiary service sectors with relatively higher levels of productivity, located in urban areas. The urbanisation process brings about changes in human settlement patterns, values, norms, attitudes and behavior, consumption patterns, and lifestyle, family and social changes.

Urbanisation Challenge Fund — developed in the PNG urban context, the Urbanisation Challenge Fund is a matching fund facility that leverages funding for activities supporting agreed urban priorities. An Urbanisation Challenge Fund is a facility that supports initiatives and good practice that are likely to make a substantial difference to the quality of life in urban areas. The facility supports those projects seeking cross sector outcomes and involving the active participation of local stakeholders, including some financial commitment.
Urbanisation of poverty — the increasing concentration and number of people living in poverty in urban areas, as a result of the urbanisation process. In many regions of the world, the urbanisation of poverty will result in more people in poverty in urban areas, than rural areas. The urbanisation of poverty was first documented in the Pacific Region for Fiji in 2004 as part of the preparation of the ‘Urban Policy Action Plan for Fiji’, a joint ADB and Government of Fiji technical assistance project.

Source: Author
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Annexes

Annex A: Goals and Benefits of Sustainable Urbanisation

- Priorities and actions for the economic sustainability of towns and cities should focus on local economic development. This entails developing the basic conditions needed for the efficient operation of economic enterprises, whether large, small, formal or informal. These include:
  - reliable infrastructure and services including water supply, waste management, transport, communications, and energy supply;
  - access to land or premises in appropriate locations, with secure tenure;
  - financial institutions and markets that are capable of mobilising investment and credit;
  - a healthy educated workforce, with appropriate skills;
  - a legal system which ensures competition, accountability, and property rights;
  - appropriate regulatory frameworks which define and enforce non-discriminatory, locally appropriate, minimum standards for the provision of safe and healthy workplaces, and the treatment and handling of wastes and emissions.

- Environmentally sustainable urbanisation requires that:
  - greenhouse gas emissions are reduced, and serious climate change mitigation and adaptation actions are implemented;
  - urban sprawl is minimised and an increasing number of compact towns and cities served by public transport, are developed;
  - non-renewable resources are sensibly used and conserved;
  - renewable resources are not depleted;
  - the energy used and the waste that is produced, per unit of output or consumption, is reduced;
  - the waste that is produced or disposed of, does not damage the wider environment,
  - the ecological footprint of towns and cities is reduced, and
  - the criteria for ‘adequate housing’ is met, namely, security of tenure, availability of services, materials, facilities and infrastructure, affordability, habitability, accessibility, location and cultural adequacy.

- As a result of the urbanisation process, towns and cities are the centres of economic and social development. They have become the centres of wealth generation and political power. With urbanisation come higher incomes, improved health facilities, and generally an improved quality of life.

- The benefits of sustainable urbanisation include access to information, lifestyle activities, diversity, creativity, initiative and innovation. For many people, especially women, urbanisation provides a chance to leave behind ‘restrictive’ and controlling village and customary norms and values, which constrain their participation and value to society in rural areas. Urbanisation, if properly managed, proves the window of opportunity to escape poverty rather than a process that supports its creation.

# Annex B: The National Urbanisation Policy for PNG, 2010 to 2030 — Major Implementation Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of NUP Component</th>
<th>NUP Component Objectives</th>
<th>Possible Key NUP Component Activities</th>
<th>Major NUP Component Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The provision of primary infrastructure and services in PNG towns and cities.</td>
<td>• the design and implementation of a national program aimed at addressing deficiencies in trunk and primary infrastructure and services (e.g. water, sanitation, power and roads) in priority urban areas.</td>
<td>• urban profiling; • town and city development strategies; • structure and physical planning; • development planning; • infrastructure investment program; • application of the PNG Challenge Fund; and • design, tender and construct.</td>
<td>• Implementation of a program of primary and trunk infrastructure (including pro poor focus) by a strengthened council authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The development of sites and services in PNG towns and cities.</td>
<td>• the design and implementation of a national program of sites and services roll out, as well as unplanned settlement upgrading; and • utilisation of customary and State lands as part of land development.</td>
<td>• urban profiling; • town and city growth strategies; • structure and physical planning; • mobilisation of land and communities; • application of the PNG Challenge Fund; and • design, tender and construct.</td>
<td>• Up scaled sites, services and upgrading programs by local councils meeting stakeholders needs, especially the poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The development and rejuvenation of provincial and district service centres.</td>
<td>• the design and implementation of a national program focusing on improving, supporting and enhancing rural service centres with infrastructure, land, etc; and • stimulate and support economic activity in agreed districts/provinces.</td>
<td>• mobilisation of communities; • economic analysis of potential centres; • town and city development strategies; • structure and physical planning; • infrastructure investment program; • application of the PNG Challenge Fund; and • design, tender and construct.</td>
<td>• Strengthened rural centres (for example, employment, services and infrastructure) being managed by strengthened community and council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Building national capacity to better manage urbanisation, urban management and urban development.</td>
<td>• the design and implementation of a national program to address urban capacity needs at local, plus district and provincial level councils so as to allow them adequately address their urban management and urban development mandates; and • *more sustainable urban outcomes.</td>
<td>• needs assessment; • national urban capacity building program supporting components 1-3, and 5; • development of toolkits; • train the trainer programs; • documentation of lessons learned and incorporate into components 1-3, and 5; and • knowledge sharing and learning.</td>
<td>• Strengthened councils meeting their urban management and urban development mandates and functions using their own resources; • enhanced civil society; and • good governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The development of national urbanisation policies, plans and programs.</td>
<td>• the development of national policies and plans to allow more effective NUP implementation including balanced urbanization.</td>
<td>• national settlements hierarchy e.g. service and mega cities; • climate change assessments; and • new urbanisation legislation.</td>
<td>• Clear policies and plans contributing to national social, economic and environmental growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>