

## 2. Content of Conference

### 4) Opinion Exchange

**M.C.:** Thank you very much for waiting, ladies and gentlemen. We would like to resume the session.

We had case study reports from five cities; now we are ready for free discussion. We would like to ask Professor Araki of University of Kumamoto to serve as Coordinator and also to kindly wrap up the session. Professor Araki, please.



**Coordinator (Prof. Shojiro Araki):** Thank you. Allow me to moderate the discussion. Since earlier this morning and also through to the afternoon we have had a very long day of discussing collaborative community building, town building. We were able to learn from different examples in different cities. And as a result we have a number of questions from the floor. I think there are many questions to the speakers, and I have just examined them all. It looks like altogether we have about 30 different questions from the floor. We would like to thank you very much for your interest. I am afraid we will not be able to answer all these questions given the limited time.

We would like to first address the questions to the speaker who has received the most questions, that is, the City of Kumamoto. And I would like to ask the City of Kumamoto to respond to the questions. And also, for the report given already in the morning, maybe there are some supplementary comments that the speaker may wish to add. We will follow the order of the presentations in answering the questions from the floor for this part of the program.

So beginning with the City of Kumamoto, we will call upon Mr. Soh, and on and on according to the order of the presentations. I would like to ask each speaker to respond within five minutes.

#### 4)-1 Kumamoto City

**Mr. Ryoji Soh (Kumamoto City):** Thank you. Speaking on behalf of the City of Kumamoto, first let me try to answer the questions given to us.

##### [Question from Mr. Sulaiman Mohamed of Kuala Lumpur]

First, from Mr. Sulaiman Mohamed of Kuala Lumpur I was asked this question: There are more than 100 members on the City Council in Kumamoto. Do they represent certain groups or are they participating as individuals?

They are representing in their individual capacities. We haven't asked the group to be represented, but rather, we have a city newsletter, and through this newsletter we are inviting many people as individuals to participate in the City Council. So they apply as individuals to participate in Council activities. Everybody is representing himself or herself as an individual.

**[Question from China]**

The next question is from China on the collaboration between the city and the public: Perhaps certain basic knowledge or training would be required for the citizen participants to be able to collaborate, and what has been done by Kumamoto to improve the level of knowledge and education on the part of the citizens?

We have the public hall or the community hall where life-long education is being offered. And there are many citizens' circles formed, and this is a spontaneous voluntary activity. Citizens are addressing certain questions, some at a citizen level, some on a social level, through such circles.

Kumamoto City is also encouraging the leaders of the community to participate in Council activities. We have our community-building workshop where we are trying to involve the citizens, for instance, in developing or improving the school districts, where we actively ask for citizen participation.

**[Question from Kumamoto City Resident]**

A question from a citizen of Kumamoto: You mentioned development and formulation of a new community as part of the citizen autonomy. Are there any examples?

I think this is the realm of Professor Araki; he is a specialist in this area. But if I may, I will provide my view. When I was young, the school district was a unit of administration. There were close neighborhood connections for local festivals and other community level activities in those days, but now we have less relationship with our neighbors. So in the eyes of the residents, perhaps the school district is still an appropriate unit to promote communications and the gathering of the residents centering around children going to the schools in those school districts. The population of Kumamoto is 700,000, and there are 80 primary school districts. That would mean there are 80 community units that should be able to display unique features on their own. So we have a combination of or collection of 80 very unique individual administrative units.

**[Question from Dr. Miyakita of the Civic Meetings for Kumamoto Environmental Partnership]**

The last question is from Professor Miyakita regarding collaborative community building. There are two aspects; the first being building parks, improving parks, and garbage waste stations, and the other being more basic philosophical types of activities or policies. We have a basic policy for Kumamoto, and the basic ordinance may have to address two different aspects. We have two-year long activities for the Council and we are hoping that the community aspect be addressed more.

We hope to reflect the views of the citizen council members in this aspect, and citizens will be making efforts and should also be offering a helping hand. So in the basic ordinance this is indeed a very important part.

But for the latter part, the environmental issues are affecting all the citizens or welfare health policies. This is where we should have the basic ordinance or sub-setup of the ordinance for the different areas in question. For instance, we have one such case for the environmental question. We should review those existing policies also in different areas for environment and others, because these would affect all the 700,000 citizens of the city. So we should have a set of different ordinances, basic ordinances for different

## 2. Content of Conference

areas covering the lives of those in the city.

There are, I believe, 300 different ordinances for Kumamoto City, and they should be organized in a hierarchy so they are closely related in addressing different areas of the lives of the citizens.

**Coordinator (Prof. Shojiro Araki):** Thank you very much. May I now move on to Dr. Miyakita?

### 4)-2 Civic Meetings for Kumamoto Environmental Partnership

**Dr. Takashi Miyakita (Civic Meetings for Kumamoto Environmental Partnership):** There are questions from three participants. Let me briefly address the questions first.

#### [Question from Mr. Hisayuki Machida of Nagasaki City]

From Mr. Machida of Nagasaki: What is the role of the Secretariat for the Citizens' Environmental Partnership?

The most important job is being a contact and liaison between the government administration and the citizens. We have working groups; there are water issues, garbage issues or the protection of greenery and preservation. They also work with the Councils and also have some relationship with the transport sector. So the working groups and the government administration side must be liaised through the Secretariat. That is one. And second, there are some funding requirements for the activities. Working groups are now getting subsidies, and these subsidies need to be negotiated. So the Secretariat job is to help in this negotiation. And third, organizing the members' list and informing all of the upcoming events as well as organizing meeting records. These are the basic functions of the Secretariat.

I believe that not everything is to be left in the hands of the government. There are three members working for the Secretariat, and we hope to strengthen the functions of the Secretariat starting next year so they are not fully dependent on the government side.

#### [Question from Vladivostok]

A question from the delegate of Vladivostok: What is the financing of Kumamoto Eco-Partnership activities?

We are collecting membership dues; 1,000 yen from individuals, 2,000 yen from group members. For the working group activities, as I said earlier, Kumamoto City is assisting through subsidies; for three working groups 1.5 million yen of subsidy was paid. But we are not going to be dependent fully on the subsidies. The working group, consisting of NGOs, have their own funds available, and also they can go to the public sector financing groups to get some financial help. So private funders are also involved.

The Government and Eco-Partner Kumamoto jointly organized certain activities, and we can commission certain activities. For instance, a million yen this year was paid for this undertaking on behalf of Kumamoto City. My belief is that Eco-Partner Kumamoto is a promoter of the local agenda for the

environment, therefore, so far the government has been spending all the tax revenues. But we are trying to regain some of the ownership of the tax revenues in the hands of the citizens through such activities. Now the tax money is not to be fully utilized by the government alone, and the citizens or private sector should be able to play a larger role in making use of taxpayers' money.

**[Remark from Conference Participant]**

Lastly, a question on compost. Instead of looking at the situation as recycling or waste, we should change the paradigm so we should look at waste as something to be part of the closed loop; there are three things: reuse, reduce and recycle. This is how we should approach the waste. And prioritizing among the three is very important.

First we should reduce the waste, and then further on, during the production and processing stage, we should reduce what could later on become waste. This is how we hope to tackle the waste issue. Today we are trying to recycle.

Eco-Partner Kumamoto now has four members working on this raised issue. In analyzing the current issues, we are trying to have a 20-year or 30-year horizon. It's back casting, not forecasting. We should have a clear picture for the long-term, and we are trying to do away with landfills and incineration. For this, looking at what the government should be doing and what the citizens should be doing this is how we are trying to approach the waste issue.

**Coordinator (Prof. Shojiro Araki):**  
the representative from Hong Kong.

Thank you very much, Dr. Miyakita. I would like to call upon

## 4)-3 The Government of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

**Mr. Jimmy Leung (Hong Kong):**

I will just go through each of them quickly.



**[Question from Dr. Miyakita of the Civic Meetings for Kumamoto Environmental Partnership]**

The first question is from Professor Miyakita. Thank you for your question. He asked me that aside from town planning, how do you get the public involved in environmental protection, preservation and public welfare?

Actually, in Hong Kong the setup is that we have a separate Environmental Protection Department and Social Welfare Department. They are the departments that are dealing with these responsibilities. They do a lot of promoting environmental education, encouraging the recycling of waste like bottles, papers, aluminum cans, and so on and so forth. They also tell the citizens how to best save energy. The process usually involves two levels: At the policy-making level, experts are involved. They give the government advice on

## 2. Content of Conference

how these things should be carried out. And on the general public level, we have campaigns, education programs and publicity to promote environmental protection.

### **[Question from Saga City]**

The second question is from Saga City, Japan, asking me to explain more about the users' liaison group. This is a small group of citizens; they are mostly frequent users of planning services, so they know about us. We nominate a small group of people, usually six to eight, and they serve a term of two years. They meet about two to three times a year and advise us on how to improve our services. For example, if we receive a written inquiry, we should respond within a week's time. They look at our records to check whether we are doing our job properly. They give us a lot of comments and advice and how to improve our services. And, they are not paid.

### **[Question by Conference Participant from Japan]**

The third question, there are two questions here actually. It's also from Japan. The first question is: what type of people are most actively involved in town planning? Are they students, scholars, professors or business people? The simple answer is that there is a mix of people, people from all walks of life are participating in the planning process. But to generalize without really giving you statistics, at the strategic level, I would say that the more informed group of people, like business people, academics, professionals, are more involved in giving us opinions and suggestions. But we try our best to reach out to the people on the streets, particularly young people, as in my presentation I talked about competition and training program for youngsters in participating in our planning process.

Increasingly students are more active in the process, probably because we are nurturing them to participate in the process at the primary and secondary school levels; they have this idea how planning is done in Hong Kong. So they are very active in participating in our process. At the local level, I would say that most of the people involved are the local residents because they care about what is happening in their own neighborhood. So obviously they are very concerned, and they come to this meeting with the residents to talk about the local plan, and so on and so forth.

The second question is: What fields of town planning are the citizens most interested in, is it education, environmental preservation, or residence construction? Actually they are interested in a lot of topics like urban design, the local area planning, but very recently, the public is very vocal on the reclamation within the Victoria Harbor. We have a lot of campaigns against it, and there are some people supporting it. So I would say the reclamation is currently the hot topic in Hong Kong.

### **[Question from Vladivostok]**

Moving on, there is a question from Russia, asking me who pays the Town Planning Board members. Good question.

Let me explain the Town Planning Board setup a little bit in more detail. The Board is made up of both official and non-official members. At present we have seven official members, like the Director of

Planning, the Director of Environmental Protection, and the Commissioner for Transport; they are there as advisors, experts in the particular field, and to advise the Board. We have 31 unofficial members, 31. So the majority are unofficial members. They are from different sectors like professional institutes, architects, engineers, planners, transporters, and engineers. There are also professors, people dealing with landscaping; a mixed group, business people as well are involved. They are not paid; they are just performing a public service for Hong Kong. The workload is very heavy because every Friday they come along to have meetings. But they are not paid anything, except perhaps a nice dinner we treat them to once a year.

**[Question from Kuala Lumpur]**

The next question is from Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, who asks: Is the strategic plan or the territorial plan a statutory document? How is the public opinion incorporated in the strategic plan?

The strategic plan, planning at the strategic level in Hong Kong is not a statutory plan; it's not a statutory document. But as I explained in my presentation, the consultation process is even more elaborate than that of the local plan-making process, where we publish documents for consultation, like this one. This is Stage 1 public consultation, Stage 2 consultation, and also the response of the government.

We release all the public comments, and we have the government's response; whether we have taken on board the suggestion or not, and if not, we have to explain. So this is a process that we have gone through in writing.

**[Question from Conference Participant]**

Now there comes the last question. I don't know the source, but it is organized in such a way that the last one is the most difficult one. The question is: After Hong Kong's restoration to China, how does this change affect citizens' lives? This is a big question. I don't think I can answer it in five minutes or ten minutes, but I will try my best so that I won't over-run my time.

Let me, first of all, say this: The basic lifestyle remains unchanged after the handover, after 1997, because I am one who witnessed it among 6.8 million other people. Hong Kong remains very much an international city; people come here, do business, and they enjoy the lifestyle in Hong Kong.

But if you ask me whether there are changes, I would say, yes, but it's probably not due to the handover in 1997, because right at the beginning or the end of 1997, at the beginning of 1998, we had the Asian financial crisis. And our property market before the handover, sort of, the prices going up and up and up, and after that, half a year's time, boom! The bubble burst, and people suffered naturally; the whole economy suffered. We experienced a high unemployment rate; never seen before. We are talking about 8 percent now. The deflation rate has been maintained for many months already, and this naturally affects investment.

But things have gotten better these days with China's accession to the WTO, and there is closer cooperation, and there are more business opportunities in China. Hong Kong, being the natural doorstep to China, to mainland China, benefits from this opening-up of the mainland. So we are improving a lot; I would say, the worst is over.

## 2. Content of Conference

Regarding people, generally, I would say the people are more vocal after the handover because they are no longer living in borrowed place, borrowed time. Hong Kong is naturally their own home now; they can plan their own future; the future is in their own hands. So they are more vocal, they are being more critical of the government. So we accept that; we try to improve, and we will do better.

On the impact on planning and infrastructure, I would like to say this one final word, this is a challenge to Hong Kong because with the handover, actually right before the handover, there were a lot of people moving from the mainland, doing business in Hong Kong, and vice versa. So there was a lot of movement at the boundary, at the border. We have to plan to open up new roads and new infrastructure to cater for the growth.

On boundary between Hong Kong and the mainland is another city is called Shenzhen. If you don't know it, it is one of the most busiest border cities in the world with over 300,000 people going across each day. So it is a huge challenge to the planners to make the proper laws and infrastructure to facilitate the interaction.

Perhaps with that I will come to a close. Thank you.

**Coordinator (Prof. Shojiro Araki):** Thank you very much. I would like to call upon the representative from Kagoshima City, Ms. Harada.

### 4)-4 Kagoshima City

**Ms. Keiko Harada (Kagoshima):**

**[Question from Saga City]**

I have one question from Saga City about the ordinance for the local participation, citizens' participation; what is the current process?

Our Citizens Participation Promotion Division was established last year for the promotion of the purpose, but before that we have always been active in promoting community activities, and we have always listened to the general public. In addition to that, we have additional people who are in charge of the actual promotion of the participation. So these added up to one division. In the implementation phase we need to acquire the opinions of the citizens. We have done that in that past.

And going forward we need to closely relate to various divisions which are related to the participation process. So for the formulation of the ordinance, what is most important in the procedure is the relationship between the citizen groups. And currently we have only drawn up the principles. For this year we need to come up with concrete plans, that is, we conduct various surveys of the current situation. According to the survey we try to examine the results. Next year we would try to draw up concrete plans to promote the citizens' participation. So for the ordinance, we have established the Citizens' Council. That is kind of a monitoring system, and we try to review their opinions raised from this monitoring system of the citizens. So this will be the current process.

**[Question from Mr. Jimmy Leung of Hong Kong]**

And we have a question from Hong Kong: How is the administration going to disseminate information, how do they try to make a fair decision from the citizens' proposals?

We try to state our position in our public relations paper, our newspaper, and also we try to provide guidelines at public facilities. We also use the Internet and have public hearing institutions. And, three years ago we started another project where we have face-to-face talks between the administration and the citizens. So we have been carrying out various projects to balance the actual policy and the policy execution.

**[Question from Vladivostok]**

I have one question from Vladivostok, Russia. The 100 Citizens Meeting, how do you select the members? We actually solicit the membership from the general public, so we use the general public relations newsletter as well as the Internet. We try to solicit applications from the general public.

**[Question from Conference Participant]**

And as for the public facilities policy, how do you actually decide on the policies for facilities for the disabled, for example, the length of the corridor, the width of the corridor, and so forth?

In this year's plan we have a plan for the Welfare Center, the Health Center, and that includes measures directed toward people with disabilities and various groups, and we are trying to acquire opinions from these different groups. And also this was touched upon in my previous presentation; this was also drawn up in our Comprehensive Plan where we try to acquire opinions from various citizens groups. That includes groups having people with disabilities and also their usage of public facilities. So their opinions are also included in the Comprehensive Plan of Kagoshima City.

**[Question from Dr. Miyakita of the Civic Meetings for Kumamoto Environmental Partnership]**

I have one question from Professor Miyakita of Kumamoto. In order to promote planning with citizens' participation, what is the current process, and what is the system that you have at this point, and what is the conscious level of the staff, besides those involved in the Citizens Participation Division?

This is for environmental policies, but citizens' rules and also businesses' rules are stipulated in the regulation, and we try to promote their policy execution on individual levels. Citizens are responsible for promotion at their own respective levels. As for the consciousness level of the staff in the City Hall, we have tried to acquire opinions from the citizens, and we have always tried to carry out this process. To formulate this ordinance, we drew up a regulation that applies to all of the City Hall staff members, and various conferences and meetings have been held to raise the consciousness of the people involved in the City Hall. This year we have drawn up 14 measures related to the issue. Some staff are not directly involved in citizens participation, and it might be difficult to raise their consciousness at this point. However, in moving ahead, as we try to enlighten the citizens, we also try to enlighten the minds of the staff within the City Hall. So it is another important strategy that we have to adopt as we move forward.



## 2. Content of Conference

**Coordinator (Prof. Shojiro Araki):**  
representative from Singapore, Ms. Seah.

Thank you very much. I would like to call upon the

### 4)-5 Singapore

**Ms. Caroline Seah (Singapore):**

**[Question from Kuala Lumpur]**

The first question I have is from Kuala Lumpur. The question is: Singapore faces the problem of scarcity of land, so what is the public's position on this and the need to have rapid urban redevelopment?

As I mentioned just now, Singapore is a really small country; it's only 680 square kilometers. Currently we have a population of four million, so that makes the population density about 600 people per square kilometer. We have actually done a strategic plan for a longer term population of 5.5 million in 40 to 50 years time. So I think the public understands that we don't have sufficient land. In fact, we receive ideas very frequently from the public telling us how we can best make use of our land. For example, one suggestion we have is building over our highways, like building a bridge over a highway. Another one is building underground? Sometimes some of these suggestions are constrained by technology and cost. So, we will bear them in mind; we can't do it on a massive scale, but we will do it selectively over time.

We also conduct frequent study trips overseas, like to Hong Kong, to study how they make good use of their land by building higher. And recently we have this idea of building under the MRT. MRT is our railway system. So, maybe one way is to make use of the land underneath the railway system. I think the key to scarcity of land and rapid urban development is actually to have a balance, which is why in recent years we have been consulting the public quite extensively on identity issues. We wonder in developing our island so rapidly, how can we still retain identity? We don't want to wipe out all our identifying areas. We still want to retain character. But we intensify our development selectively over various parts of our Island.

**[Question from Conference Participant]**

The second question is: how do we involve businesses in our plans, and do they invest in properties? For this question, maybe I can take it in two parts, the planning part and the implementation part.

In the planning part, we involve our businesses by consulting them quite extensively. When we prepare major plans like the Concept Plan and the Master Plan, we will consult businesses. We will consult partners that we work with very frequently, like the Real Estate Developers Association of Singapore as well as the Singapore Institute of Architects and the Singapore Institute of Planners.

We also have regular dialogues with them. I think once or twice every year, we meet them to see what are some of the ideas that they have, some of the feedback that they can give us about the state of businesses in Singapore, and how we can best help them and facilitate them.

Then we come to implementation, how do we involve them in implementation. Basically, after we plan, we make the land available to them through the sale of sites. We sell land to them, and they can then



invest in the land and build the property according to our plan. This is how it usually works. Only in certain cases where the private sector doesn't take up our plans, for example, when we first start conservation, the private sector or the businesses don't really understand what conservation is about. In such a case, we will then take the lead to develop the property, so we will engage contractors to conserve some houses, to do a demonstration project to show them what the project could be, and then when they look at the product and they like it, then they can invest in more projects of a similar nature. So, that's how we involve the private sector.

**[Question from Conference Participant]**

The third question is about the subject groups; it's about how we choose the subject group members and their chairperson. The chairperson is chosen by URA, the Urban Redevelopment Authority. What we do is have a list; we comb through a list of well-known personalities in Singapore or we just brainstorm. This could be people who have been vocal about government policies, people who have been actively involved in the community, or people who are just good in their fields and are just well known in the Singapore community. It's very important that these chairpersons are non-government employed because you want to make sure that the group's opinion is independent and that the whole public consultation exercise is credible. For example, for the three subject groups we have three chairpersons; one is a sergeant who is interested in building and conservation, another one is the executive director of the Singapore International Foundation, so he is very well known, and another one is a lecturer or the dean of one of our university faculties. So these are already very well known people who are known to have balanced points of view.

How do we select the members? We looked at what is the topic under discussion. So for example, if the topic is about parks, about nature areas, we make sure that the various segments of society who are interested in this particular topic are represented in the subject group. What we do is we first identify the organizations who are interested, for example, we will invite people from the nature society, for conservation we will invite people from the heritage society, then we also make sure that we have other segments of society represented, like ordinary people. So we just make sure that every segment of the society is represented within those subject groups so that all opinions can be heard at the same time, and the chairperson can then weigh these opinions and offer a balanced point of view.

Another question on the subject groups, the question is: What are the concrete measures that you can take in order to ensure that there is an agreement? As I mentioned just now, it's important to have a chairperson, so that the chairperson will basically balance the various points of view. For us we usually take the back seat. We don't interfere in their discussions unless we are asked. What we do is, because we are the Secretariat as well as the resource person for each of these subject groups, we are involved in every meeting, we sit and listen to their opinions, and where relevant, we will give all the background information that is necessary for them to reach a balanced point of view.

And we will only intervene when absolutely necessary, but so far in all our subject group discussions this has not been necessary.

## 2. Content of Conference

### [Question from China]

Finally, I have one question from China on how we handle strong objections and differences to the government.

I think the first thing we do is we will consider whether it is something that we can actually accept and incorporate in our plans, whether there are strong reasons for objecting to these voices. Especially in consulting the public, it is important that when we consult the public we don't defend our policies, because then we will come off as very defensive. All we can do is explain our government policies, provide the relevant information, and after the public feedback is all collected, we will have the opportunity to respond to all the views which are given to us.

And if we can't agree with these views, we can then explain why. Because some of these views are very local in nature, they are very colloquial, some of them are from special interest groups. So I think it is the government's role to provide balanced perspectives as well as to consider the wider and the longer-term perspectives for the country. That's it. Thank you.

**Coordinator (Prof. Shojiro Araki):** Thank you very much. I think toward the end very delicate issues had to be dealt with, and I think we have very similar questions in Japan as well. Mr. Eto, please.

### 4)-6 City of Oita

**Mr. Yoshiyuki Eto (Oita):**

#### [Question from Ms. Ono of the Kumamoto Citizen Council]

A question on the volunteer activities to develop guide dogs for the blind. Are there any activities as such in Oita?

No, there are none in Oita today. On the NHK Broadcasting Station there were some popular series about a dog named Quill that became a guide dog. I actually watched this TV program. I think I learned a lot. I was very much moved by this story of a dog. And for the assistance to the disabled citizens, we hope to see what is possible. We hope to have an opportunity to talk with people concerned.

At the City Assembly of Oita for guide dog issues there were some proposals, for instance, places for the dogs to go the bathroom and proper facilities to accommodate dogs in public places.

#### [Question from Dr. Miyakita of the Civic Meetings for Kumamoto Environmental Partnership]

There is another question for the partnership with NPO and other members of the public.

And, yes, the partner doesn't have to be a group or NPO. In promoting the partnership with citizens, we have an increasing number of non-profit organizations in the City of Kumamoto these days, so we thought perhaps we could involve these groups of people, which are usually very eager to the calls. So if the City could partner with an NPO it would be a very good start towards public participation. That's why we are now working on this possibility today. There are private businesses and other groups, and NPOs of

course are one of them. As we are trying to promote this partnership with citizens in the city affairs, we just started all this with NPOs; nothing very special as we were singling out NPOs; it doesn't have to be an NPO.

**Coordinator (Prof. Shojiro Araki):** Thank you very much for responding to the questions in a very limited time.

## 4)-7 General

**Coordinator (Prof. Shojiro Araki):** We have just one last question. I think this is a rather comprehensive question encapsulating all other questions. Who would run projects for the community; is it the community or the local government? Who is responsible? Who's in ownership? Who funds community projects? This question is posed by one of the people on the floor.

I think I may ask for a little bit of your time in trying to respond to this question which is a more comprehensive question.

When we say a community-type project, why it is the community? It's a very delicate terminology. I wonder what the idea of "community" is in the mind of the person who asked the question.

For instance, the community could be just a school district for a primary school. If you are referring to a particular project for such a size of the community, in case of Japan we have the neighborhood groups, and also there are women's groups in the community, or PTA, Parents Teachers Association, or other resident organizations based and rooted in the community of that size. So such resident groups may undertake the project if it is of a scale that is manageable to them. So such an organization is run by the residents, and not by the local government. That is how it should be handled. So, who is responsible, whose has ownership for the project? The answer should be naturally the residents or the residents' group in the community. They would have the ownership, and they should be held responsible.

Now, who funds such projects? In many cases, for the residents' group, in the community there are certain running costs, that is, the residents would pay the dues, and if the activity is within the scope of the dues collected, then that money would be used in financing the activities. But if the activity, the project is much larger in scale and more expensive, then the residents would talk to the local government and see if it could be a government measure and a part of the government's undertakings. If there is some program similar to the particular proposed project within the government's programs, then the government may be able to spend some subsidies to help with the activities of the particular community. So the running costs are to be borne by the residents. But for some more expensive type of activities, the capital cost type of expenses, the government may subsidize. This is a typical case of how funds are managed. And in Japan there are many municipalities, and I think the most typical example is between the government and the residents in groups for welfare, for community building type activities, culture, education related activities, sports, recreational activities; there are different areas where they are engaged, and they have community

## 2. Content of Conference

resident initiatives. And many of these activities are not really funded by the local government or subsidies, but the residents themselves collect membership fees, dues, to pay for these expenses. But if it requires something special and is going to be a costly project, then the local government's subsidy may be added to the pool of money collected.

But one last word, and later on, if time allows, we could invite further questions from the floor. Now, just one point. Who is to be held responsible? This is relevant to what I am going to mention, that is, in Japan very often many residents are dependent upon the local government, and this kind of tendency spread for some time. But later on people came to realize that whatever they can do should be done by themselves. This has been a major transformation we have seen in the recent past. So the people are less dependent upon the government. Very often we see collaboration between citizen groups for greater regional activities. Very often such kinds of activity for a greater area was promoted by the government's initiative. And then the government made a plan, and also offered labor to promote such an initiative. But now the citizens plan themselves, and they check to see if their plan is in line with the government's plan, and then conduct activities. When this takes place, formerly the government alone was responsible, but now the government initiative is run along with the residents' initiative, and there are certain parts that residents themselves are responsible. So, now the responsibility is shared between the residents and the local government. These are called "agreement" type or "compact" type activities, or it could evolve into contract type activities. That is agreement-based or contract-based administration. This is a methodology which may be taken, that is, the contract or the agreement would stipulate the extent of the responsibilities, also terms and conditions of the activities. Then we will see where the residents are to be held responsible, where the local government should be held responsible. And with this clarity the residents could partner with the local government in conducting or carrying out such an initiative.

Well, this has been my personal comment on this issue. I believe we have some more time available for entertaining further questions from the floor. You have already heard responses on other questions. We have had many questions in writing and the answers had to be given rather briefly. So you may like to ask for further clarification, or you may have some other additional questions. So, please raise your hand if you have any further questions.

**Mr. Kim, Gwang-hee (Busan):** As the society transforms, the private sector is changing. I would like to see in the civic society what is the direction of the policy. That is, there are some groups that are affirmative and there are some groups that are against this trend, and also there are some groups which are affirmative towards construction and some are against it.

So there are different standpoints within the civic life. In order to formulate these policies, which opinions or which ideas are you trying to base your policy on, or which are



the ones you are trying to mix or trying to implement into your policies? If you can, could you outline to us some examples, concrete examples?

**Coordinator (Prof. Shojiro Araki):** So that is in terms of the coexistence of development and environmental conservation; I guess that was the question. So how are you going to make harmony between these two? From the standpoint of harmony, and also under the theme of collaboration, how can we solve this difficult issue in terms of town planning and in terms of community building? Could some of the panelists answer this question from your own standpoint?

**Mr. Jimmy Leung (Hong Kong):** The other speakers have not indicated their willingness to answer; perhaps I will just have a go at it. If I understand the question correctly, it's about the harmony between environment and development and collaboration with the private sector.

I think cities at different levels of development will face different problems. For instance in Hong Kong, Hong Kong is a highly developed society already, and what we are trying to do now is to use the already built-up areas, like industrial areas no longer in use. We have detained those areas, adapting the industrial factories into other uses. There are a number of benefits in doing this. First of all, we can make use of the existing infrastructures. You don't need to build new roads or new infrastructure because they are already there, you can make use of them. Secondly, you will have a mixed use pattern, different uses, business, maybe residential lofts, studios in industrial areas, so on and so forth; it makes the area so much more interesting, and it's becoming more popular. These are the directions that we can use, because this is also in line with the so-called sustainable development. We try to preserve as many green fields as possible.

Although Hong Kong is a small place, as I said in my presentation it's only 1,100 square kilometers, but we have only built up about 25 percent of our land. The majority of our land is designated as country parks, 40 percent, over 40 percent, 45 percent, I think, are designated as country parks where development is strictly forbidden. This is the area people go during weekends to take a walk in a mountain-like area. So it is a very important asset we have; so, we preserve the environment. But we still need to develop, because without development, without economic growth, people will suffer. People without jobs are the ones who are socially deprived. They have been excluded from the society. So we need development; we need to protect the environment. It's a matter of choice, it's a matter of trade-off between development and environment. And the decision, as the main theme of this conference, is to involve the public as far as possible in the process.

I am not sure about the funding of community projects, because in Hong Kong we have a different model. The government sometimes provides land free of charge, or at nominal cost, say, one dollar a year. And they will use the land to build a school. And this organization will run the school, fund the recurrent cost, and so on and so forth. We now have a major development cultural facility. What the government is trying to do is to ask the consortium to develop the museum, the performance venue and using hotel and entertainment facilities to cross-subsidize the development. I don't know whether it will work or not. We are just at the beginning of the process. Some community projects are not funded by the government at all.

## 2. Content of Conference

For instance, there are some local projects by the Community Center. Because we have a high unemployment rate, even people with high level of skill can't find jobs. So some people, like those having the skills to decorate a flat, will do it free of charge for the resident. And other residents, such as those that have the skills to look after children, will provide their services and so forth; it's kind of a barter trade, if you like. This is an entirely voluntary self-help type of project done at the local level, and the government is not involved. It does not provide any funds. The people are doing it themselves. Thank you.

**Dr. Takashi Miyakita (Civic Meetings for Kumamoto Environmental Partnership):** Also I would like to make a comment. On the possibility for sustainable society, that is, ecology, environment and equity, these three concepts are very important vis-à-vis environment. We need to balance; we cannot just put forth environment only. And there are some people within the administration and the NPOs who are leaders within each of these entities. First of all, we need to develop these people with strong power, strong leadership. That is another point to be mentioned.

**Coordinator (Prof. Shojiro Araki):** I think there was another question from the floor. Could you make it concise, please.

**Questioner:** I have to say in short: My question is to our speakers from Hong Kong and also from Singapore, because I would like to know the situation of responsibility sharing in your country. And the description of Mr. Araki was very correct in terms of the Japanese situation, but I would like to know the situation of your two countries.



In Japan, responsibility sharing is nowadays increasingly toward the individual and community itself, but that's a new tendency in Japan. But before, people would like to depend upon the administrative authority or some other authorities. That's a new tendency. So, how is the tendency in your area?

**Ms. Caroline Seah (Singapore):** I think in Singapore we are still very reliant on the government. So I think the government still takes quite a lot of responsibility. We are at the stage where we are trying to get the citizens to be more involved in volunteer programs, in public participation, etc., which is why we have such a lot to learn from the conference today.

I think in my presentation I talked about public consultation. We started this in the 1990's, so now we are moving into more face-to-face public consultation to subject groups, focus groups. I think the next stage that we are embarking on is community planning, meaning, taking a project and working with the community to try to realize some of its plans. Actually I was the one who asked the question about funding. I wanted to know who is responsible; would the government still be the one to drive the program? And who is responsible for the funding of the program? I think that is something that we are working towards, and we still have a lot to learn.

**Mr. Jimmy Leung (Hong Kong):** I will answer this question briefly. Citizen participation in Hong Kong has come a long way. We don't use that many consultation programs. But in recent years, people of Hong Kong become more articulate; they want their voices heard. So we have to do more and satisfy public demand. Actually, Hong Kong is a civil society; people are very very articulate in the sense that if they don't like it, they may take the issue to the court to sue the government. This is the way we are. So we will just have to live with it. From the government's point of view we will try to collaborate with the community as far as possible. And we are doing a lot, not just in town planning but in other areas as well.

## 5) Summary

---

**Coordinator (Prof. Shojiro Araki):** Thank you very much. We have run out of our allotted time. We only have about 2.5 minutes, so I would like to make a summary of today's Summit.

Starting from this morning through this afternoon we had presentations, and by listening to these presentations I believe that the condition of the city administration in the Pan-Pacific region, in the Asian region, is in similar situations. We are aiming toward a new direction, and I believe everybody would agree with me after listening to these presentations. The major critical point that I found was also raised as a question, which is as follows: How we can keep the identity of the region, and how we can enhance the identity of that particular area? And in our case in Japan, it is not sufficiently done yet. Another point that I've found was the efficiency of the administration, and also the balance or harmonization of participation of the public. At the time of decision-making, once many people get to be involved, it takes time, and this means a decrease in degree of efficiency. This is another challenge that we are faced with. So from the aspect of considering the efficiency of the administration, and also at the same time we have to consider how to enhance the involvement of the participants, the citizens, we need to develop countermeasures. I believe that some good measures were introduced from Kagoshima City, but still this is a very difficult point, and it is not easy to find the solution. But through this meeting I believe that we identified those challenges, which is a good product of this conference.

Another point that I've found was also discussed during this discussion time, that is, among the participants they are taking activities and they are making their activities by their own funds, and also they look for contributions from the private sector. Those are cases that you may find in your own area.

But at the same time, once the public coordinates or collaborates with public organizations or the public sector, and at the time of sourcing the fund from the public sector, the conscious level of getting the money from the public sector would be different from the case that you get money from the private sector, because the money source is taxes; and once they are supported from the public sector, people tend to think that we need to get the support from the government, and you have to be treated in a fair manner compared with other organizations. So not only from the budget requirement aspect they are calculating the money that they need apparently from the comparison with other organizations supported by the government. There are about 253 organizations among the NPOs, and many of them are requesting money from the government