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About Urban 20

Urban20 (U20) is a city diplomacy initiative that brings together cities from G20 member states and observer cities from non-G20 states to discuss and form a common position on climate action, social inclusion and integration, and sustainable economic growth. Recommendations are then issued for consideration by the G20. The initiative is convened by C40 Cities, in collaboration with United Cities and Local Governments, under the leadership of a Chair city that rotates annually. The first U20 Mayors Summit took place in Buenos Aires in 2018, and the second took place in Tokyo in 2019. For 2020, Riyadh City is the Chair city and host of the annual Mayors Summit. The first meeting of U20 Sherpas was convened in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, on the 5th – 6th February during which the foundations were laid for the U20 2020 Mayors Summit in the Saudi capital later this year.

About the Urban 20 Taskforces

As U20 Chair, Riyadh has introduced taskforces to add additional structure and focus to the U20. These taskforces explore specific priority issues and bring evidence-based solutions to the final Communiqué. Each taskforce has commissioned whitepapers led by chair cities, and with input from participating cities and knowledge partners. These whitepapers help us build an evidence-based, credible and achievable set of policy recommendations.

Taskforces activation

The taskforces workstream was an innovative and recent introduction to the three-year-old U20 initiative by the chairmanship of the city of Riyadh this year. Three thematic taskforces, each guided by one of the U20 Riyadh 2020 overarching themes of Circular, Carbon-neutral economy, Inclusive Prosperous Communities, and Nature-based Urban Solutions, were officially launched and activated during the U20 First Sherpa meeting back in February. During the meeting, the U20 priority topics that fell within the three overarching themes and intersecting with the three cross-sectional dimensions of Implementing the Sustainable Development Goals, Urban Innovation and Technology, and Urban Finance and Investment were prioritized and refined through the statements delivered by all attending cities. The top 5 topics were then chosen to be the focus of whitepapers for each taskforce.
The top 5 topics under each of the three taskforces and cross cutting dimensions were then chosen to be the focus of whitepapers for each taskforce:

### Cities and Partner Engagement

The vast majority of the twenty-three cities who attended the first Sherpa meeting, representing 12 G20 countries, along with the U20 Conveners, agreed to the importance of having taskforces as interactive platforms to produce knowledge-based and evidence-based outcomes that can effectively feed into an actionable U20 Communiqué. During and following the meeting, several cities demonstrated interest in volunteering in the capacity of chairs and co-chairs, leading and overseeing the activities of each taskforce. The cities of Rome and Tshwane co-chaired Taskforce 1 on Circular, Carbon-neutral Economy, Izmir Taskforce 2 on Inclusive Prosperous Communities, and Durban on Nature-based Urban Solutions. Others expressed interest to participate in the taskforces, some in more than one, both during and after the meeting.

Alongside interested U20 cities, several regional and international organizations proffered to engage in the work of the taskforces, in the capacity of knowledge partners, to share their knowledge and experiences with cities in producing whitepapers. Some of the knowledge partners volunteered to play a leading role as Lead Knowledge Partners, supporting the taskforces’ co/chairs in review and guidance.
All participants who actively took part of the taskforces were subject matter experts nominated by the cities and knowledge partners and have enriched the taskforces’ discussions with their know-how and experiences. In over 3 months, all three taskforces, with great effort and commitment from all their participants, produced a total of 15 evidence-based focused whitepapers, bringing about more than 160 policy recommendations addressing the national governments of the G20 Member States.

The taskforces content development efforts is comprised of 23 U20 cities and 31 U20 knowledge partners. The 100+ experts and city representatives produced 15 whitepapers which widely benefited and informed the development of the first draft of the communique.

**Content Development**

Under the leadership and guidance of the chair city, Izmir, and the lead knowledge partner, Metropolis, the work of Task Force 2 kicked off with an orientation for all participants in mid-March.

During the period between March and April, the participants of Taskforce 2 presented more than 24 concept ideas and 11 concept notes and developed initial outlines for the whitepapers focusing on topics of interest. Teaming up into five author groupings, the cities and knowledge partners developed five outlines of whitepapers. Refined and revised outlines were then developed into draft whitepapers that underwent several iterations for development and finalization, ensuring that each paper delivers a set of concrete and targeted policy recommendations that address the different U20 stakeholders.
The five whitepapers under Taskforce 2 (listed below) explore priority topics on affordable housing, mainstreaming gender equality, socio-cultural inclusion and cohesion, upskilling for the future of work, and youth empowerment, and are titled as follows:

1. “Securing affordable housing delivery in cities: investing for better outcomes”
2. “Removing barriers to mainstreaming gender equality”
3. “Urban inclusiveness, safety nets and social compacts in the time of a pandemic”
4. “Inclusive creative economy and the future of work”
5. “Youth empowerment for prosperous and inclusive cities”

Along the taskforces timeline of activities, three review meetings were held where co/chairs and lead knowledge partners presented and discussed with the U20 Executive Team the progress and findings of the taskforces they represent, leading to the U20 Second Sherpa meeting that took place during the first week of July. Parallel to the taskforces activities, the first draft of the U20 communiqué was developed by the U20 Executive team incorporating recommendations presented at the third (and final) review meeting.
About the Inclusive Prosperous Communities Taskforce

Cities need to provide indiscriminate access to opportunities and services for all the diverse people that live, work, and play in them to prosper. Cities need to empower all citizens to thrive, by preparing them for the future of work and overcoming the digital divide, ensuring cultural inclusivity and integration, and providing safe public spaces and infrastructure.

The U20 taskforce on Inclusive Prosperous Communities, addresses challenges and priorities covered in global agendas that are faced by cities and these include affordable housing, mainstreaming gender equality, socio-cultural inclusion and cohesion, upskilling for the future of work and youth empowerment. Cities face daily challenges on the fronts of inclusivity, equality, accessibility, and cohesion and have been the epicenters of the recent COVID-19 pandemic worldwide.

Cities are the melting pots of different social and cultural textures are at the heart of the G20 nations’ power. Cities are in constant action to provide and ensure urban social safety nets and social protection to urban residents, far before the pandemic and are today, in a tougher position to prevent potential deterioration and speed up a healthy recovery. The priority topics addressed by this Taskforce are at heart of the cities’ battles, where each topic is portrayed in focused whitepapers that describe the situational challenges, present opportunities for change and improvement, and design action-driven sound recommendations.
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Executive Summary
Cities lie at the heart of the G20’s power and vitality. Cities have been at the epicenter of the recent COVID crisis and hold the key to short and long term recovery and renewed prosperity. Ensuring that all cities and all urban residents are safe and healthy is the foundation of a post COVID G20 agenda and this aligns with the overarching ambitions of the 2030 Agenda as well. An ambitious and innovative program of urban social inclusion is thus a G20 priority - alongside a city scale agenda for carbon neutrality and nature based urban innovation.

Urban social inclusion rests on three pillars of action to restore and secure public health and prosperity. The first pillar is, providing strong urban social safety nets and social protection to urban residents - not just in a crisis but also to prevent and recover from crises. The second pillar is ensuring that all stakeholders are prepared to and able to work together in and out of times of crisis because there are robust governance practices, attitudes and mechanisms in place at the city scale and across the intergovernmental system that are able to support the urban partnerships and social cohesion necessary to make cities resilient. The third pillar is government must protect the poor, vulnerable and marginal of the city from discrimination and include them in all aspects of city life through targeted social inclusion programs. Collectively, implementing the three pillars of urban social inclusion not only ensure fair and inclusive cities, in alignment with the SDG, but will also reduce long term risks of disease and social unrest.

This paper sets out examples of how G20 cities are already working to enhance social inclusion across these three dimensions and proposes a social inclusion learning network hosted by the U20.

Further, it provides recommendations on how to enhance urban social inclusion via action at the local, national and G20 scales are provided, with a strong emphasis on ensuring the enabling conditions of effective intergovernmental systems; fit for purpose local fiscal capacity and good sub national data are met.
Background
Background

The way cities are designed, built, organized, and run undergirds the prosperity of nations and their security (across, health, political or economic security). This is particularly so for the G20 where, for every member state, the population is already predominantly urbanized and the major cities contribute disproportionately to GDP. The power of the G20 rests on the interdependent social, ecological and economic performance of its cities.

The 2019-2020 COVID crisis demonstrates the imperative of underscoring the social dimension of urban prosperity - to securing the livelihoods, health and wellbeing of all citizens through social action in cities. Urban social inclusion policies that embrace social safety nets that protect the poorest and most vulnerable; social and political compacts which ensure that urban stakeholders can all work together and targeted social inclusion programs that mitigate discrimination and promote harmony are three pillars dimensions of the urban social inclusion agenda of the U20. This agenda sits alongside other U20 recommendations about nature-based solutions and carbon neutral cities and aligns with the global sustainable development agenda.
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This white paper – that advocates putting a stronger emphasis on social dimensions of the city as a non-negotiable practice of sustainability in the G20 – is an alert to links between regional, national and local programs that seek social inclusion alongside a carbon neutral economy and nature based urban solutions. The G20 has always acknowledged the importance of the social dimension of sustainability but COVID-19 has thrown the significance of the threat posed by failing to fully address the underlying tensions of urban social exclusion into sharp relief. In setting out a long term strategy for a safer world, the G20 must now lead on promoting a stronger focus on social issues across government and the multilateral system, ensuring that inclusion in cities is clearly prioritized in the overall drive to restore prosperity.

Prioritizing the social issues posed by urban life is not an option. A post COVID recovery will not occur until government addresses the health, wellbeing and prosperity of all citizens, in every city. Post COVID flourishing and future pandemic preparation rest, not just on finding a vaccine or antiviral therapy, but also on strengthening social policies at the city scale where the pandemic has been concentrated.

Cities, the epicenter of the disease, have borne the greatest burden of the COVID downturn but will also be the vanguard of recovery. Laying out the case for a G20 adoption of an urban social inclusion initiative, the paper has five parts:

Part 1 is the introduction

Part 2 looks at the urban nexus of the pandemic, inclusion and prosperity. It details how the work of local, national and regional actors come together around issues of reducing exclusion at the city scale. It sets out the case for a G20 focus on the city to advance inclusion and prosperity in the context of the pandemic.

Part 3 defines three pillars of social inclusion activity (safety nets, social compacts and living together policies) and provides examples of the tools and instruments that G20 members might consider adopting in the battle against urban social exclusion. To illustrate the range of social inclusion action that is possible we draw examples from cities across the G20, noting cases of special relevance to the experiences of dealing with COVID.

Part 4 explores the preconditions for effective action to scale up social inclusion across the 3 social inclusion pillars identified from work already underway in cities of the G20

Part 5 is a conclusion and a set of specific recommendations highlighting why and how cities are critical for post COVID prosperity and reiterating why the social dimension needs to be prioritized alongside nature based and smart city innovations.
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COVID-19, a pandemic that continues to ravage cities and towns across the G20 and beyond, cannot be addressed without a strong understanding of how cities function, including how they function for people and for human health. We need to not only respond to the disease but also build expertise in how and why things can go wrong in one urban place, only to impact the whole globe. Understanding that, for cities and for a global order that is dependent on the effective interconnection of a system of cities, COVID-19 is as much a social disaster as it is a health crisis. As is now self-evident, global urbanism means that the quality of life and security of every person, no matter how rich or powerful, is directly connected to the conditions of every other urban resident. A global acknowledgment of the imperative to advance a universal agenda that is inclusive, safe, sustainable and resilient exists in the SDGs and the pandemic highlights the urgency in finding practical ways to implement better urban management.

The rupture of lockdown has, rightly, prompted a massive rethink in how cities can use technology better and how the recovery can be linked to a massive shift to a green economy (see other U20 papers). Widespread social unrest, increases in gender based violence, the displacement of migrant workers who had no secure urban base, and the disproportionate health and economic burden of COVID on lower socio economic groups mean that the G20 and the world faces an escalation of unemployment and urban poverty not seen in a century.

COVID did not introduce these hardships and injustices, but without adequate protection the impact of the disease and its fallout is and will be skewed to the urban poor and underlying tensions in cities will escalate. The extensive loss of life and livelihoods, the disruption of personal and collective security and the rupture of long term assumptions about future prosperity that are associated with the recent pandemic have emphasised how interconnected we all are, reinforcing the 2030 position that we can leave no place or person behind in the search for a more sustainable developmental path.
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Box A

COVID: New cities initiatives related to the COVID-19 crisis

In March 2020, since the COVID-19 was declared as a pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO), cities proactively organized in order to cooperate, coordinate and share experiences and knowledge in the middle of the emergency. Several new initiatives were launched:

- Metropolis and Proyecto ALLAS, in cooperation with UCLG, launched Cities for Global Health, a digital platform to document and share local initiatives related to COVID-19.
- OECD developed a series of political notes on cities responses to COVID
- Association internationale des maires francophones (AIMF) adopted an emergency plan to financially support African cities to deal with COVID-19.
- C40 Recovery Taskforce gathered Mayors from selected cities in order to think collectively on a recovery approach that improves public health, reduces inequality and addresses the climate crises.
- The Seoul Metropolitan Government launched Cities Against COVID-19 (CAC), a cities’ cooperation alliance to deal with infectious diseases.

These are some examples on how cities quickly reacted in order to share experiences, resources and strengthen international cooperation. These initiatives show there still a lot of room for the G20 to reiterate its commitment to and support international cooperation.

More than ever cities must be at the forefront of the G20 thinking about the future. It is in the nature of cities that they are the concentrated sites of the design and investments not just of local actors, but also of national and international stakeholders. The fact that cities are both locally owned places and hubs of more global action requires national and sub national policy makers to commit to thinking strategically about a post COVID reality, starting with an appreciation of urban complexity and interconnections. As the varied case studies of this paper illuminate, the drive for social inclusion is achieved by many different kinds of interventions and innovations.
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Changing cities to improve health and wellbeing and reduce exclusion demands nuanced appreciation of the drivers of urban transformation to allow identification and implementation of the necessary interventions for change, including the prioritisation of new institutional arrangements, the harmonisation of activity across sectors and scales and the strategic use of location and flows across space to ensure social inclusion (Keith et al, 2020). None of this sort of radical reorganisation of cities is possible without a judicious coupling of careful planning, innovation, and money.

In the broader discussion about post COVID investment and realignment, it is imperative that calls for green renewal or smart city innovation do not sweep aside the core (often old fashioned) social dimensions of urban management and regulation. Rather, the social foundations of urban form, function, and culture that have been found wanting over the last months, must be restored to underpin the value of other fresh stimulus measures and the radical rethink of urban cohesion and inclusion.

Despite the existence of intense pressure for resources in the aftermath of the pandemic and its economic downturn, a review of social policy and how it works at the city scale is not a luxury. The fallacy of being able to distinguish between policies that promote human health and those that promote the economy has been asserted on numerous occasions over the last six months as G20 governments seek to forge their own and a shared global post COVID recovery plans. Additionally, it is imperative that the national social policy reform focused on securing health and safety is appropriately crafted for what are predominantly urban populations of the G20.

The pandemic is an inherently urban condition, in its genesis as much as its resolution, but post COVID urban interventions will demand regional, national and sub national actions. The fact that strategic policy debate about the role of cities in the G20 has to take multiple variables into account should not detract from the imperative of defining critical points of intervention including, a major revitalization of social policy interventions at the city scale that will see cities as a focus of post-recovery spending and capacity building, better urban data collection, stronger social protection, better urban governance arrangements and clear new commitments to protect the vulnerable and foster social and cultural inclusion.

The pandemic, like climate change and the degradation of ecosystem services, underscores the imperative of addressing longstanding issues of the safety, sustainability, resilience, and inclusion of cities as a priority focus of long term innovation and governance reforms, including fiscal reprioritization, law reform and capacity building for civil servants. These challenges cannot be achieved without a clear understanding of the dimensions and impacts of the problems of exclusion. It is much easier to understand what has to happen if there is a common or shared understanding of the problem to be solved. The next box sets out a common
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Understanding of the term “urban social exclusion.” It highlights the fact that people can become socially marginalized from the benefits of urban life in varied ways, including through a shock such as the recent pandemic that has left millions without jobs.

In an ideal world cities would be fair and the drivers of inequality, prejudice and the distributional, administrative and procedural injustices that have made COVID so much worse for some will be if not erased, but eased. There is an alternative to urban social exclusion and there is much that can be done to overcome and ameliorate the problem - especially in relatively rich countries such as those of the G20.

Across the G20 there has been a push to make cities more equal, fair and, the umbrella term we use in this paper “inclusive.” Successful inclusion programs predate COVID, though in recent years there has been an erosion of clear programs to ensure that all urban citizens rights are protected and that their basic needs are met, this social fragmentation was highlighted by the pandemic.

At the height of the pandemic and in its ongoing aftermath, a number of other G20 cities have embraced comprehensive city programs to promote inclusion. There is much to be learned from reflecting on what can be done, where interventions have worked well and how interventions can be scaled up or adapted for use in other cities.

Box B

Living Together, a local and global challenge

Every society -- and thus city leaders -- wonder what to do to ensure harmony and social cohesion better. In a context of diversity and globalization, increasing urbanization and international mobility are posing new challenges to social cohesion. Today, urban challenges related to inclusiveness are not just local, but also global, as cities are increasingly interconnected.

Urban inclusion involves:

- Being respected and appreciated regardless of race, gender, age, disability, etc by all

- Being part of a group, structure or institution that has local neighbourhood, city and or national and global traction and meaning -- a sense of belonging.

- Equal access to opportunities and resources

- Eliminating barriers to the above e.g. systemic or structural discrimination intolerance, unconscious bias and resulting economic, social, political inequalities i.e exclusion

(continued)
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Fostering urban inclusion is not a political luxury and it is an essential foundation of effective public health. The absence of a common or shared access to city services, values, and opportunities has exposed millions in the G20 and beyond to life threatening disease. It will preclude any effective return to a stable prosperity pathway. For this reason it is essential that the G20 nations exert strong individual and collective leadership in promoting bolder practices of urban social inclusion.

Fortunately elements of effective social urban inclusion are already in place, with G20 cities providing outstanding examples of good practice. But we need to do more, better and with innovation in the field of urban social policy to develop packages of interventions that address the multiple points of social stress in cities.

The responsibility for addressing this challenge falls primarily on local authorities who face many issues associated with “living together,” such as coexistence among different groups, efforts to fight discrimination, integration of newcomers, sharing public spaces, urban safety, etc.

Beyond its consequences on health and the economy, the COVID crisis has highlighted existing social economic and political inequalities revealing that some groups are more vulnerable than others. We also notice the emergence of different forms of discrimination and stigmatization of some specific groups. The global movement against racism that emerged in the middle of the crisis has also uncovered the structural inequalities within our societies.

The crisis has not only eroded trust, among groups, but also has created tension directed to the institutions. Those promoting extremist ideas and hate have exploited the uncertainty created by the crisis. These challenges, related to inclusion and more broadly to social cohesion also threaten peaceful coexistence within communities.

Box B
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Achieving an inclusive, fair, or safe and resilient city will not happen automatically. The concentration of economic power in cities tends to benefit some more than others, even when everyone is doing better than before on the back of rising prosperity. Moreover, other risks (such as natural disasters or pandemics) have uneven impacts. In times of recession and elevated climate risk, inequality is either amplified or is producing new divisions in cities. These are the moments when urban social policies play a critical role in maintaining stability and enabling recovery and revival. Like good insurance policies, social inclusion policies and programs need to be updated and made fit for purpose.

National and local governments can foster and stimulate urban inclusion through the use of well understood social policy instruments or tools. They also have scope to innovate in social policy, learning from successful social responses to overcoming exclusionary and unstable conditions created by or highlighted by the COVID experience.

The social dimension of urban life traverses very different areas of policy intervention. It ranges from traditional welfare or social protection and the social structure of governance right through to personal awareness training (for example around race or gender) and neighborhood and city cultural programs aimed at ensuring that every citizen (locally born or migrant) identifies with and feels ownership of the city in which they live.

The following section expands on three related but distinct forms of social inclusion and wellbeing policy and provides examples of the widely used tools and instruments illustrating their application in G20 cities, including in relation to the experience of or recovery from COVID. They are:

- Living Together Policies
- Social Safety Nets
- Social Compacts
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3.1. Living Together Policies

Below, the paper showcases a few examples of Living Together policies and examples from cities around the world.

Numerous cities around the world are investing considerable effort in promoting Living Together in their respective communities.

The concept of Living Together has emerged in a context where many factors are forcing us to think about the pluralistic reality of contemporary societies (due to urbanization, urban growth, international mobility and so on). New forms of mobility coincide with new forms of diversity. The term “super-diversity” also embraces ethnic, religious, linguistic, sexual and gender identity.

Living Together refers to:

• a concept, including a set of values (e.g.: peace, diversity, solidarity, etc.) at the political level
• a framework, which encompasses a set of actions (on social cohesion, inclusion, community safety, etc.) at the practitioner level, aiming to ensure social harmony in cities.

The Living Together concept serves as a way to approach the challenges and solutions related to social cohesion in the context of globalization. It informs city policies and programs related to all fields of municipal action (i.e.: social development, culture, housing, urban planning, urban safety, etc.).

While inclusive policies usually aim to “leave no one behind,” Living Together encourages the combination of three different policy approaches related to pluralism:

• Diversity (promoting diversity)
• Discrimination or Equality (combating discrimination)
• Dialogue (rapprochement-oriented activities)

A fourth cross-cutting principle, citizen participation, fostering public participation and social cohesion underlines the effort.

Cities - and particularly mayors - play leadership roles in the promotion of this approach. Since the first “Mayors Summit on Living Together,” held in Montréal in 2015, many cities have joined this movement.

The Summit led to the creation of the International Observatory of Mayors on Living Together, a platform and a network involving more than 50 cities around the world that exchange best practices in this field. It convenes a Mayors Summit on Living Together every two years in a different city/region around the world.

The social, economic and political challenges of the current global crisis highlights remind the urban leaders of need for inclusion policies in cities, and calls for cooperation at the international level.
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Living Together: a definition from the cities' perspective

“Living together in the city refers to a dynamic process involving various stakeholders in order to foster inclusion and a sense of safety and belonging. Promoting Living Together means recognizing all forms of diversity, fighting against discrimination and working to facilitate peaceful co-existence among society’s members. To implement Living Together, local stakeholders must work together to identify values that contribute to positive interactions and social cohesion”.

Source: AIMF’s Standing Committee on Living Together (2018)

Living Together policies - Montréal, Canada

For more than 30 years, the notion of “Living Together” has been at the core of Montréal’s society project. It involves the entire Montréal community: newcomers and migrants, urban indigenous communities, “minority groups”, as well as the host society. This approach is based on a cross-cutting vision, which is reflected in the social development policy of the city.

Starting in the 1980s, the City of Montréal embraced a set of policies supporting an inclusive society, that recognized all forms of diversity. It developed a series of programmes and initiatives around four issues: 1) Openness, 2) Social inclusion and fight against discrimination, 3) Promotion of intercultural relations, 4) Urban safety and prevention. A few recent examples illustrate this pursuit:

- In 2016, Montréal created Bureau d’intégration des nouveaux arrivants (BINAM) in order to create the conditions to support the integration of Montréal’s newcomers.
- In 2018, the City adopted the ADS + tool (Analyse différenciée selon les sexes) - an approach that allows to take into account possible forms of discrimination in the process of policy and programme development.
- The City has put in place Montréal interculturel (PMI), a programme supporting intercultural community initiatives in order to fight against discrimination and racism.
- Since the 2000, the City has implemented a series of programmes on social cohesion at the local level (i.e.: urban safety, social mediation, crime prevention, etc.), as well as a Centre for the Prevention of Radicalization leading to violence (CPRLV), which works with the community in order to sensitize to and prevent different forms of extremism.

Source: City policies on Living Together
Part 3. Three distinct but interdependent pillars to urban social inclusion and wellbeing - with G20 city examples

Box F

**Council for Foreign Residents - Strasburg, France**

Reduction of inequalities are at the core of the actions undertaken by the City of Strasburg and its partners. The city implements different actions and programmes in order to value the contribution and the participation of foreign residents.

The Strasbourg Foreign Residents’ Council (CRE) is a debate forum bringing together residents and local stakeholders in order to build a more inclusive city. The Foreign Residents’ Council aims to:

- Promote an intercultural society
- Support equality of rights and fight against discrimination
- Advocate for the right of voting and eligibility of foreign residents

The Council is composed by voluntary residents and representatives of community-based organizations. The Council and its working groups develop a working plan including actions and proposals that are submitted to city officials. The Council of Foreign Residents has been created by the will of the City of Strasburg. From this model initiated by Strasbourg, a network of French Council of Local Citizenship has been created.

Source: City policies on Living Together
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Box G

Agora Co-existence Life Atelier - Izmir, Turkey

The Social Projects Directorate of Izmir Metropolitan Municipality established the Agora Co-existence Life Atelier in 2016. It targeted selected groups (women, migrants, youth) in 15 neighborhoods in the Agora region and around the city for group assistance and educational, social and cultural activities.

Agora-Basmane district, where the “Agora Co-existence Life Atelier” is based, is one of the most disadvantaged areas in Izmir due to its high level of immigrant-population. It has become an important prototype of the success of the city’s multicultural and multi-identity programs that provide services that enable interaction among people who belong to different cultures, and create areas that will ensure their productions and sharing collectively. The result of this work, has been to create an inclusive non-discriminatory culture that is free from prejudice, the foundation of social peace and culture of coexistence.

The “Agora Co-existence Life Atelier” offers activities, that support and strengthen peoples’ psycho – social lives. The project collaborates with non-governmental organizations, local government and public institutions in order to understand the specific needs and expectations of the population.

Source: Izmir Metropolitan Municipality
**Box H**

**Embracing Diversity and Socio-economic Development - City of Kazan, Russia**

Kazan is addressing critical challenges of social and economic development through three progressive, innovative and proactive initiatives.

Launched in 2010, the “Embracing Diversity” initiative, celebrates Kazan’s multi-cultural and multi-ethnic cultural heritage. As a central hub connecting these diverse communities, in the second initiative, “The House of Friendship of Nations,” provides offices, libraries, conferences and concert facilities, and has also developed an internet portal bringing together diverse associations throughout the city and region. The initiative ensures co-existence and tolerance to achieve peace and harmony, civil identity of minorities, and effective integration of migrants.

These initiatives underpin social and economic development by harmonizing diverse populations, providing a sustainable environment and building a strong citizen base (SDG 3-4-11-16).

Source: Guangzhou awards 2018
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3.2. Urban Social Safety Nets

This section presents a definition and few examples of social safety nets in cities and a few COVID-related examples.

A provisional definition

The idea of a city that has a social safety net is that it has many different programs that together deal with varied dimensions of individual, household and collective wellbeing. Each program is important but inclusive and prosperous cities will have most if not all elements of the net – and the overall impact is what provides social and economic resilience. A key concern in delivering the overall safety net is to ensure not just the finances of a particular social or economic program but the overall spread of programs across the city. Many social programs that make up the city safety net require subsidies and so making city finances work for inclusion and prosperity is fundamental.

Social safety nets could refer to:

- Access to (free) primary health care including family planning, child and maternal health
- Social support for issues such as homelessness, domestic abuse or addiction are locally accessible
- Disaster mitigation, adaptation and response capacity is well developed and locally appropriate
- Public space and transportation is affordable well designed for all, including the disabled
- Information about the city and urban opportunity is readily available
- Food production, distribution and consumption is sustainable and affordable
- Nationally funded or run welfare, education or health programs operate optimally across all parts of the city

- Rights based Housing and land initiatives that ensure secure tenure and healthy accommodation (including subsidies if necessary)
- Affordable and accessible basic service provision for household water, sanitation, waste (including subsidies if necessary)
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Box I

COVID: Measures of solidarity with the most vulnerable - Paris, France

The City of Paris has been distributing daily some 15,000 individual meal packs in 10 soup kitchens, 22 Churches or to individuals with the help of social services (Samu social) and civil defense patrols. In addition, it is jointly operating five distribution points to give away every day meal packs with the State and Aurore, a social service organization, to help provide social services to the city’s homeless population. In less than a week, more than 1,000 Parisians participated in social patrols, in preparation and distribution of meal packs. Local aid networks, via jemengage.paris.fr platform, have been created enabling Parisians in need of help to connect with those willing to give a hand in their building or neighborhood, while always abiding and recommended health measures.


Box J

COVID: Monthly Rent Support for Young People - Seoul, South Korea

The Seoul Metropolitan Government (SMG) began its “Young Seoluite Rent Support” project in the context of the COVID-19 crisis. Under this program, young single person households that are suffering from high housing costs will be eligible for support for up to ten months. Further, the project will target 1,000 applicants -- who have lost their jobs or had their incomes decreased by more than 25 percent due to the COVID-19 crisis.

The project, suggested by young Seolites as part of the “Young Seolite Autonomous Budget” system, will serve 5,000 applicants between 19 and 39 years of age who earn less than 120 percent of the median income (criteria: health insurance payment).

Source: Seoul Metropolitan Government - Housing Department
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Box K

**COVID: Protection for women and children**

With families homebound due to the COVID lockdown, the incidents of domestic violence have spiked in the past weeks in Dusseldorf. To meet this crisis, the city government has extended its shelter and protection services and rented hotel rooms for women and children in need.

Further, the city recognized that while staying at home and social distancing were taking psychological and emotional tolls on everyone, they were especially difficult for those who already suffered from mental disorders and/or were reliant on medical or social support. Thus, it added psychological counseling services via telephone hotlines to offer assistance during these times.

This service is also available to parents who simultaneously were working and supporting remote learning homeschooling.

Source: City of Düsseldorf

Box L

**COVID: Gardons le contact! - Namur, Belgium**

In the context of the COVID-19 crisis, the city of Namur has put in place several measures to support vulnerable people. One initiative is an initiative to keep in contact with elderly and isolated people.

Every person in need can register in order to be contacted by a city staff member or a volunteer. The objective is to assist those without access to technology and identify and address any social needs they may have.

They can choose how often they would like to be contacted and what services (e.g. shopping food and medicine).

In the first month, more than 300 people requested assistance. Most of people contacted were alone or couples and wanted to be called every week. Half needed a courtesy call, the other half expressed having difficulties. One month after its launch, more than 200 people were still using the service.

The city invited more than 15,000 residents (65 years old plus) to register for this programme.

Source: Ville de Namur
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**Box M**

**COVID: Online Surgeries For Community Groups - Glasgow, UK**

Glasgow, like other peer cities, is acutely aware of the impact of COVID-19 on the community groups that many in the local communities rely upon.

To help these groups during the public health emergency, the Glasgow Council on Voluntary Services (GCVS) is offering a range of free training workshops and surgeries designed to support staff, volunteers and organisations.

The workshops have been developed, planned and will be delivered in partnership with the city-wide Glasgow Capacity Building Group including Glasgow City Council, Volunteer Glasgow, CEIS, Jobs and Business Glasgow and Glasgow Life.

Surgeries cover topics such as funding, staff furlough, homeworking and lone working, redundancy and restructure.

This initiative is in addition to the “Glasgow Helps” Community Hub, a new online directory of COVID-19 services supporting people across the city. It operates in partnership with Glasgow City Council, Glasgow Health and Social Care Partnership, and Volunteer Glasgow.

**3.3 Urban Social Compacts - and examples**

Lastly, the following section presents definitions and examples of social compacts in cities

**A provisional definition**

An urban social compact is more than participatory agreement. It refers to the cultural, regulatory, institutional and even fiscal mechanisms that exist to make the city work well and run smoothly, ensuring not just inclusion and prosperity but also ecological sustainability and climate change mitigation and adaptation. Good urban social compacts are concerned with short term and long term inclusivity and prosperity. They draw in all the actors who make decisions about how a city works (eg national and local government, all the key sectoral parties such as land management, transport, welfare or health and the non state actors). An urban social compact emerges around the points of tension and conflict as a means to settle or harmonize exiting political, social and economic interests. Urban social compacts (that may cover attitudinal, institutional or even legally binding processes) also mediate the conflicting temporal and sectoral priorities to make the city more inclusive and sustainable.
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Urban social compacts are strongest when:

- A clear intergovernmental structure is in place
- The powers and functions of government on which cities depend are appropriately funded and staffed
- Neighborhood, religious, sport and other civic organizations are active in the city
- Civil society is well organized and represented at a neighborhood and city scale
- Effective public information and critical debate on urban policy exists
- Public private partnerships and platforms are available
- Local elections are free and fair and party political funding is transparent
- War or civil conflict are not present
- Fundamental threats to the health or ecological integrity of the city are absent
- The entire population is well fed, housed and educated
- Migrants and refugees have clear, predictable and fair conditions for living in the city
- Relationships between the city and its hinterland are strong
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COVID: COVID crisis management governance - Buenos Aires, Argentina

Argentine detected its first Covid-19 case in the city of Buenos Aires, on 3 March 2020. Within two and a half weeks, the national government and the government of the city of Buenos Aires had issued more than 100 decrees and measures, including mobility restrictions, quarantine in hotels for repatriated citizens, remote working, online courses for students of all ages, healthcare system reinforcements, maximum assistance for senior citizens, and a nationwide lockdown that began on 20 March.

At the outbreak of the pandemic, a series of interconnected and highly responsive working groups were set up to manage the crisis and prepare for the “day after”, all reporting to a strategic policy working group that meets daily every morning. Decisions are data-based, a close eye is kept on how other cities across the world are acting, and the working groups maintain a permanent dialogue with the private sector and civil society.

Permanent dialogue with the private sector, civil society and academia

The city is working hand-in-hand with large companies, NGOs and universities to coordinate and strengthen collaboration on multiple joint initiatives, ranging from straightforward donations and on-the-ground support for vulnerable communities and individuals, to facilitating educational qualifications and jointly developing solutions to support the easing of restrictions as the city switches back on.

Source: Government of the City of Buenos Aires, Adaptation and response in times of crisis, The COVID-19 Strategy of the City of Buenos Aires, Updated 13.05.2020
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Box O

The City Support Program, South Africa

South African local government has an unusually high level of autonomy that rests not just on the Constitution’s allocation of important developmental powers and functions to the local scale, but also to the ability of cities to generate much of their own income from the sale of services and the raising of local taxes. High levels of urban social and economic inequality, however, mean that even the richest metropolitan areas face severe pressure to provide basic services and uphold public health and wellbeing. It is increasingly obvious that local government cannot succeed turning the tide on urban exclusion all on its own. Over the last decades national government’s commitments to urban reform (eg through the Integrated Urban Development Framework or IUDF) have become an increasingly important driver for realising social inclusion at the sub-national scale. After sustained reticence to give cities any political priority, there are now clear efforts to improve urban social inclusion across government.

The City Support Program (CSP), run out of the National Treasury, is an example of a new form of social compact intended to improve intergovernmental and inter-sectoral issues as post apartheid cities strive to address big challenges like reducing spatial segregation or massively improving public transport access for the urban poor. Unlike earlier periods where a national commission was typically followed by the promulgation of new regulatory or fiscal interventions in a command and control execution of policy, the CSP is grounded on building enduring relationships between national and local levels of government. Under the auspices of the CSP expert interventions designed to improve monitoring and evaluation systems or remove fiscal disincentives have been forged through embedding staff in the institutions that must deliver urban services. Crucially the CSP brings into the Treasury highly regarded staff with a track record in local government.

Significantly, the CSP has not taken up any urban health reforms - reflecting the tendency for local government in South Africa to focus on built environment functions like water, sanitation or transport rather than the social welfare functions of health or education that are the remit of provincial and national government. In thinking about the formation of social compacts post COVID, the institutional linkages that must be built to ensure social inclusion and public health in cities it may need to be given a higher priority.

Source: African Centre for Cities
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Box P

**COVID: COVID-19 Health Inequities Task Force - Boston, USA**

A new COVID-19 Health Inequities Task Force was created to provide guidance to the City of Boston on addressing current inequities in data analysis, testing sites, and health care services for Blacks, Latinos, Asians and immigrants.

The Task Force will review existing racial and ethnic data among Boston residents, as well as review data collection processes, data analysis and best practices related to the COVID-19 response for the Black, Latino, Asian, and immigrant populations. This guidance will support a strategy for equity and accessibility to services for populations that are historically underserved or underrepresented, including recommendations for additional resources and considerations, that can be implemented by the City of Boston and community and healthcare stakeholders that are serving as partners in this response.

Source: City of Boston

Box Q

**COVID: C40 Recovery Task Force**

In April 2020, a dozen of C40 mayors united to launch the Global Mayors COVID-19 Recovery Task Force to rebuild their cities and economies in a way that improves public health, reduces inequality and addresses the climate crisis. The COVID-19 pandemic has profoundly impacted the world’s cities. It is not just a global health crisis, but a social and economic crisis, the effects of which will be felt for years to come. The harm caused by COVID-19 has not been equitable. Leaders of major cities across the globe are clear that their ambition should not be a return to ‘normal’ - their goal is to build a better, more sustainable, more resilient and fairer society out of the recovery from the COVID-19 crisis.

Source: C40
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In 2018 at the U20 Inception meeting in Bonn, the attendees proposed seven entry points to elevate action on cities:

- Foster hybrid multi-scale urban finance and governance
- Prioritize and localize the new normative urban agenda
- Build capable civil society
- Improve data and intelligence
- Expand public good and future value of cities
- Contain and channel the private sector and elites
- Reduce conflict and crisis

Along the process, the U20 has continued to address these topics in relation to climate action, social inclusion and integration, as well as sustainable economic growth. This year, the U20 is tabling more specific recommendations on actions to be taken to ensure that cities are an integral part of the work of the G20. These include adopting a bold program of urban social inclusion (see recommendations below) and defining cities as the leading edge of the COVID recovery (see the COVID Urban paper).

A number of preconditions must be met before large scale changes of the kind set out in this paper can occur. They include:

- Political buy in - a clear commitment from leaders of cities, nations and the G20 itself to the importance of the sub national scale
- Capacity building across all G20 cities and towns and in national departments with an urban remit
- Updated fiscal and regulatory frameworks of national and sub national government to ensure the effective working of the three pillars of social inclusion
- Data – comparative data; interoperable sectoral data; geospatial data; longitudinal data is needed at the sub national scale to provide evidence led advice on urban social inclusion challenges and opportunities.
- Robust and holistic government that has the confidence and trust of citizens
- Innovative outlook that is willing to make radical changes in how cities are designed, built and managed to ensure a different more inclusive urban pathway
- Strong and well informed civil society that can engage with and hold local and national government to account and encourage innovation
- Technical expertise in the three pillars of social inclusion (urban social safety nets, urban social compacts and targeted living together policies).
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Box R

Civic Imagination: Engaging Communities for a More Inclusive and Sustainable City - Bologna, Italy

In 2014, two major events led to the implementation of this initiative. The residents of Bologna had demanded the right to manage abandoned public spaces, as a way to improve their neighbourhoods, a power not permitted by existing municipal regulations. That year also witnessed a 30 percent drop of voting turnout in the city’s regional elections. In view of this loss of interest in civic affairs, the municipality launched “Civic Imagination” to regain the trust of the citizens by work with them to create a better living environment.

Overseen by the Vice Mayor, this initiative has three key components: a regulation, participation laboratories and participatory budgeting. Legislation, which serves as the foundation of the initiative, legalises the cooperation between the government and citizens for the regeneration and maintenance of public spaces. The participation laboratories, located in each of the six districts of Bologna provide the venues for public meetings, during which the citizens can voice their needs and discuss issues like how to use resources. Participatory budgeting, started in 2017, allows the citizens to have a say about certain budgets for proposals of specific renovation projects.

The initiative has not only contributed to the improvement of the city’s public spaces but also strengthened social cohesion in the city. It has engaged a large number of people. For instance, in 2017, 2,500 people, including city executives, have participated will focus on involving more young people from high schools and universities in this process.

Source: Guangzhou awards 2018
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Box S

Diriyah Gate - Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Diriyah, established by, King Abdulaziz bin Abdulrahman bin Faisal as the capital of the First Saudi State formed the foundation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. In 2010, historic Diriyah achieved international recognition with At-Turaif listed as a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

This national landmark is set to become a destination welcoming Saudi and overseas visitors. It will proudly reveal the origins of the modern Kingdom and the cultural and spiritual values on which it is firmly rooted. Its legacy will also enhance the awareness and education of the youth of the country and provide a declaration of national identity.

Diriyah Gate has been conceived around this key landmark of At-Turaif to celebrate and recreate its uniqueness through a mixed use vibrant urban district that becomes a source of pride for country.

Diriyah Gate aspires to become a cultural destination that will act as a catalyst for growth in both the local and regional area. It is an iconic project which embeds, reflects and celebrates the rich history of Diriyah and its unique architecture and heritage; a source of inspiration for Saudi citizens to reflect on the past, and be proud of their new future and place in the world. While in 2018 about 1 million people visited, the authority expects that the number of visitors could increase up to 27 million annual visitors by 2030, including almost a quarter from abroad.

The site is undergoing a $17 billion-dollar revamp and about 1 billion riyals ($267 million) of contracts are already awarded. In addition to government funding, the initial phases have gained traction from a lot of Saudi entrepreneurial capital and most recently from foreign capital as well including an interest from global hospitality brands.

The Diriyah authority plans to complete most of the 86 main assets, which include hotels, museums and performing arts centers, within five years. The projects targets achieving social and cultural inclusivity through different fronts:

- Distinct urban district – replicating a 300-year-old mud settlement, unique in its form and function, to form a piece of city with a real community and active resident population;
- Walkable district – collection of neighborhoods with daily uses within reasonable walking distance for residents;
- Visitor focus/tourism – Centre for history, heritage and culture at national and regional

(continued)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| scale – a regular destination for residents and a must-see destination for international visitors;  
- Connected district – a porous development at its core, well-connected with all surrounding neighborhoods across the western ring road;  
- Reinforce heritage links – a homage to heritage through the design layout and style of buildings and districts; retaining and enhancing views towards At-Turaif and Wadi Hanifah;  
- Car free environment – special limited access will be allowed with parking mostly below ground.  

The Royal Commission for Riyadh City (RCRC), is the custodian of the overall development of Riyadh City and is a key stakeholder in this project. Diriyah Gate Development Authority (DGDA) works closely with RCRC to ensure that the Diriyah Gate Development fits into the overall Riyadh puzzle and works harmoniously and compliments other developments with the same end goal which is to achieve the overall vision of the Kingdom for both state and city. In addition to RCRC, DGDA has been working closely with different stakeholders including UNESCO, expert panels (formed by global experts approved by the Board) and other academic foundations particularly around the heritage and culture agenda.

When it comes to innovation and technology, Diriyah Gate’s aim is to become a Smart District leader. This entails a world-class user experience, optimal performance of assets (i.e. monitored by smart systems), world-class community infrastructure (i.e. aligned to the wider Riyadh city plans) and complete curation of assets of experience.

Nurturing local talent has been at the forefront of DGDA agenda. DGDA has a Saudization rate of over 70 percent encompassing both professional and managerial levels. This includes all professional areas from strategy to finance, development, design, project management, heritage and culture, support services, etc.

DGDA has also been sponsoring local students to study both internationally and locally, completing degrees that are relevant to the target sectors of DGDA and therefore can directly contribute to the economy and employment rates upon return.

Furthermore, DGDA employs foreigners of the highest caliber, working hand in hand to deliver the vision and mandate. This in turn, allows for on the job training for the young Saudi talent nurturing and developing future professionals and industry leaders.

Source: Diriyah Gate Development Authority
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The G20 mobilizes the world’s largest and most powerful nation states. These 20 countries also represent (and depend on) their powerful cities for their global prominence and national prosperity. Cities of the G20 hold a significance beyond the national boundaries within which they are located. Nations that thrive do so in large part because their major cities are healthy, prosperous and well-functioning places. They act as hubs and conduits of the global movement of people, trade and wealth, but also are sources of emissions, disease and pollution.

Conversely, inter and intra urban inequality and exclusion provide proxy indicators of wider national fragmentation and malaise. The tension between prosperity and inclusion is thus inherently urban. Crises such as the recent pandemic also reveal that the foundations of global prosperity rest on having cities that ensure public health, that protect the vulnerable in conditions of crisis and that can be galvanized to reform in ways that ensure human health and wellbeing alongside other major urban reforms.

CORONA has tilted the G20s’ policy emphasis dramatically. The current global health crisis, that is concentrated in cities, underscores why it is a priority for the G20 to affirm and where necessary reassess the provision of urban social safety nets, foster social compacts that allow all stakeholders with a role in cities to work together and promote the living together policies that ensure that cities are creative stimulating places for all in the context of a post pandemic recovery (see recommendations).

Incorporate three pillars of Social Inclusion Policy into the G20’s Post COVID response

Urban Social Safety Nets
- Expand social safety net and social protection, especially for low income frontline wage earners who have played a critical role throughout the Covid-19 pandemic
- Ensure capacity to subsidise and redistribute at the city scale, especially for those working in essential services and those working in the informal sectors

Urban Social Compacts
- Promote cross sectoral and scale interaction across all tiers of government and across territorial jurisdictions
- Consolidate meaningful city partnerships in coordination with civil society and business at the urban scale

Social Cohesion and Inclusion Policies
- Adopt urban diversity management policies
- Recognize cities as laboratories of socio-cultural inclusiveness and cohesion
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- Apply a gender lens in policies and technologies to design safer public spaces and services
- Recognize the role of Mayors and national leaders in the fight against discriminations and the development of a sense of community

Prioritise Urban Social Inclusion Action Across Scales in the G20

Within the G20
- Consolidate the mandate of the U20 to include a focus on social inclusion and mandate to undertake research and make recommendations to the T20

National Government should:
- Promote ‘National Urban Policies’ including the profiling of social cohesion of cities in G20 member’s plans and strategies for attaining the Sustainable Development Goals
- Encourage governments and employers to adopt gender and diversity mainstreaming tools to develop pandemic response strategies.
- National governments should invite their respective cities to include Voluntary Local Reviews as part of their national reporting on the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals

- National governments should encourage effective intergovernmental collaboration on social policy and, where appropriate, the devolution of social policy to local authorities

Local Government need to:
- Ensure effective capacity building of key actors and stakeholders to identify critical needs and priority areas of action for enhancing social inclusion
- Revise their local development strategies to foster innovative approaches to enhancing social cohesion
- Engage, and their associations, in the systematic identification, documentation and dissemination and exchange of good practices in the enhancing social cohesion

Foster the Enabling Conditions for Urban Social Inclusion Impact

Improve City Data
- There is a need for a platform where cities and their private and civil society partners can exchange knowledge, experience and expertise on the collection and analysis of comparable social data (i.e.: sex-disaggregated) for monitoring the effectiveness of urban social safety net provision, strengthening social compacts and inclusion.
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Fiscal Capacity at the City Scale

- Both national and local governments need to revisit their fiscal policies and strategies in the provision of basic services to ensure greater and more resilient social protection in cities.
- National governments should devolve more human, technical and financial support to social programs implemented by cities.
- Adopt gender-responsive budgeting to ensure that pandemic recovery measures foster a gender-inclusive workforce.
- Local governments should provide reliable support to civil society and grassroots organizations that work directly with the urban poor and the most vulnerable segments of society.

Ensure greater coordination with cities in the recovery and post-pandemic process

Within the G20

- Create a forum where representatives from all tiers of government, civil society organizations and the private sector can exchange good practices in post-pandemic recovery.
- Foregrounding cities in the G20 COVID response via U20. Mayors could be included within the Delegations of G20 Summits.

National Government should:

- Foreground cities within the national COVID response.

Local Government

- U20 learning networks on Social Policy (focusing on the 3 pillars and starting with how they relate to COVID).
References


Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, Agora Coexistence Life Atelier [Internal document - updated January 2020].

Keith et al. (2020), Future Cities, New Economy and Shared City Prosperity Driven by Technological Innovation, UN-Habitat, Nairobi.


The G20 Finance Ministers and Central Banks Governors Meeting, Communiqué, 15 April 2020 (Virtual).


Ville de Paris, Parisian Measures, Measures to contain the spreading pandemic of COVID-19 [Internal document - updated 04.05.2020].

Additional References for Reading


D. Metropolis (2019): "Do metropolises have gender?”. Gender Keys Collection, n°1. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK https://webmail.arriyadh.net/owa/redir.aspx?REF=gNXOPd8Fq3hsp12VdIn wLm8u6Gugdusj88B7GI7uKQIrs34yvYCAFodHRwczovL3d3dy5ZXRYyb3BvbGlzLm9yZy9zaXRlcyc9KZWZhdWx0 L2ZpbGVzL3Jlc291cmNlcj9kZWZH dWx0L2ZpbGVzL3Jlc291cmNlcj95wZGY."https://www.metropolis.org/sites/default/files/resources/do-metropolises-have-a-gender.pdf


Appendices
COVID: The role of innovation in bridging containment, mitigation and recovery

The COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on cities described in this white paper underscore more than ever before the need for urban innovation in all of its dimensions. As cities in the G20 begin their path to recovery, it will be necessary to undertake an appraisal of our past policies and practices. There are already initial indicators that show how some cities coped better than others in very similar conditions and contexts. It will be essential to draw those lessons out to help re-shape the urban agenda.

The Guangzhou Award for Urban Innovation, designed as a knowledge sharing system for sustainable urban development, recognizes the unique challenges of the COVID-19 crisis. It is therefore expanding its scope for the 2020, in close collaboration with UCLG and Metropolis, to include the following key issues and lessons learned from experience in recognizing the front-line role of local authorities. Some of the key issues and questions that need to be asked include:

Viewing containment, mitigation and recovery as a continuum most notably from the perspective of what worked well and why and what worked well and why and what worked less well and why;

Rethinking local governance mechanisms including the respective roles and responsibilities between different departments, sectors and tiers of government. Cities and regions that responded well to the outbreak and the effects of the pandemic were, in many cases, already engaged in systems thinking and improved communications, information and resource sharing across departments and jurisdictions;

Rethinking urban morphology and typology including new perspectives on density, compactness and mobility. While there are no one size fit all responses, there are definitely lessons to be learned from the pandemic in terms of the spatial configuration and design of the city;

Addressing the unacceptably high impact of the Covid-19 pandemic in terms of the exacerbation of social, gender and racial inequalities in cities. This will require a systemic approach to eliminating often built-in barriers to social, economic, legal, procedural and budgetary equity;

Improving the resilience of the urban economy and reducing the risk of failure. How could decentralisation and recentralisation of certain municipal functions improve the resilience of cities and which actors need to be empowered to effectively manage them;

The role of technology, especially information communication technology, to help monitor and evaluate the effectiveness to containment, mitigation and recovery strategies.