Iss. 7 | October 2008 | INAUGURAL LECTURE OF THE UOC 2008–2009 ACADEMIC YEAR

Planning and Beyond in the Globalising World

By Alfonso Vegara
President of the Fundación Metrópoli
Trustee of the Eisenhower Fellowships
Honorary Consul of Singapore in Spain

Presentation
Imma Tubella, President of the UOC

Counterpoint
Francesc Muñoz
Urbanisation Observatory Department of Geography
(Autonomous University of Barcelona)

From the UOC on the Internet to the Network-UOC

Imma Tubella

Two years ago, at the Inaugural Lecture by Professor Mustapha Cherif, I wanted to highlight his work in obstinately fighting for dialogue and diversity, for opening up to the world, for linking modernity and tradition. Likewise, at last year's Inaugural Lecture, I underlined how we have taken on the values represented by William J Mitchell, Professor and Director at MIT's Media Lab; ie, innovation, collaborative and interdisciplinary work, and rigour. Following on with this thread, this year I am delighted that Alfonso Vegara – architect, economist and sociologist, but, above all, innovator in spirit and action – is to open this academic year, whilst maintaining the links to previous years. I would like to share with you all my admiration for his desire to search out and find answers to the effects of the globalised world; for the culture of innovation and internationalisation that runs through his projects, and for his work over many years to improve the sustainable development of cities and regions; in other words, the sustainable development of people.

This drive for quality, sustainability, coexistence, opening up to the world, mobility, cooperation and innovation has also marked our University's direction.

As we reach fifteen years of activity, the UOC is to enter a decisive stage in consolidating its position in the Catalan, Ibero-American and European university systems. It will be a year of change, not just because of the starting up of the first European Higher Education Area-adapted degrees, but also because of the need to rethink the educational model that the UOC has spearheaded for the last decade, to redraft the Statutes of the University Foundation to adapt to the new legal framework and to reshape our teaching, work and research environment, the Virtual Campus, which has to face up to the demands of a community of more than one hundred thousand users committed to lifelong learning. The UOC has to evolve alongside ICTs.

Faced with this ambitious challenge, the University's Governing Council has decided to drive certain specific strategic objectives for the organisation over the academic year 2008-2009. These are to act as the focus for the strategic principles of the current seven-year period. Cooperation, communication, transversality, flexibility, mobility and quality are the bases for the organisation's renewed corporate culture.

The main objectives for the academic year 2007-2008 were development of the Virtual Campus, positioning of the Ibero-American Campus within the Spanish university system, approval of the first EHEA-adapted degree proposals, consolidation of the International Graduate Institute (IGI), starting up of innovation catalysing projects, drafting of the Library's strategic plan, completion of the institutional assessment process and negotiation of the Programme Contract; whereas the key challenges for this new academic year, 2008-2009, are to position the UOC in the world, rethink the research, roll out new Campus tools and classrooms, and consolidate our place as an international benchmark for e-learning.

Highlights in our agenda for this new phase include increased cooperation with local and international bodies, mobility (of knowledge, students and faculty), technological (Virtual Campus 5.0) and teaching innovation (a quality, multilingual offer), driving research (new knowledge areas), commitment to social wellbeing (quality of life) within our University and beyond, and humanitarian outreach through the promotion of cooperation projects (Eco-University, Virtual Cooperation School).

These objectives are our priorities and an inspiration to all the teaching and management teams, designed to strengthen the UOC community and complete the transformation of our organisation into a university network: a university born on the Internet, online and open to people, cultures and ideas.

Imma Tubella
President of the UOC

uocpapers · e-Journal on the Knowledge Society

article

Planning and Beyond in the Globalising World

Alfonso Vegara

Abstract

Globalisation has completely changed the scale of territorial intervention. The global economy has generated continental spaces of economic cooperation and trade. International regulators were created alongside. Similarly, a new spatial culture is needed to accommodate these macro-economic mutations. This paper shares some reflections on what such a new spatial culture could entail and how it would influence the professionals who deal with the built environment.

Keywords

planning, globalisation, mega-region, governance, urban ecosystem of innovation

Resum

La globalització ha canviat completament l'escala de la intervenció territorial. L'economia global ha generat espais continentals de cooperació econòmica i comerç. Paral·lelament es van crear reguladors internacionals. Anàlogament, cal una cultura territorial que tingui en compte aquestes mutacions macroeconòmiques. Aquest article comparteix algunes reflexions sobre què podria implicar aquesta nova cultura territorial i com influiria en els professionals que tracten amb l'entorn construït.

Paraules clau

planificació urbanística, globalització, megaregió, governança, ecosistema urbà d'innovació

Setting the Scene

Globalisation has completely changed the scale of territorial intervention. The global economy has generated continental spaces of economic cooperation and trade. International regulators were created alongside.[1] Similarly, a new spatial culture is needed to accommodate these macro-economic mutations. This paper shares some reflections on what such a new spatial culture could entail and how it would influence the professionals who deal with the built environment.

Evolution of Urbanisation, Government and Planning

Industrialisation and urbanisation brought about an unprecedented change in the settlement structure and its administration. Population growth compounded with migration to cities generated exponential demand for living space which resulted in suburbanisation, densification and overcrowding. Government structures followed this growth with cities aiming, and often succeeding in incorporating adjacent local authorities. This extended territorial base affected the management of space.

---

1. To name but a few, banking: The World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and equivalent regional banks such as EBRD (European Bank of Reconstruction and Development); free trade: WTO (World Trade Organisation) (regulator), NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement), FTAA (Free Trade Area of the Americas), the European Union Single Market, ASEAN AFTA (Asian Free Trade Area); telecommunications: ITU (International Telecommunications Union) (regulator), ISO (International Organisation for Standardisation) (regulator), ECTA (European Competitive Telecommunications Association), the International Trade and Economic Development.

uocpapers e-Journal on the Knowledge Society

Planning as we know it became a key instrument of spatial development. It arguably has its origins in the 19th century when plans for whole cities were devised to accommodate their transformation.[2] In many places urban development was originally left to industrialists[3] or to "realtors" in the USA[4], while some philanthropic entrepreneurs realised planned settlements for their workforce in the UK in the absence of public spatial planning.[5]

In the early 20th century, key responses by planners and urban designers were formulated in the Athens Charter in 1933 postulating the rational city[6]. Their ideas found shape in the New Towns, albeit with uneven results as their urban functionalism was often misunderstood and misinterpreted. Without a doubt, they influenced formal 20th century planning, pioneered in the UK.[7] Before functionalist modernism, at the turn of the 20th century, the Garden City Movement[8] reacted against the insalubrious environments and living conditions which industrialisation had spawned and realised private developments.[9] Both these planning concepts required political support for their implementation and their legacies persist side by side as key planning models to date.

More far fetched urban utopias have inspired planners and their political masters over many centuries. New utopias, ranging from apocalyptic visions to places for ultimate happiness are continuously dreamt up by visionaries, also among designers whose visions are often driven by aesthetics.

After the Second World War, technology harnessed for mass production brought about affluence and widely affordable motorisation. Together they generalised urban sprawl, starting in the USA and spreading to all industrialised nations and now increasingly to emerging economies. The expansion of the urban fabric, most noticeably in large cities, diffused populations to medium size cities and further out to villages, thus spreading suburbanisation even to rural areas. Metropolitan government structures were put into place for large cities and their hinterland to enable them to exercise more integrated spatial management. Meanwhile, in developing countries poverty and hunger continue to drive populations to cities where squatter settlements are spreading through their outskirts and invading the existing fabric.

Many new conceptions of cities have arisen since post-modernism has disowned modernism. They were influenced by the post industrial revolution of information technology and its introduction of virtuality on the one hand,[10] and the democratic demand of citizens for a greater stake in the making and running of their urban environment on the other hand.[11] Fed by the contradictory nature of globalisation, the digital revolution is affecting the structure and function of cities, as does the democratic deficit reinforced by ever increasing spatial concentration of power remote from citizens.

Planning Issues in a Globalising World

Climate change

Besides the spatial and socio-economic dysfunctions stemming from fragmentation and polarisation, the latest preoccupations of development strategies are global warming and climate change. The environment, ecology and now sustainability have become a crucial aspect of forward planning and require access to a new body of knowledge. In turn, scientists who study these issues desire a better insight into the built environment and its potential to alleviate them.

For some time now, planning issues have branched out beyond purely spatial matters to economic, social and environmental concerns, the three pillars of sustainability. Such an approach requires both a great understanding of the interaction between these sectors and their spatial effects at different scales. The New Charter of Athens,[12] promoted by European planners in 2003, includes environmental connectivity as one of its key planks of sustainable development, linking up health and other social concerns with nature, landscape, open spaces and energy. Yet all its strands of preoccupations converge into spatial synthesis, an important new notion in a world which focused primarily on the globalisation of the economy.

Migration and cultural cohabitation

Globalisation was expected to accelerate wealth creation and increase prosperity worldwide. There are signs though, confirmed

---

2. eg, Ildefonso Cerda's Barcelona (general theory of urbanisation); Otto Wagner's Vienna; Reinhard Baumeister (1876), Incorporarated society of Architects and Engineers (1907); Commissioner's grid iron plan for Manhattan New York, in 1811, for developing and selling land (by governor Morris, John Rutherfurd and Simeon De Witt).
3. *Laissez faire* urban development was common during the Industrial Revolution throughout Europe, with entrepreneurs building cities to harness primary resources near coal mines, oil and gas reserves, primary materials, or manufacturing towns near water courses, etc.
4. eg, Houston Texas was founded by real estate developers, the Allen brothers, with little planning.
5. eg, Cadbury's Bourneville, Lever's Port Sunlight, Peabody's philanthropic housing for workers.
6. CIAM (1933).
7. Various royal commissions (eg, Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population, 1940) prepared the ground for the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act, seen as the precursor of modern town planning and still the underlying model of planning today.
8. E. Howard (1902).
9. Letchworth was the first garden city in England, followed by Welwyn Garden City, alongside Barry Parker and Raymond Unwin and Edwin Lutyens's Hampstead Garden Suburb in 1907.
10. eg, digital cities, invisible cities, networked cities, intelligent cities, mobile cities, spaces for the knowledge society...
11. eg, convivial city, hidden city, cities for people, survival cities, liveable cities, healthy cities, creative cities...
12. ECTP (2003).

UOC

by scholars of complexity economics,[13] that the new riches are very unevenly distributed throughout the world and that the gap between those who are getting richer and those who are falling behind is increasing dramatically. Although affecting countries and regions in different ways, these contradictory effects are most visible in cities which have to accommodate the wider consequences of these trends, most noticeably migration. Due to *in-migration*, many cities are getting increasingly cosmopolitan. Yet, in turn they show signs of social and spatial segregation. Such ethnic, cultural and economic diversity can bring tensions and social conflicts. How to transform these differences into assets are very much the tasks of cities, the key protagonists of spatial, as well as social and economic solutions.[14] These new geo-political changes have become an inherent part of planning and require a better understanding of their impacts on spatial development and human wellbeing.

Knowledge base of planning

The examples of climate change and migration demonstrate the need for planning to interact increasingly with areas hitherto outside its remit. How to establish links between these specialised fields of knowledge – still very much in the making – and the intellectual capital of planners, and at what level, or for which purpose has become a pressing issue. This, in turn, raises questions about the knowledge base of planning.[15] Examining whether a convergence of planning strategy and ethic is feasible at the globalising level requires a solid base of inquiry. ISOCARP had the foresight to prepare the ground with its *International Manual of Planning Practice*[16] which exposes the trends of physical planning worldwide, together with a critical assessment of the effectiveness of planning in the light of unplanned development. All these transformations and changing contexts require not only new insights but new planning instruments to invent the cities of tomorrow and to create conducive spaces for the knowledge society. A well known literature, too vast to address here, has dealt with many of these trends.[17]

Urbanity of the future

Territorios Inteligentes,[18] a vision of future urbanity, focuses on the drive of those who aim to reinvent the city by design, albeit aware that their ideas need political support, appropriate institutional structures and entrepreneurial drive to get implemented. The

work of the Fundación Metrópoli carried out in over thirty cities to identify their components of excellence, based on the Proyecto CITIES analytical tool it developed interactively at City Forums, has led to the conclusion that cities have to resort to innovation and creativity to realise their full potential. The research indicated that cities and regions with a promising future are those able to imagine an "urban project". Based on a well pondered balance between an economic development strategy driven by city-own, context-specific assets, cohesive social development and respect for the environment, the urbanity of such "urban projects" is enhanced by innovative landscape design.

This succinct review purports to set the scene for current thinking about the spatial dimension of a new urbanity and its democratic governance. Uneven economic development means that cities at different stages of economic development are subjected to different phases of these processes. Yet, those lagging behind may grasp the opportunity to learn from others and leapfrog directly to the most contemporary ideas about sustainable spatial development and how to plan and sustain it.

A New Spatial Culture

The Emergence of Meta-Regions

Early initiatives in the USA conceived the relations between existing cities as large scale regional entities, for example from Boston to Washington. America 2050 foresees that the most urbanised areas are merging into mega-regions, federated in a national spatial plan. When Japan entered into breathtaking economic growth it spawned the movement of metabolic design which expanded cities underground, under water, onto reclaimed land, into large metropolitan conglomerates within the Tokyo to Osaka Belt. Combining west and east – traditional dualism with dynamic pluralism – in an increasingly nomadic world, Kisho Kurokawa proposed a better symbiosis between man and nature, based on metabolic concepts which he expressed in his ideas about cities and super-regions of the future, such as multimedia super-corridors.[19] Comprehensive regional development strategies are also proposed for the Pearl Delta with its unprecedented growth of cities in numbers and size.[20]

13. eg, E. Beinhocker (2006).
14. The study on open cities is an example of advancing this topic. See the British Council project *Open Cities* (2008) <http://opencities.britishcouncil.org/web/index.php?what_is_en>, in which Greg Clark participates.
15. ISOCARP has compounded a considerable body of knowledge on planning during its existence of over four decades which is synthesised in: J. Ryser *et al.* (eds.) (2005).
16. J. Ryser *et al.* (eds.) (2008).
17. Besides many expert authors, Peter Hall's seminal work is a comprehensive way into to these developments. See, for example, P. Hall (1988) 2002.
18. A. Vegara *et al.* (2004).
19. K. Kurokawa (2001) and (1998).
20. eg, by The Hong Kong Guangdong Cooperation Joint Conference.

In Europe, the European Union refers to the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) – elaborated for the Council of Europe – for its regional strategy of balanced spatial development while including globally competitive concentrations.[21] In 2000, France adopted a new legal planning framework in the Law on Solidarity and Urban Regeneration[22] to facilitate large-scale regional development perspectives, joining up cities and the countryside into super-regional polycentric structures. In 1999, Germany also allocated a regional territorial dimension to its networks of competitiveness and innovation to foster closer cooperation between industry and research.[23]

While most of these efforts to introduce a large-scale spatial dimension to national development strategies are focusing on the respective countries and their regions, some are also outward looking by creating links with other territorial networks beyond national boundaries. The concept of the European Diagonal developed by Fundación Metrópoli is such an emerging mega-region which reaches beyond national boundaries and brings together cities and polycentric regions of different countries.

The European Diagonal[24]

The European Diagonal is a concept of a mega-region emerging in the most dynamic part of Europe. With Lisbon, Madrid, Barcelona, Marseilles and Milan as its key protagonist cities, the Diagonal in southern Europe has the potential to complement the "Pentagon", the only global mega-region in Europe. The driving forces of the Diagonal are four polycentric urban "Diamonds" in Portugal, Spain, southern France and northern Italy. Based on its long-range history and cultural affinities, this mega-city network is extendable to eastern Europe, taking in Ljubljana, connecting with the three Adriatic Baltic corridors in Vienna and reaching Bratislava, Budapest and cities beyond, thus contributing to European integration in the longer term.

At a supra-continental scale, the Diagonal is also an emerging gateway to South America through cultural and linguistic links, and to North Africa, the Middle East and Asia through longstanding trade relations. The Diagonal illustrates the new scale of spatial relations based on a wide range of communalities as well as challenges which cities and regions can nurture, develop, or resolve through pooling their knowledge base, building on their cultural affinities and generating shared resources. Desertification, scarcity of water, accommodation of immigration flows, for example, are pressing common issues which are likely to benefit from being addressed at the Diagonal scale.

The innovative feature of the Diagonal as a mega-space for sustainable development is the political support this vision has generated among leaders of key cities. The mayors of Lisbon, Madrid, Barcelona and Milan have already subscribed to the pertinence of such widespread cooperation on strategic spatial development issues. Others have expressed interest to join up, including the mayor of Casablanca, who conceives his city as the northern gateway to the south of the African continent and, in the opposite direction, very much a linchpin to the action-oriented development perspective of the Diagonal.

The revival of closer cooperation across the Mediterranean initiated by France's president Nicolas Sarkozy[25] during his EU presidency confirms the timeliness of Building the European Diagonal. Sharing ideas and political will are a first step towards large-scale cooperation in more concrete, especially high-risk projects and experimentation. Only active participation between political leaders, innovative businesses and learning establishments can mobilise such projects with, most importantly, the engagement of civil society, a dynamic force needed to anchor such projects in the public domain and to raise support. Besides improving hard links between the cities and regions of the Diagonal, soft connections resting on long-standing cultural bounds are equally important as a basis of knowledge creation and sharing.

Urban – Rural Continuum

Supra-regional cooperation provides the setting for greater risk sharing while benefiting from a powerful trans-national knowledge pool which encompasses the complementary experience of two or more cities and their often still rural surrounding regions. What meta-regions like the Diagonal have in common is the blurring between city and countryside into an interactive continuum. Urbanity has been penetrating for some time into the deepest countryside while cities are adopting spatial strategies which bring nature back into the urban fabric, the

21. Informal Council of Ministers of Spatial Planning (1999). *ESDP(European Spatial Development Perspective).* Potsdam. <http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/som_en.htm>.
22. Loi Solidarité et Renouvellement Urbains ("Loi Chevènement") (15/11/2000), introducing SCoT (Schéma de Cohérence Territoriale).
23. Visit Kompetenznetze Deutschland: <http://www.kompetenznetze.de/service/nachlese/medien/germany-kompetenznetze.pdf.>
24. J. Ryser (ed.) (2008).
25. EuroMed summit 13 July 2008 in Paris following the Barcelona Process (1995) to form a Union for the Mediterranean within the existing EU cooperation framework, co-chairs Egypt and France. Biennial from 2008, its aim is a single European Mediterranean Policy and co-responsibility through concrete project cooperation (migration, peace, promotion of democracy and human rights, energy, technology transfer, trade, etc), which would lead to regional integration and reduce disparities of wealth between the nations bordering on the Mediterranean (43 states, 12 to the south). EuroMed Info Centre. Also the GO-EuroMed project furthering institutional design and management strategies under the Citizens and Governance in a Knowledge-based Society programme.

former driven by information and communication technology, the latter by the sustainability movement which is seeking a more harmonious balance between nature and man-made environments. Townscape and landscape design are increasingly intertwined into a comprehensive whole, drawing on respective specificities, finding points of connection and sharing overlapping areas throughout their shared region.[26]

An emerging trend is to translate regional spatial development objectives into landscape strategies, based on the specificities and characteristics of the individual townscapes and their surroundings. Finding articulations between a set of landscapes which correspond to different activities and cultures can happen at a very large scale, and could form the basis of future synergies between integrated spatial development and functional structural change.

Such an innovative approach to conceptualising spatial entities helps to identify the critical mass which can turn these new large spaces into powerhouses of the global economy. The Fundación Metrópoli has experimented with a number of landscape projects.[27] They are building on the local topographies and the historic and cultural influences which have shaped these places and their uses over very long periods of time and imprinted unique features onto whole regions. Landscape strategies of this kind can regenerate precarious monocultures in the countryside, by preserving, reinventing, building on them, and by diversifying them into innovative complementary and outward reaching activities or artefacts. It is conceivable that such large-scale landscape strategies could also assist blighted landscapes after natural and man-made disasters, volcano eruptions, tsunamis, earthquakes, flooding or drought, even nuclear fallout in hitherto no-go areas.

A similar landscape or townscape-based approach could be adopted for cities, although development pressures tend to prevent real understanding of their *genius loci*. Yet, they may ignore the archaeology of their spatial memory to their peril and find that their hurried changes may sometimes end up in dramatic consequences, even to the detriment of the self-interest of their protagonists, not to mention the local economy and powerless citizenry. Cities may stand a better chance of building on their strengths if they become part of integrated landscape strategies for whole regions, such as the "Diamonds" of the Diagonal, or the polycentric city systems and their hinterland propagated by the ESDP. This scale may favour the development of townscapes or urban landscapes and create unexpected new "scapes" at the interface between the rural and the urban.

Cities as Drivers

During the process of growth and concentration accelerated by globalisation, cities have acquired a more prominent role and have become key drivers of the global competitive economy of the 21st century. It is essentially at city level that spatial development ideas are transformed into reality to support economic strategies. It is not by chance that intergovernmental bodies, such as the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) have been turning their interest to cities.[28]

For example, all the cities studied for the Diagonal initiative have undertaken large-scale regeneration projects in their own right: restructuring waterfronts, rejuvenating derelict inner-city areas, greening urban areas, using world expos, international trade fairs and other world class cultural events as anchors to revitalise themselves. These undertakings give them international exposure and attract talent, thereby increasing their competitiveness. Such high risk operations need foresight, leadership, powers of conviction and ultimately support from the base to reach their goals.

Risk sharing is an important factor of spatial development and has led to supra-regional cooperation involving various levels of government and territorial institutions. In an increasingly interdependent world, successful 21st-century cities are adopting development strategies at metropolitan and regional levels to form networks of cooperation and complementarity. In harnessing their identity and territorial specificities and by clustering their components of excellence, they increase their competitiveness. Their development policies have to be action-oriented and evidence-based to perform at their best in the knowledge society. Their strategy is to behave increasingly as ecosystems of innovation to sustain their competitive advantage. Thus, the promising scale of spatial strategic planning is the type of region where convergence between global developments and urban ecosystems of innovation takes place.

New Scale of Planning

By constituting networked entities of ecosystems of innovation cities we are entering a new era of planning and beyond. Many cities have become metropolitan in nature and thus tend to operate at a regional scale, sometimes as a challenge to the nation state. This is reflected in OECD's new departure to include regional competitive development strategies in its

---

26. An example among many is the ecological Green Wheel strategy for Greater Milan.
27. eg, *paisaje de vino* in La Rioja, *paisaje de arena* in Southern Spain, *paisaje de hielo* in Patagonia (wine, desert and ice landscapes).
28. Madrid Conference on What Policies for Globalising Cities? Rethinking the Urban Policy Agenda (29-30 March 2007), in cooperation with Madrid municipality and OECD; Conference on Efficient Local Development Strategies (16/08/02).

programme.[29] The shift to large-scale conceptual planning is not arbitrary. It rests on the need for a broader knowledge base to handle the complexity of spatial development issues which have emerged with globalisation and have led to intergovernmental allegiances.

The hurdles of sectoral approaches to planning are more difficult to overcome with increasing scale. Existing planning cultures are another obstacle with their tendency to operate in isolation within elaborate hierarchic legal systems, often remote from physical, economic or political reality. Having evolved before the growing importance of geo-political issues above the nation state, planning is in need of adjustment. Finally, the traditional separation between the state and the market increased the gap between planning and the chances of implementing the somewhat abstract plans and regulations due to their incompatibility with the real world of land ownership and the private development industry.

There is a lack of ready instruments to converge sectoral strands at a regional scale which encompasses many different territorial entities, and increasingly across national boundaries. Not only would such planning and implementation instruments have to overcome the friction of space, but also the friction of borders and mental territorial preserves which, together, hamper vertical integration, horizontal coordination and overall cooperation within large regions. New institutional structures are needed to facilitate early interaction between the regulatory and proscriptive activities of planners and those in a position to materialise physical development.

From Government to Governance

Spatial transformations are linked to government structures, notwithstanding that this interdependent system of interactions reflects society itself. The changes which are taking place in and to space at present are connected to those occurring to the organisation of government which, in turn, is related to the scale of territorial unities.

Size of countries vary enormously. Russia, the largest country of the world, with its 17.1 million km^2, is almost twice the size of the USA, and much larger than the whole of Europe which, with its 9.938 million km^2, is the 6th largest continent on earth. At the other end of the spectrum there are countries like Luxembourg with an area of 2586 km^2 and the Vatican, the smallest independent state, with 44 km^2. The relation between countries varies with type of measurement, be it area, population, density, GDP or income per capita. Conversely, these factors affect the nature of government, although the latter is essentially determined by political structures which, in turn, influence spatial development.

Usually governmental decision making on spatial issues is shared between central power and local bodies, the former in charge of matters of national interest, the latter applying agreed development rules with varying degree of local autonomy, on the whole handed down from the centre. The intermediary level or levels differ in terms of numbers, size, powers and responsibilities. Often they are only sectoral, sometimes overlapping and not necessarily spatial. Nevertheless, and perhaps due to the wide range of roles which intermediary levels are playing as representatives of the central state, independently elected entities or vertically mediating bodies, the transition from government to governance has been dynamic and innovative at this level. New forms of governance range from single-tier or multiple-tier city administrations, various types of public-public inter-communal, inter-sectoral or publicly owned and privately run agencies, to metropolitan and city-region structures. All these forms are instrumental in accommodating the spatial transformations which cities and regions are undergoing during globalisation and in response to the regionalisation of supra-national bodies, such as the European Union.

If geopolitical realms get too large and unruly, they tend to deconstruct into manageable units again. There are clear pressures for devolution and even independence within many nation states, while in federal structures many powers are devolved to lower tier entities. Continuous interplay between the various levels is essential regardless of governance structure, as it facilitates open dialogue with cross-fertilising effects and encourages autonomy, freedom of action and space-bound initiatives.

The OECD observed these structural changes and showed an interest in lower tier governance, as economic performance is seen to depend on administrative capacity at local levels and creative governance, essential in leading the integration process between spatial, economic, environmental and institutional innovation.[30] Although less preoccupied with the social dimension of spatial development, even the OECD has been looking into the role of civil society and public participation in the development process, together with capacity building of other local entrepreneurs and leaders. Other action research, such as the Open City project,[31] is focusing on the socio-cultural dimension of globalisation and postulates that cities should welcome migration and turn their cosmopolitan diversity into an asset, even a precondition of competitive development.

29. OECD Conference on Strategic Planning and Evaluation for Regional and Local Development (17/06/08); Challenges in an Urban Age, Rethinking Metropolitan Regions in the OECD and Beyond (12/07/08).
30. *OECD Territorial Review: Madrid* (2007), about the evolution of governance framework to meet new challenges.
31. G. Clark (ed.) (2008).

Institutional Innovation and Agencies Zero

By their very nature even the most flexible forms of governance cannot guarantee the realisation of spatial visions on their own, especially at the large scale required to deliver international competitiveness. New forms of institutions had to be invented to bridge the gap between ambitious visions of spatial development and the chances of their realisation. While national governments resorted to publicly accountable development corporations – sometimes drawing on private sector management – the most dynamic cities had started to set up pertinent institutions themselves with the capacity to implement ambitious regeneration projects, including necessary infrastructure. Owing to the general trend of declining public finances, such institutions often take the form of public-private partnerships in charge of raising and managing required investment. Alternatively, private sector bodies take over which have the necessary economic clout and endurance to operate across economic cycles, a capacity required to convert such large-scale and long-term investment into productive space for a viable urban future.

What Fundación Metrópoli terms *Agencies Zero* are action-oriented dynamic bodies which assist in starting up strategic development processes within large territorial contexts. By combining research, development and capital, they have the capacity to conceptualise long-term spatial transformations at a regional scale while mobilising key forces to buy into these spatial concepts and translate them into concrete urban projects as part of innovative regional landscapes.

Agencies Zero intervene before the initial phase of large-scale development. They thus enable the private sector to get involved at a very early stage in the conceptual phase of development projects of collective interest. Agencies Zero are based on the cooperation between the public and the private sectors during the critical phase of identifying and conceiving projects of strategic importance for a city. In this capacity they are genuine incubators of spatial development projects, bringing together R&D (research and development) with operation capital, management capacity and strategic connections. They thus constitute a new instrument of innovative management of both the existing built environment and potential development sites, by bringing together leadership of public administration, research and design capacity, incubation processes and the power of financial instruments.

Together with innovative governance and joined-up leadership between key public and private institutions, these innovative Agencies Zero constitute yet another essential building block of a new approach to bringing large-scale development visions to fruition. These institutional innovations, together with the new large scale of spatial strategies and the capacity of cities and regions to innovate constitute a trialogue: the three pillars of urban ecosystems of innovation.

Urban Ecosystems of Innovation

About Ecosystems

In an increasingly interdependent world where communication technology provides instant access to information with potential impacts anywhere on anything, borrowing the notion of "ecosystem"[32] from natural sciences helps to conceptualise such an interactive situation. Transposed to the dynamic of spatial development processes in the context of globalisation "urban ecosystems of innovation" signify the interplay between the three pillars of a trialogue:

- spatial strategies at a regional scale;
- governance inventing institutions fit for purpose;
- capacity of cities and regions to innovate.

From there it is possible to identify the components of excellence, the *genius loci* of each city, each node in networks of cities, together with the links crisscrossing large spaces between them. These nodes and flows as Manuel Castells calls them[33] – the connections and interchanges between these places and spaces – are getting the system to operate as a flexible and ever-changing whole. Akin to systems theory used in information and communication such as Bertalanffy's work,[34] the dynamic of this system is generating material as well as virtual clusters to harness the synergy of its innovative energies in response to globalisation.

Turning Cities into Urban Ecosystems of Innovation

In more concrete terms, cities are no longer in a position of competing in isolation. They have to rely on their culture of innovation to secure their long-term sustainability. In this sense they are the solution, not the problem of 21st-century issues, such as climate change, and share the responsibility to contribute to the sustainability of the planet. They are also the privileged spaces of nurturing creativity, as well as solidarity and tolerance,

---

32. According to Arthur Roy Claham, who coined this expression in the 1930s, "ecosystem" is "the physical and biological components of an environment considered in relation to each other as a unit".
33. M. Castells (1996-1998).
34. eg, Bertalanffy (1968).

the essence of civilised society in a cosmopolitan world. While learning from their past, they form both spatial and immaterial networks, and through establishing greater connectivity they are broadening their base of survival in the global economy and thus benefiting from a new sphere of influence. Having become metropolitan in nature, cities are operating at a growing regional scale. Cities have turned into mega-cities and city-regions at an accelerating pace, exemplified by America's North East Super-City ranging from Boston to Washington, Japan's Tokyo-Osaka Belt, or the Southern European Diagonal and its polycentric urban Diamonds.

The ability of cities to develop, evolve and adjust is deeply rooted in their identity.[35] Continuous interactions between their physical setting and their people are forging the uniqueness of cities. A constellation of their history, culture, physical specificities and lifestyles, together with their ability to change and their capacity to reinvent themselves characterises cities with a sustainable future. Cities have accommodated to industrialisation, the shift to a service economy and, more recently, to the information age in rapid succession. Forming part of urban processes, the latter evolution toward immateriality are reflected in the transformation of cities into ecosystems of innovation which characterise the knowledge society.

As cradles of creativity and knowledge generation, cities devise new visions of their future. They improve their urbanity by exploiting the opportunities of technology and adapting their system of governance to new circumstances. While mobility of people, capital, goods and services is accelerating without precedent throughout the world, only cities of the highest quality will be able to attract, retain and nurture world class talent. Their environment has to meet the challenge of global attractiveness, which entails mixing and layering different uses, creating spaces which facilitate the symbiosis between business ecologies and urban life where living, working, playing and learning coexist with ease.

Understanding Innovative Urban Profiles

The way cities are taking advantage of their components of excellence to capture innovative institutions, advanced technologies and artistic creativity is the object of current research on ecosystems of innovation at the Fundación Metrópoli, to be published shortly.[36] It currently examines cities of different sizes and at different stages of development in four continents to identify their clusters of excellence and how they use them to constitute innovation hubs which enable them to uphold a leading position in ecosystems of innovation. Applying the

Proyecto CITIES methodology developed by Fundación Metrópoli for this purpose, the urban profiles derived from the study of over twenty cities show that cities in ascendance are relying on the same "necessary" components of excellence to extend and sustain their competitiveness. The other "sufficient" components which get their clusters of excellence to operate as effective ecosystems of innovation stem from the specificities of each city and its ability to put them to competitive advantage.

Due to the uniqueness of context, the given moment in time, and the size of successful ecosystems of innovation, it is not feasible to aim at a finite combination of "necessary" and "sufficient" conditions overall. Nevertheless, lessons can be drawn from the strategies and actions which underpin the success of cities, derived from the way they are constituting clusters of excellence, and at what scale.

What is relevant is how they are operating as ecosystems of innovation:

■ either by creating synergy between the various innovation hubs located in the city;
■ by constituting ecosystems in their own right;
■ by forming part of a supra-regional ecosystem of innovation;
■ or by combining all three spatial strategies.

Understanding the complex processes of such a culture of innovation and how cities scale them up or down to suit their components and clusters of excellence is expected to make an useful contribution to the knowledge base of urban development and, in the longer term, towards building a sustainable future.

Fundación Metrópoli is applying these findings to its projects which range from broad regional scales, for example Catalonia or the Basque Country, to landscape approaches which encompass innovative change, expressed in the Paisaje de Vino projects in La Rioja, as well as to urban areas of innovation at city level, such as the Isla de la Innovación in Avilés.

New Challenges for Planners?

What are the implications of the meta-structural spatial developments for planners? Even the imaginative approaches to sustainable development sketched out here occur within existing systems of governance, which regulate the development and management of space. New departures into alternative models of sustainable urban development – including those conceived as ecosystems of innovation driven by cities at different interactive scales, or by people in their daily activities and uses of cities

35. M. Castells *Op.cit.* Volume II.
36. J. Ryser (ed.) (forthcoming).

– are inscribed in a given environment with its own momentum or inertia. Establishing the bridges between existing solutions and visions for the cities and regions of the 21st century may be a worthwhile challenge for planners in all parts of the world.

Reference:

BAUMEISTER, Reinhard (1876). *Stadterweiterung in Technischer, Baupolizeilicher and Wirtschaftlicher Beziehung.* Berlin: Ernest & Kron, 1907.

BERTALANFFY, Karl Ludwig von (1968). *General System Theory: Foundations, Developments, Applications.* New York: George Braziller.

BEINHOCKER, Eric D. (2006). *The Origin of Wealth, Evolution, Complexity and the Radical Remaking of Economics.* Boston: Harvard Business Press.

CASTELLS, Manuel (1996-1998). *Trilogy: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. The Rise of the Network Society (Vol I) The Power of Identity (Vol II), the End of the Millennium (Vol III).* Oxford and Malden: Blackwell.

CIAM (1933). *Chartes d'Athenes.* Unpublished proceedings.

CLARK, Greg (ed). (2008). *Towards Open Cities.* Madrid: The British Council.

ECTP (European Council of Town Planners) (2003). *The New Charter of Athens.*

HALL, Peter (1988) 2002. *Cities of Tomorrow, an Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century.* Oxford and Malden: Blackwell

HOWARD, Ebenezer (1902). *Garden Cities of Tomorrow.* London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

INCORPORATED SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS (1907). "Planning Towns and Cities: Principles Advocated by German Authorities for Future Growth, Squares, Class Districts and Buildings". *Municipal Journal and Engineer,* iss. 22.

INFORMAL COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF SPATIAL PLANNING (1999). *ESDP. European Spatial Development Perspective.* Potsdam. <http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/som_en.htm>.

Loi Solidarité et Renouvellement Urbains, ("Loi Chevènement") (12/12/2000).

Kompetenznetze Deutschland <http://www.kompetenznetze.de/service/nachlese/medien/germany-kompetenznetze.pdf.>

KUROKAWA, Kisho (1988). *The Architecture of Symbiosis.* New York: Rizzoli.

KUROKAWA, Kisho (2001). *Kisho Kurokawa Architects and Associates. The Philosophy of Symbiosis from the Ages of the Machine to the Age of Life.* New York: Edizioni Press.

OECD Territorial Review: Madrid (2007). OEDC.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE INDUSTRIAL POPULARTION (1940). *Barlow Report.* Cmd 6153.

RYSER, Judith; NG, Waikeen (eds.) (2005). *Four Decades of Knowledge Creation and Sharing.* ISOCARP.

RYSER, Judith; FRANCHINI, Teresa (eds.) (2008). *International Manual of Planning Practice.* IMPP. ISOCARP.

RYSER, Judith (ed.) (2008). *Building the European Diagonal.* Madrid: Fundación Metrópoli.

RYSER, Judith (ed.) (Forthcoming). *Beyond Planning: Urban Ecosystems of Innovation.* Madrid: Fundación Metrópoli.

VEGARA, Alfonso; RIVAS, Juan Luis de las (2004). *Territorios Inteligentes.* Madrid: Fundación Metropoli.

Recommended Reference:

President of the Fundación Metrópoli
Trustee of the Eisenhower Fellowships
Honorary Consul of Singapore in Spain

Alfonso Vegara is President of the Fundación Metrópoli, Trustee of the Eisenhower Fellowships and Honorary Consul of Singapore in Spain. He has taught architecture and planning at the Universities of Madrid, Navarra and Pennsylvania and co-founded Taller de Ideas in 1987. He has been advisor to the Government of Singapore on the One-North Project, as well as to the Curitiba and Dublin Local governments. From 2002-2005 was President of ISOCARP, The International Society of City and Regional Planners.

Counterpoint

Against Urbanalisation: Urban Policies in the Globalisation of Cities

Francesc Muñoz

The context

In recent decades, the urban globalisation process has encouraged the academic discussion and redefinition of the very nature of urban development in a number of cities, of modern metropolises – London or Paris –, of the industrial areas that are the heirs of Fordism – Germany's Ruhrgebiet –, of capital cities, which bring a diversity to this capital in political and economic terms, to intermediate cities, where the triple process of economic-urban-cultural globalisation call for new plans and projects.

The challenge

From the city and regional planning perspective, the main problem has been and continues to be one of achieving improved transversality and contact thresholds between sectorial urban policies, understanding that a single policy can and should have more than one registry for more than one region. A clear example is the fact that the urban regeneration or revitalisation policy for scenarios as casuistically different as a historic centre, an outlying industrial area, a run-down neighbourhood in the city outskirts or a central waterfront development should not be the same (Muñoz, 2008a).

The lack of this necessary update of urban policy protocols becomes crystal-clear in the way that so-called *planners* join work teams who, to sum up very briefly, are defined by adopting a profile shaped by the double "intervention-management", "problems-opportunities" duality.

In other words, we either intervene or manage, but it is difficult to find urban processes where intervention and management occur proactively, generating mutual synergies. Besides this, the mission of many of these planning teams becomes excessively univocal with them either working with an eye on solving problems, or with the intention of making use of opportunities. However, problems

and opportunities seldom occur within the same intervention or management framework. This would facilitate urban policy monitoring or evaluation processes, but, above all, would bring to light a truly virtuous circle: solving problems may be a very good strategy for creating new opportunities. Likewise, making full use of opportunities makes complete sense when problems are solved simultaneously, which, once resolved, allow for new development possibilities through urban projects.

For all this, the main bone of contention is none other than the fact of better diagnoses of the city and region, of their dynamics and processes. A detailed analysis of how sectorial urban policies have become institutionalised would clearly show us how, in quite a number of cases, the basis is an out-of-date or even erroneous diagnosis.

A paradigmatic example of this lack of correct diagnosis, in appearance only referring to the specific field of architectural composition, is the one that has explained the effects of globalisation on the look, shape and landscape of cities. It seems that there is a consensus regarding the fact that these effects can be summed up in the idea of a progressive homogenisation and a certain convergence between urban functions and forms at a planetary level, which, in the most extreme approaches, is the same as proposing a shared and standardised urban future.

The example

This urban homogenisation that is, then, recognised as being at the hands of globalisation dynamics in cities, is usually explained in light of the changes in the visual order of the constructed space. This analysis, however, is limited to understanding this homogenisation as something brought about, for example, by the presence of international architects in the execution of urban projects.

By contrast, the urban visual order displays much more complex dynamics rooted in it, such as the management of the

UOC

differences that there are in the local substrata of the cities with the aim of producing a sufficiently global, while at the same time common, urban form. In other words, the differences between cities exist, but their adequate management, through architecture and urban planning, designing interior and exterior spaces, allows them not to be overly emphasised, so making them comparable. This process of urban "equalisation" through the urban planning of the common landscapes can be summarised with the idea of a banal urbanisation, in the sense that it is independent of the place, becoming evident through diverse mechanisms that standardise the form of the city.

However, although it is that this process of *urbanalisation* (Muñoz, 2008b) represents the appearance of generic urban environments where the similarity of the urban design programmes goes hand in hand with the equivalence of the uses and behaviours that may have a place in them, at the same time, it is evident that there is no global process of homogenisation of the urban territories. In other words, despite the fact that globalisation of the city, of cities, has very often been associated with a homogeneous repetition of certain spatial formats – the same commercial franchise spaces, the recurring tourist and consumer areas, and the repeated urban development spaces surrounding the major airports – what is true is that there are always differences between some cities and others. So much so that the debate between those who defend the homogenising power of the global and those who see in the singularity of places a source of resistance to this universalising trend occasionally becomes intricate, full of common ground and, in the last extreme, too dependent on the specific cases that are presented to support one or the other ideological stance.

In my opinion, it is the management of these differences and nothing else that makes the urbanalisation process universal. This is why, in fact, urban spaces are not identical, but they are as similar as the management of those peculiarities or roughnesses specific to the place allows. This tension between the global and the local ends up coming down, differently depending on the case, more on one side than the other. This is the way of the doses of global and local end up characterising the urban reality of some similar yet at the same time different places, and always within the framework the *urbanal*. This is surely why the Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC) outlets in Asian cities such as Bangkok show Colonel Sanders – the company logo – with the same goatee beard and familial air bestowed by his granddad glasses and half smile. The difference, however, is that there his eyes are slanted. A small difference that, through the presence of the biotype, efficiently manages to anchor the global product in the local substratum.

Consequently, far from what we might initially think, urbanalisation does not have so much to do with the homogenisation of cities but, very much the opposite, with the management of their differences. Paradoxically, what this statement reveals is simply the excessive reductionism that

many proposals are guilty of which try to decipher the effects of globalisation on the urban space. Discussions about the existence of a global architecture, about the universal dominance of the media, or the imposition of economic models and homogenous lifestyles in cities, tend, therefore, to become accustomed to simplifying an effective global process whose nature is much more complex and dynamic.

Rather than equalisation or homogenisation, we should think in fact about standardisation and commensurability criteria. In other words, differences do not disappear, nor are they erased by the globalisation process. They do continue to exist, but the discussion about the global issue tends to make them comparable, measurable, in other words, it standardises the criteria so that they can be understood. In this sense, urbanalisation can be understood as a "transformer" which domesticates and contains urban differences that are difficult to read and understand at first, due to their uniqueness, into a more open narrative that is easily assimilated.

A metaphor that may throw some light on the complexity of the process in question is the equaliser, which is normally found on music systems. In short, the equalisation process of a melody achieves a correct balance between the bass and treble, so eliminating the excess derived from the presence of harmonically extreme sounds making it clear and transparent to listen to. This digital or analogue process allows us to listen to pieces from the same genre, for example opera arias, defining the exact levels of equalisation so that sopranos and baritones contribute in the right amount to our listening of the piece.

However, this equaliser in the system means that we can also repeat the process should the genre of the music change: from more aggressive industrial rock to Hungarian folk, from New Age pieces to Flamenco guitars. In other words, the equaliser manages the differences efficiently, minimising certain sounds and making others stronger, clarifying certain voices, hiding others. All compositions are different and maintain their differences, but these have been equalised to create a balanced musical composition.

I believe that a specific type of architecture and urban design are in fact tools at the service of a very similar equalisation of times and urban spaces and it is here that we find its new global nature. A process that interchanges roughness, creases, imperfections, in a word, the differences of urban places, ensuring that, by not allowing these to disappear, they are easily and clearly understood. It is in this sense that urbanalisation is a complete process for urban simplification, the loss of diversity and the complexity that the city may and should contain.

This is not a trivial question, since, beyond considerations regarding the aesthetic or compositional, urban simplification also represents the impossibility of designing transversal and complex urban policies, whereby the city loses even more shades of difference. In a global world that tends towards the equalisation of urban habits however diverse their history, culture or traditions may

be, this means that *urbanal* cities will be less unique and attractive and, precisely because of this, less competitive and sustainable.

A clear example of the mechanisms or itineraries that urbanalisation configures in today's cities is the establishment of new urban security protocols resulting from an increasingly indiscriminate copy and paste, which, through specific ways and methods, help achieve a banal visual order.

Since the emergence of what has become known as *global terrorism*, both the design of public spaces and the architecture present in new buildings are undergoing new trends of encapsulation and, in the more extreme cases, of clear militarisation not only of the complexes but, and here lies the really new development, of the very appearance of the construction, in other words, of the actual constructed form and of its meaning in terms of urban culture.

Consequently, an urban planning is becoming evident in which security measures are revealed as the first priority that architecture must respect when configuring both relation spaces and those intended for use as a place of residence or work. However, beyond the design of the specific buildings, these architectures of fear are expressed above all in the conception of urban complexes. It is here where we can glimpse the greatest risk that this "non-architecture" entails: the more oriented towards security the design of the city is, the simpler the result of the projects that shape it.

In effect, the very complexity of the city, which has always been read as proof of its efficiency as a social machine, and which is derived from the diversity of different and simultaneous urban situations, is beginning to be seen in these new projects as a problem, since the greater the complexity, the greater the difficulty of control of the space at times of danger or emergency. Thus, the absolute priority given to security aspects consequently requires the production of a simplified, predictable and flat urban space, with no relief, completely adjusted to highly standardised security protocols that are, moreover, being cloned equally from city to city, so configuring places where architecture has just a few nooks and crannies in which to be able to express the collective meanings that are supposed of it.

The security protocols not only represent, therefore, the appearance of a new urban *rationale*, which includes the design of security zones, recommended itineraries or areas of special vigilance, but they also show, above all, the appearance of an *urban planning of silence* (Muñoz, 2008c), in which architecture, as art or tool conveying collective meaning and value, silences itself to make it compatible with the rigid requirements of predictability by which the management of urban security appears to be inspired.

Between the specificities of the place and the global imagination that is progressively characterising urban life, the urban planning of security represents a new visual order, one that demands an architecture in permanent silence, the visual order of urbanalisation.

The conclusion

Ultimately, what this explanation of the configuration of the visual order in urban form raises is the need for correct analysis of the urban globalisation process. As we have said, the risks of this urbanalisation have not yet been recognised in their magnitude, partly due to the fact that their causes are usually sought in explanations that are both simple and reductionist.

The future challenges for urban planning are quite clear on the horizon: the relationship between the economic model and climate change, the management of global immigration, the definition of suitable frameworks for urban innovation or the presentation of more thorough bases to channel urban growth towards more environmentally and socially sustainable futures.

What happens, however, is that these obvious and clear challenges seen from a distance show multiple edges and links between them close-up. What seemed possible to draw and be fitted into an area of urban management becomes complex and one could almost say it takes on the appearance of a fractal space. Having identified these long-term challenges, the short term urges us to guide urban policies in at least two directions that I feel are quite clear:

The first is to identify the most necessary diagnoses and develop them transversally, viewing the region as a sum of layers that are not positioned perfectly geometrically one on top of the other, but which create folds, roughness and faults that lead these layers to intermingle. It is essential to recognise this metaphor in the work of the planner, as, in practical terms, it means that both the causes of the problems and the reasons for the opportunities do not always have the most obvious explanations. This is why the explanation of urban homogenisation based on such simple and univocal questions as the mere presence of global architecture firms in urban projects is not convincing.

The second is to pose the challenges on the basis of clear, specific and, above all, assessable objectives. In this sense, the ultimate aim of the call for the rescue of complexity and diversity, not only in the city but also in the region, is to return to urban planning what is, in my opinion, its great value: the fact of being capable of hosting and promoting processes. Hosting the existing ones, managing them and orienting them to create added value or greater margins for urban integration, ie, solving problems. Promoting new processes, recognising existing values or making other barely visible ones appear, ie, making the most of opportunities.

It is this ability to nurture processes, maintaining the dynamic force of the urban, and the possibility of highlighting new situations, that has always accompanied the city and is also what is clearly lacking in everything urbanal.

uocpapers · e-Journal on the Knowledge Society

References

MUÑOZ, Francesc (2008a) "Revitalització versus Rurbanització: Estratègies de política territorial a Catalunya (93-105). *Eines*, no. 4. Barcelona.

MUÑOZ, Francesc (2008b) *UrBANALización: paisajes comunes, lugares globales.* Barcelona: Gustavo Gili.

MUÑOZ, Francesc (2008c) "*Lock Living*: el paisaje urbano y el urbanismo de la seguridad". In: *Architectures of Fear. Terrorism and the Future of Urbanism in the West.* Barcelona: CCCB (Col·lecció Urbanitats, 19).

Francesc Muñoz
Urbanisation Observatory
Department of Geography (Autonomous University of Barcelona)
franc.munoz@uab.es

Francesc Muñoz is a doctor in Geography and lecturer at the Autonomous University of Barcelona (UAB). He has specialised in urbanism, urban planning and regional strategy design. He has taken part as an expert in European Council missions regarding these issues and he has been guest lecturer at universities in France, Italy, Portugal and the United Kingdom, where he has published texts on the present transformation of urban and metropolitan landscapes. His latest work is the recently-published book *urBANALización: Paisajes Comunes, Lugares Globales* (2008). He now manages the Urbanisation Observatory and the Master's programme in Landscape Intervention and Management at the Autonomous University of Barcelona.

UOC
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya
www.uoc.edu