

# **BARRIER 5: PROMOTION AND PRODUCTION**

Friday, 20 May 2022  
10 a.m. – 12 p.m.

Also broadcasted through the  
AHA Forum virtual platform.  
Access at [ahamadrid.org](http://ahamadrid.org)

---

Key words: modes of housing development and production; public promotion; public-private partnerships; private promotion; innovation; materials; technology; self-promotion site and services; progressive housing; regeneration; rehabilitation; transformation and adaptation; management and maintenance; favelas/slums.

In most cases, the efficiency of affordable housing has been associated with a decrease in the quality of housing: smaller dwellings are produced, sometimes with inferior construction quality and, above all, located in areas far from population centres and job opportunities, with difficult access to urban services. In the last decades, the promotion of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) for the construction of affordable housing has been gaining relevance. PPP-models have had a long and successful track record in different sectors including infrastructure construction and management and urban service provision, yet, successful experiences of such partnerships in affordable housing have been limited to the implementation of specific projects.

The self-construction programmes, which in some ways mimic the traditional processes of construction in the informal settlements, promote that the families themselves build their own homes directly, generally in a progressive manner, usually accompanied by public aid. There are various forms of this process, such as "site and services" programmes, where families receive a plot of urbanised land with the connections to basic services. Families, as their capacities increase, complete the construction over time. The idea of progressive housing can take various forms and scopes, depending on existing public resources, the families' own ability to pay and the technologies employed. In any case, self-build programmes have been shown to be one of the most effective mechanisms for providing affordable housing for the most disadvantaged social groups.

On the other hand, another alternative promotion mechanism is housing cooperatives, where groups of families with housing needs are constituted as a non-profit social association with the aim of generating resources - often through savings, but also by obtaining aid - to build and/or improve their homes. Although housing cooperative experiences have been implemented in many countries, only in a few cases they had a significant impact in relation to the scale of the housing problem.

## **From public to private development**

Until the 1980s, the impetus for social housing production, particularly in Europe, North America, Oceania and some Asian and Latin American countries, came from the public sector, which implemented the projects directly or indirectly. This trend changed in the 1980s, when, in the context of the emergence of "neo-liberal" economic policies, housing policies were oriented towards the promotion of the "enabling environment approach". Under this approach, the public sector should concentrate on facilitating the best conditions for the different actors, and above all the private sector, to operate more efficiently. From this point onwards, and practically everywhere in the world, the public sector progressively withdrew from its role as a developer of social housing, transferring this responsibility to the private sector.

However, this shift in the approach of government policies has not proven to be more effective in the provision of social housing. Although, in quantitative terms, in some contexts – such as Chile or Mexico – the number of housing units built has increased. But, in most cases, this efficiency has been associated with a decrease in the quality of housing: smaller dwellings are produced, sometimes with inferior construction quality and, above all, located in areas far from population centres and job opportunities, with difficult access to urban services and fittings.

In some exceptional contexts, most notably Singapore, the public sector has continued to play a predominant role in the production of social housing. Other particular cases, especially in the European context, have shown that the public sector as a housing developer can facilitate affordability for many households, even when competing on equal terms with the private sector.

Moreover, in the last decades, the promotion of PPPs for the construction of affordable housing has been gaining relevance. Public-private partnership models have had a long and successful track record in sectors such as infrastructure construction and management, urban service provision and, to a lesser extent, the provision of social services such as education and health. Even in the field of urban development, public private partnerships are perhaps one of the most widely applied mechanisms.

## **Alternative forms of production**

In addition to the conventional actors that develop and promote housing "formally", there are alternative forms of development, which have facilitated access to housing, although not always in adequate conditions.

Until the advent of the Industrial Revolution, for example, self-construction has historically been the way in which human beings have provided themselves with a roof, and it is still customary in much of the rural areas of low- and middle-income countries. Similarly, most of the existing housing in informal areas (shanty towns, favelas, slums) has been built by families themselves. And, according to population growth projections in low-income countries, in the coming decades the vast majority of the new housing built in the world will follow this path.

In this context, since the 1970s, the idea has been promoted that one way to facilitate housing affordability must be to reinterpret and formalise the mechanisms through which households themselves are able to contribute, directly or indirectly, to the construction of their own

housing. These alternative forms, associated in many cases – although not necessarily – with alternative financing mechanisms, could be grouped into two types of modalities, which are not mutually exclusive.

On the one hand, self-construction programmes, which in some way mimic the natural processes of construction in the slums, promote that the families themselves build their own homes directly, generally in a progressive manner, usually accompanied by public aid. There are various forms of this process, such as "site and services" programmes, where families receive a plot of urbanised land with the provision of connections to basic services. Families, as their capacities increase, complete the housing over time. The idea of progressive housing can take various forms and scopes, depending on existing public resources, the families' own ability to pay and the technologies employed. In any case, self-build programmes have been shown to be one of the most effective mechanisms for providing affordable housing for the most disadvantaged social groups.

On the other hand, another alternative promotion mechanism is the housing cooperatives, where groups of families with housing needs are constituted as a non-profit social association with the aim of generating resources – usually through savings, but also by obtaining aid – to build and/or improve their homes. Although housing cooperative experiences have been implemented in many countries, only in a few cases they have had a significant impact in relation to the scale of the housing problem. Perhaps Uruguay's experience is the most advanced.

### **Affordability through the improvement of the existing housing stock**

The problem of the shortage of adequate and affordable housing is often addressed only from the perspective of the production of new housing. This is certainly very relevant, especially in some contexts of rapid urbanisation or clearly insufficient housing stock. However, it is important to note that, beyond the cases of homeless people (which are not few, and would require a separate reflection), the rest of human beings currently live in some kind of housing, as inadequate as their conditions may be. For this reason, especially in recent decades, the importance of policies, plans and projects aimed at improving, adapting and/or extending existing housing has been highlighted. This has several advantages over building new housing: from a financial point of view, it is more economical and, consequently, has the potential to impact more families; from an environmental point of view, it allows the reuse of something already created, avoiding the production of new material and the expansion of cities; and from a social point of view, perhaps the most relevant, it allows individuals and families to preserve the social as well as economic links they have been consolidating throughout their lives.

Improvement and adaptation processes can range from specific interventions in existing buildings and housing to entire city neighbourhoods. In recent years, for example, and particularly in the European context, much housing policy has focused on improving the conditions of existing housing, essentially to adapt it in terms of accessibility – responding to some extent to the ageing of the population, as well as to the extension of care for people with reduced mobility – and, more recently, in terms of energy efficiency. On the other hand, housing extensions have been shown to be an effective mechanism to, on the one hand, alleviate the

situation of overcrowding that families may be facing and, on the other hand, provide new spaces for expanding families.

On the other hand, slum upgrading processes are effective efforts to address the adequate housing needs of part of the population, taking into account their social, cultural and economic ties and established habits in the community.

Finally, urban regeneration processes constitute opportunities to improve not only the existing housing stock but also, and above all, the urban environment in which they are built. In line with what was previously noted, urban regeneration, in itself, is a particularly effective mechanism for ensuring the adequacy of public spaces, improving public services, increasing access to urban amenities and generating employment opportunities in the neighbourhood context. Combined with housing improvement proposals, they provide an effective lever to ensure adequate housing in existing built environments.

## **CROSSING BARRIER 5:**

Speakers are coming from the national governments, academia, as well as foundations and organizations of professionals. In addition, private sector will be participating in this session. This will be followed by reflection and analysis of case studies from Austria and Thailand.

### **Objective of the session**

To propose three priority actions to accelerate the crossing of the barrier.

### **Guiding Questions**

- Which action-oriented mechanisms could be implemented to solve some barriers such as the lack of flexibility of public administration plus the risk of corruption in terms of public funds and direct executor of affordable housing?
- How to approach the capacity building process needed to ensure public enterprises can deliver adequate and affordable housing to their population?
- Are there any existing financing experiences that work well in engaging the private sector to develop affordable housing?
- Why is it so difficult to scale-up successful partnerships experiences? How to solve this challenge?
- How can we ensure that self-produced housing, as well as the affordable housing projects, are connected to a sustainable urban development and compact cities?
- Are public-private partnerships common in your country/region for the construction of affordable housing?
- Does your country face decrease in the quality of housing?
- Are newly produced affordable housing projects located within the urban areas of the city or far from city centres and job opportunities?
- Are there self-construction programmes that you are aware of that had positive outcomes?
- Are there housing cooperatives and other organizations in your country/region that work on affordable housing? What challenges might they face?

### Final question

Please provide three action-oriented proposals that from your point of view will accelerate the crossing of barrier 5 on Promotion and Production.

### Agenda of the session

- 10 a.m. Opening intervention of the Chair's session.  
*Ishtiaque Zahir Titas*, Vice president, International Union of Architects (UIA)
- 10:15 a.m. Initial proposal of priority actions to face the barrier by each speaker:
- *Güldehan Atay*, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University
  - *Johann Baar*, Director Affordable Housing and Technology, Hilti Foundation
  - *Reinhard Goethert*, MIT Architecture
  - *José María Lapuerta*, Founder and co-director of the Master in Collective Housing, UPM
  - *Sergio Magalhaes*, former Housing Secretary of Rio de Janeiro
  - *Mona Rady*, Chairperson of Habitat Professional Forum
- 10:45 a.m. Reactions from the Chair/speakers to the introductory remarks and first round of guiding questions to focus the discussion on specific proposals.
- 10:55 a.m. Presentation of the first case: Vienna  
*Silvia Hofer* and *Nicole Büchl*, *wohnfonds\_wien*
- 11:10 a.m. Reflections on the case presented and second round of guiding questions
- 11:20 a.m. Presentation of the second case: Thailand  
*Thipparat Noppaladarom*, Advisor, Baan Mankong Project
- 11:30 a.m. Reflections on the case presented and third round of guiding questions
- 11:45 a.m. Wrap-up and summary of priority actions proposed for the AHA Forum Madrid Declaration
- 12:00 p.m. End of the session

## Biographies of invited chair and speakers

---

**Ishtiaque Zahir Titas**, Vice president, International Union of Architects (UIA), a practicing Architect & Urban Designer from Bangladesh. He is the Honorary fellow of the American Institute of Architects (Hon. FAIA), also the Co-founder of VITTI, an award-winning leading practice in Dhaka for past 31 years. He did his master's in architecture from UEL, London. Designing sustainability through participatory process and designing public spaces are the key point of his interest. He represented UIA in UN-Habitat, advocating on professional's interests in the New Urban Agenda (NUA). At the 7th plenary meeting of Habitat III conference, in Quito, 2016, he made the official statement and worked as the Policy Unit expert. As the Co-Director of UIA Commission on SDG, he spoke and organized multiple side events in Habitat III, WUF9 in 2018, WUF10 in 2020, in COP21 in Paris, COP 24 in Katowice, COP26 in Glasgow.

**Güldehan Atay** is teaching at the Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University. In 2011 she graduated with a Ph.D. Program with a thesis titled "Participation of User in Architectural Production." She has been a Lecturer in the MSFAU-Architecture graduate and post-graduate Programme since 2002. She is an executive in the design studio of different levels of the architecture program. She is a lecturer in postgraduate programs and coordinates the masters and Ph.D. thesis.

**Johann Baar**, Director Affordable Housing and Technology, Hilti Foundation. In his role, he drives large-scale initiatives across the global south aiming to change how low-income families build and live. A priority is the development of technical solutions for better and safer homes. In 2019, Johann was appointed as a Trustee of the Base Bahay Foundation in Manila, Philippines. He also serves as a member of the Advisory Boards of Architecture in Development and the Urban Housing Partitioners Hub. Johann previously worked with the Robert Bosch Foundation where he established the Robert Bosch Academy as a space for international decision-makers to pursue confidential exchange on issues of global relevance. Earlier assignments include positions at the German Federal Chancellery and the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Following his studies in Germany, Poland and Hungary, Johann obtained a Master of Public Policy at the Hertie School of Governance in Berlin.

**Reinhard Goethert** is teaching at MIT Architecture. He is internationally recognized in physical planning and upgrading of low-income settlements and participatory technique in development. He teaches and directs SIGUS (Special Interest Group in Urban Settlement), cited by the American Institute of Architects Education Honors. Goethert designs 'site and services' projects and serves as consultant to international development agencies. Much of his approach is documented in URBANIZATION PRIMER, with Horacio Caminos (MIT Press, 1978), and MAKING MICRO PLANS: A Community Based Process in Programming and Development (Intermediate Technology Publications, 1988); and ACTION PLANNING FOR CITIES: A PRACTICAL GUIDE, (with Nabeel Hamdi) John Wiley & Sons Press. He got his PhD in city and regional planning at Rheinisch-Westfälische-Technische Hochschule (Dr.-Ing.) Aachen, Germany, earning the Friedrich-Wilhelm-Preis for outstanding thesis on the informal development sector of Cairo. In October 1997, Dr. Goethert was recipient of the United Nations Habitat Scroll of Honour for "outstanding contributions in the development of innovative methodologies, training and field practice in Community Action Planning."

**José María Lapuerta**, Founder and co-director of the Master in Collective Housing, UPM. Chair professor of Architectural Design of the School of Architecture of Madrid, ETSAM, UPM. Honorary professor of the University of Montevideo. Director of the Master in City Sciences (MCS), ETSAM, UPM. In addition to his position as Chair professor at the ETSAM and Director of the Master in Collective Housing, he is director and coordinator of the PhD courses of the doctoral program agreement between the Universidad de la Republica de Uruguay and Universidad Politecnica de Madrid. He has also been director of the Summer School of the UPM, coordinator of the Master in Interior Design of the ETSAM and coordinator of the Socrates-Erasmus agreement with the Slovak University of Technology. He has been PhD director of several theses and final thesis tutor at the ETSAM, UPM. He has been member of the Cultural Council of Madrid, Member of the COAM Governing Board and representative of the High Council of Architects. He has also participated as jury of several architecture awards and competitions and has been lecturer in conferences all around the world. He is a member of the Research Group on Collective Housing of the ETSAM, UPM and has participated in different research projects. His writings have been published in books and magazines such as *Arquitectura Viva*, *Habitacao e Cidade* or *Ciudad y Territorio*, among others. He is the author of the books *Collective housing: a manual* and *Housing, envelope, frame*. In the professional field, he is founder and CEO of DL+A architects, a studio that has been running for more than 25 years. The work of the studio has been published and awarded in national and international contests and they have opened a new headquarters in Brazil for the development of the first prize the won in a competition for the CDHU of Brazil.

**Sérgio Ferraz Magalhães** is an architect, PhD in Urbanism, professor of the Graduate Program in Urbanism at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro. He is the author of the books “Reinventing the city: interaction, equity, planet”, 2021; “About the city – Housing and democracy in Rio de Janeiro”, 2002; “Favela-Bairro, another history of Rio de Janeiro”, 2004, co-authored with Luiz Paulo Conde, preface by Oriol Bohigas; “The city in uncertainty – Rupture and Contiguity in urbanism”, 2007. Secretary of Housing of Rio de Janeiro (1993-2000), he was responsible for creating and coordinating the city’s Housing Policy, including the Favela-Bairro program, which reached 155 favelas and 550,000 inhabitants. He was President of the Institute of Architects of Brazil, IA from 2012 to 2017 and of the 27th World Congress of Architects UIA 2021 RIO. He received the America Award for Architecture / SAL 2017, Colombia (for the body of work); the FAD Award 2012, Barcelona (for the Favela-Bairro Program) and the project awards of the Instituto de Arquitectos do Brasil -RJ in the years 1991, 1986, 1977, 1975 and 1974.

**Mona Rady**, Chairperson of Habitat Professional Forum. She is a Doctor in urban and regional planning. Chairperson of UN-HABITAT Professional Forum (HPF). Member in the Advisory Committee on sustainable urbanization of PGA President of UN-general assembly 76th session. Commissioner AUA HABITAT & ENVIRONMENT Commission. Past Steering committee member for Region V Africa in international Union of Architects (UIA) Commission on the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Chairwoman of Art & Architecture House for Planning and Architecture. Dr. Mona Rady obtained a bachelor of architecture from Faculty of Fine Arts, Alexandria university (Egypt, 1998), and in 2001 she setup her office, Art & Architecture house for Planning and Architecture, which over the past 20 years Mona works focused on planning and designing new sustainable and affordable residential settlements and the design of contemporary Egyptian houses. In 2017, Mona



finalized her doctor of philosophy (PHD) on global cities and urban competitiveness at Alexandria University, Faculty of fine art. She currently serves in the field of UN-Habitat, supporting its role in planning sustainable human settlements with respect to professional efforts to support NUA & SDGs. Since 2020 she became the Chairperson of UN-HABITAT Professional Forum (HPF) and 2021 she became a Member in the Advisory Committee on sustainable urbanization of PGA President of UN-general assembly 76th session.

## **Case studies**

---

**wohnfonds\_wien** was founded in 1984. It is led by Silvia Hofer and Nicole Büchl. From its original tasks of advising and supporting the redevelopment of old buildings and providing plots for subsidised housing, it has evolved into an urban expansion and renewal programme that has received worldwide attention. The comprehensive redevelopment projects and sophisticated new residential buildings (results of the developer competitions introduced in 1995, the land advisory council and the quality advisory council launched in 2021) are nationally and internationally recognised models of a new urbanity worth living in. The wohnfonds\_wien is a non-profit organisation and acts as a service-oriented coordination office, among others, between developers, homeowners and their representatives, as well as municipal departments, especially the financing office and the service institutions of the City of Vienna. In addition, a new platform for renovations in Vienna was created with the Hauskunft, which has been in existence since 2020.

**Thipparat Noppaladarom**, Advisor, Baan Mankong Project at the Community Organizations Development Institute (CODI) at the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (Thailand) as well as an Advisor and Sub-Committee Member at the National Health Commission Office. Mrs. Noppaladarom has more than 40 years of experience in the area of housing development and urban planning in Thailand. She has previously served as Director of the Community Organizations Development Institute and the Housing Policy & Planning Division of the Thai National Housing Authority. Mrs. Noppaladarom holds a M.S. degree in Urban Planning from the Asian Institute of Technology and a Bachelor's of Architecture from Chulalongkorn University as well as a Certificate of Housing & Planning Studies from the Institute for Housing Studies in the Netherlands.