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FOREWORD

East Asia has seen enormous growth and change over the past few decades. Urbanization stands out as one of the most visible signs of progress: the urban population has grown by more than a billion people since 1980 – a number which broadly corresponds with the reduction of people in extreme poverty in the region. Cities in the region are a success story: They attract and generate wealth, jobs and investments that benefit millions in the pursuit of a better life.

But, the world continues to change fast. The skills and demands required for continued economic growth are not necessarily those that served progress well even a decade ago. Growth and progress in the next 15 years will depend on how effectively the regional labour force can meet the demand for new skills, on how new technologies are used and on how the information revolution is leveraged. Countries, cities and people will require the ability to change, to learn and to innovate in order to drive the next wave of growth.

Urbanization is one of the most powerful, transformative forces in the world today. Children, at the centre of urbanization, make up more than one third of the total urban population; and experts predict that by 2030, East Asian cities will be home to 800 million children. Sustained economic growth in the years ahead will depend on the cognitive capacity of the future labour force, which, in turn, depends on the health and well-being of today’s children.

UNICEF strongly believes that every child has a right to survive, to thrive and to fulfill his or her potential. These are rights. They are not negotiable. When these rights are delivered to all children, something amazing happens: societies change for the better and productivity increases. Improving children’s lives transforms the future. When I travel around the region’s cities I see skyscrapers and freeways and universities and hospitals that are first class. I see well-dressed, well-fed children in school uniforms studying on their computers, or talking animatedly about the world and their place in it. I see social welfare programmes that are efficient and well-designed, and health care systems that are the envy of the world.

But - because it is important to UNICEF and it is important to our future – I also look under the freeways and the sky-trains and I let my eyes wander to the vacant spaces on the fringes of the schools and factories. Too often what I see there is children who have not yet experienced any benefits of growth and progress. I see children who are too small and too thin and young people whose potential is not being realized. I see boys and girls who are not in school. Just as modernity and economic strength and growth are part of the story of the new Asian century, so too are those children and adolescents.
UNICEF is committed to working directly with the mayors and urban administrators who are the frontline providers of services for children; the influential political leaders who can address unsustainable energy consumption and air pollution – factors that contribute to climate change and damage children’s health – and promote sustainable urbanization, improved public services, social stability and future economic growth.

Every child has something to contribute. The health and well-being of children in cities must be central to urban planning and municipal administration. Global commitments, made by national leaders, should help to make this happen. The 2016 New Urban Agenda, adopted by world leaders in 2016, tasked every government with thinking differently about the way cities are planned, designed, financed, developed, governed and managed. The Sustainable Development Goals, adopted in 2015, put in place measurable targets for urban progress and for economic, social and child development.

What we must do is find practical ways to make these global commitments an urban reality. This meeting, Growing Up Urban, provided the opportunity to talk, to listen and to exchange advice about what works and what does not. I am ambitious about what we can achieve, especially if we work together. Cities can be greener and healthier places, and children and families, especially the most disadvantaged, can reap what economist call the urban advantage.

On behalf of the UNICEF Regional Office for East Asia and the Pacific, I would like to thank Mayor Ibu Risma, a vocal champion of social justice for children in Indonesia and the world, for hosting Growing Up Urban, a milestone meeting for UNICEF and cities in the region, in Surabaya. I would also like to express gratitude for the contributions made by cities represented at the meeting, whom we rely upon to take forward the child-responsive urban development agenda.

- Karin Hulshof, Regional Director, UNICEF East Asia and Pacific, Bangkok, 29 June 2018
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Part I. Overview: Growing Up Urban

East Asia is one of the most highly urbanized regions globally; posting both vibrant growth and emerging challenges. There is an inextricable link between the growth of safe and sustainable cities in East Asia and the well-being of the region’s children. The region is home to some of the fastest growing and most populated mega cities in the world. It is also experiencing dramatic growth in small and medium-sized cities, where more than half of its urban population lives. By 2030, more than 70 per cent of people living in the region will live in urban areas.

This shift creates incredible developmental opportunities across the region. Children and adolescents – whose personal, cognitive, physical and socioemotional development is powerfully influenced and ‘sculpted’ by the new urban experience – should be the clear winners of this urban century.

Making urbanization work for every child will yield dividends for all citizens. However, despite high economic growth and far reaching social transformation in East Asia, poverty and social, economic and gender disparities still prevent millions of children from developing to their full potential: Studying enriching their lives through participation, enjoying equal opportunities and growing up in healthy, protective family and community environments.

All children have the right to access basic social services and develop to their full potential. Turning this right into reality is key to East Asia’s sustainable progress. The ‘urban advantage’ that stems from high population density and infrastructure that connects people to markets and services needs to be upgraded and more fully shared: It needs to reach all children.

On invitation of the Mayor of Surabaya, Tri Rismaharini, and Karin Hulshof, Regional Director of the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) East Asia and Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO), leaders of 14 Asian cities gathered on 7-8 May 2018 in Surabaya to respond to this challenge. They were joined by child and urban development experts to review how urbanization interacts with child development and consider how urban leaders and governments can maximize urban opportunities and reduce risks for children (Box 1).
Box 1: Participants in the Growing Up Urban meeting in Surabaya, 7-8 May 2018

Participants in the meeting ‘Growing Up Urban in East Asia: A conversation with mayors on making cities safe and sustainable for every child’ in Surabaya included mayors, governors and senior officials and representatives of various urban departments (planning and development, women and children’s committees, child protection, and social welfare and education). Participants from urban and regional administrations were accompanied by UNICEF staff and a select group of experts.

The participating cities were as follows:

- Cambodia: Phnom Penh
- China: Changsha, Shenzhen
- Indonesia: Dumai, Jayapura, Magelang, Surabaya, Surakarta
- Myanmar: Yangon
- Philippines: Zamboanga City
- Thailand: Bangkok, Chiang Mai
- Viet Nam: Da Nang, Ho Chi Minh City

Overall nearly 100 participants attended the meeting. Logistics support was provided by Surabaya Mayor’s Office, while technical support was arranged by UNICEF Indonesia as well as UNICEF EAPRO. The list of participants is annexed to this report.
The themes discussed at the meeting on Growing Up Urban included:

- The urban century in East Asia
  - Why investments in children and adolescents are important for cities, what opportunities and challenges urbanization brings to children, the importance of investing in children and youth, planning for early childhood development in cities

- The urban paradox: Equity and access to services
  - Understanding the urban paradox, improving access to services for disadvantaged urban children, including migrant children, providing respite care services for children with disabilities, reintegrating of children from residential care institutions to families and communities

- Towards lifting barriers to sustainable urbanization and equitable access to services
  - Addressing spatial barriers to services, equity and the urban form, designing inclusive and integrated services, setting up and operation of child friendly schools, equitable access to services, involving children and improving access to services, public spaces in rapidly urbanizing cities

- Unpacking urban policy and fiscal space
  - Public finance and governance for children, innovative financing of learning through the triple helix model, prioritizing and investing in children’s development, child friendly fiscal policy – planning for the next 20 years, strategies for improved urban financing

- Tracing road maps to address the urban paradox for children
  - Shaping urbanization for children, voices of children, the role of local governments in improving the quality of life for children and adolescents, crafting the “Surabaya Vision”

The Growing Up Urban meeting provided an opportunity to initiate a fruitful dialogue among senior urban leaders and between urban experts and child development specialists on the opportunities and risks the twenty-first century brings to urban children and their communities. One tangible outcome of the meeting in Surabaya was a list of commitments mayors, governors and other senior urban leaders have made (see part III, section 4, Table 4.1 of this report) which reflect awareness of - and readiness to upgrade support for – a range of issues that matter for children. Considering that the 14 cities which were represented at the meeting are home to at about 12 million children age 0–17 years, the statements, commitments and action points could trigger significant and lasting change for a large number of children in the region.

A further important outcome of the event was the expressed desire by urban leaders to continue the type of dialogue and knowledge sharing started at the Growing Up Urban meeting. An immediate opportunity for this will be opened in September 2018 at the United Cities and Local Governments event (which is expected to take place once again in Surabaya) but other opportunities are also expected to emerge given the support manifested by participants at the event towards holding further similar consultations in the future.

Additional spillover effects may be expected from the analytical tools and frameworks which were prepared in advance of the meeting or crafted during the meeting by experts and participants. UNICEF prepared the Growing Up Urban situation analysis template (see Annex C) which is a useful tool for collecting a limited set of data and exploring city priorities, fiscal and policy space and other issues that matter for child-friendly urban development. The information city administrations included in their responses to this template inspired, among others, the “Urban Risk Framework”, which was presented, discussed and adjusted at the Growing Up Urban meeting (see Box 2).
Box 2: The Urban Risk Framework

The process of urbanization and related migration creates enormous developmental opportunities across the region. However, urbanization can also lead to risks, compounded by the inevitable strain the sheer pace and complexity of change can place on social cohesion, infrastructure and public services. Information shared and discussed at the Growing Up Urban meeting led to the creation of a 12-point Urban Risk Framework which may be used to conduct urban situation analyses through a child-specific lens.

Figure 1.1: The Urban Risk Framework for children and adolescents

![Image of the Urban Risk Framework](source)


As figure 1.1 shows, the top row of the framework considers access to services along four priorities, which need to be checked thoroughly. The four risks are associated with gaps in access to health and nutrition, water and sanitation, education and protection, which could derail children’s lives by depriving them of developmental opportunities. Related services should typically be provided in a ‘package’ to enhance impact and reflect upon multidimensional deprivation. Poor child outcomes such as low height- or low weight-for-age, for example, could reflect poor food intake but could also reflect poor sanitation, poor health care, lack of stimulation, lack of protection from stress and violence or a combination of these factors.

The next four risks in the framework (the second row) could compound poor access to services and represent risks on their own. Many children miss key developmental opportunities in the first 1,000 days of life (from conception through age 2) when their developing brain needs nurturing care and steady support from their family and community. The instability, poor access to services and vulnerabilities often associated with migration and/or unclear status are frequent underlying causes of poor early child outcomes and/or health and learning issues during adolescence. Unsupportive social environments for participation can hurt children throughout the lifecycle.

Addressing the last four types of risks in the framework (the third row) – poor housing, lack of public space, leisure and accessible transport facilities, safe digital connectivity and a healthy, green and sustainable environment – are particularly important for the physical, mental and social development of children and adolescents in urban contexts. Cities should not be designed chiefly for adults. Designing infrastructure, streets and public transit that are child and gender-responsive will translate into safer, smarter and healthier societies.
The “Surabaya Vision”: Led by senior urban leaders, participants at the Growing Up Urban meeting proposed a high-level vision for East Asia, as well as immediate priorities and action plans for their cities. The Surabaya Vision turns risks into opportunities with equity: services for all children, a society for all children and infrastructure and sustainable environment for all children. This comprehensive and equity-oriented vision reflects upon the globally agreed road map and universal pledge to leave no one behind: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals.

The Surabaya Vision also reflects the Urban Risk Framework shown in Box 2, and the vision was formulated as a strategic response to the 12 risks and opportunities:

- **Services for all children**: Despite the availability of essential services in cities, children from disadvantaged urban households are often unable to gain access to critical services such as education, health, nutrition and water and sanitation. Rapid urbanization places immense pressure on existing facilities to deliver accessible, equitable and quality services.

- **A society for all children**: Comprehensive analysis of children living in urban contexts reveals multiple deprivations and inequities, and it identifies unique vulnerabilities that children face during early childhood and adolescence. Migrants and minorities are often deprived of the rights of urban citizenship and are prevented from contributing to social and economic life. The voice and participation of families and children is often lacking in the decision-making process. Gaps in social protection and a lack of support to expecting parents and families with young children leads to unrealized potential in early childhood.

Child sensitive social protection has a particularly important role in addressing these risks and nurturing children’s ‘cognitive capital’\(^1\) so that every child develops to her or his full potential.

- **Infrastructure and sustainable environment for all children**: Urbanization compounded by migration exerts stress on infrastructure, which can intensify the vulnerabilities children face and threaten social cohesion. Infrastructure that is missing or dysfunctional creates dangers for children.\(^2\) Poor transportation infrastructure leads to safety concerns, including road crashes; the spatial and social structure of urban areas affects physical and mental health; digital access brings with it safety concerns; and inappropriate or insufficient infrastructure can fail to prevent and even exacerbate environmental issues including air pollution, flooding and other impacts of climate change.

The Growing Up Urban meeting in Surabaya concluded on an optimistic note: Realizing the urban advantage and preventing the urban penalty for children is not only desirable but also possible. The political will that was demonstrated and the resources and tools that were referred to at the meeting have the potential to turn the urban paradox into an urban advantage for all children.

Part III of this report takes readers through the main themes of the meeting and highlights the conclusions and action plans proposed by participants. Before getting there, however, part II of this report offers insights into the reality of the 14 cities whose representatives gathered at Surabaya. It discusses trends and presents some key statistics and pictures that were shown at the meeting.

---


Part II.
The Context

The East Asia Region has undergone a process of fast-paced urbanization in the past few decades, and is home to nearly half of the world’s urban population. In 2018, more than 56 per cent of the region’s population lives in cities, including some of the largest cities in the world. Of the twenty most populated cities in the world, nine are in East Asia.

Rapid urbanization has been an engine of development in the region. Urbanization has been a key driving force behind East Asia’s impressive pace of economic growth in the last three decades. Real per capita growth has averaged nearly 7 per cent over the period. The region has leveraged this growth to produce rapid advances in overall living conditions, as evidenced by the fact that it went from scoring low to scoring high on the Human Development Index in less than three decades (1990–2015).

Urbanization has also brought with it new challenges, and exacerbated existing ones. Higher population density in coastal urban centres in the region means that an increasing share of the population is exposed to climate-related shocks and other high-impact events, such as earthquakes. Existing inequalities between urban and rural areas are exacerbated, and within cities, the rate of population growth often exceeds the pace of growth of public services, quality housing and employment opportunities, resulting in increased intra-urban inequality and creating new groups of disadvantaged populations in urban and peri-urban centres. Poor migrants tend to settle in informal settlements and marginalized neighbourhoods that are disconnected from services. According to the World Bank, in Phnom Penh and Yangon the urban population living in informal settlements, is 55 per cent and 41 per cent, respectively. While all cities face the full range of challenges presented by urbanization, the relative intensity of those challenges varies with the stages of urban growth. Small, emerging cities, such as Chiang Mai in Thailand and Surakarta in Indonesia, face challenges related to creating services and infrastructure (in education, health and transportation) at the rate required by their growing populations. At the other extreme, megacities such as Changsha, Ho Chi Minh City and Shenzhen, face issues such as environmental quality and access to public and green spaces (playgrounds, parks, etc.), overly dense traffic and road injuries, and mental health care. In the middle are medium-sized but rapidly growing cities, such as Phnom Penh, Yangon, Bangkok, Surabaya and Da Nang, which struggle with various forms of inequality and with social issues such as addiction and sexual exploitation.

Urban leaders must listen to what children themselves have to say. Understanding urban vulnerabilities for children and how to address the physical/spatial, social and economic barriers that prevent access to services requires a child-specific lens, strong evidence and data collection with a child and gender focus as well as participatory approaches (see Box 3). Poor information and feedback reduces the ability of municipal administrations to provide adequate social protection and improve access to quality services, specifically early childhood development, quality education and urban water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH). City administrators increasingly

---

3 World Development Indicators, data include the Pacific and exclude Japan and the Republic of Korea.
recognize the importance of the participation of girls and boys in city planning and of collecting frequent and accurate data with urban stakeholders to make planning and targeting of services more evidence-based and help improve service provision across the region.

**Box 3. Youth voices in planning**

“Urban planning needs to be more inclusive … the process is the most important part in ensuring the city is able to respond to what people need. Youth are the bridge, they can describe how children see the world.”

“There is a lack of participation among youth, we need new approaches to engage youth using social media and other innovative solutions.”

- Fildzah Husna Amalina, age 21, youth representative, urban planning student and founder of Nekropolis, a platform for youth on urban activism and inclusive urban planning.

“Urban development planning for children and young people can create better cities for everyone.”

“City planning should focus on safety, children should have the right to be safe when walking to their destinations.”

- Joshua Vargas, age 17, Senior High School, Ateneo de Zamboanga University.

UNICEF’s strategic note on children in urban settings (see Box 4) presents a set of priority areas which inspired the dialogue at the meeting. Achieving a collective vision for child-friendly cities (see Box 5) will require different solutions but also will require strengthened cooperation, collaboration and knowledge exchange between cities. Discussions at the Surabaya meeting demonstrated that cities in the region are collectively seeking to create child-friendly urban environments that are safe and responsive to the needs of all children. The speed and scale of urban growth in the region is unprecedented, varied and diverse, and this poses a range of different challenges cities must overcome to become truly child friendly.

The following city profiles provide a synopsis of facts, figures and images that each participating city presented at the meeting in Surabaya. This information was provided in response to a short situation analysis questionnaire, which was circulated prior to the meeting and is annexed to this report (see Annex C).
Box 4: UNICEF’s strategic note on children in urban settings

UNICEF’s strategic note on children in urban settings prepared in May 2017, based on extensive consultations, identifies five priority areas – quality urban social services, urban environments, urban planning, governance and budgets, urban participation and evidence – as critical to realizing the rights of children living in urban settings, particularly the most disadvantaged. They are also areas in which UNICEF is uniquely placed to act building on its mandate, expertise and experience, and has a comparative advantage in doing so. Urban work is now an integral part of the organization’s 2018-2021 Strategic Plan, yet it remains an area that requires further development.

UNICEF intends to follow up the global strategy note by taking action in the following areas:

- Programmatic Framework and Guidance
- Capacity Development
- Knowledge Exchange and Triangular Cooperation
- Evidence Generation
- Partnerships
- Innovation
- Results Framework
- Child Friendly Cities Initiative (CFCI)
Box 5: UNICEF’s Child Friendly Cities Initiative

The Child Friendly Cities Initiative (CFCI) was launched in 1996 bringing together local stakeholders and UNICEF to ensure safe, inclusive and child-responsive cities. The CFCI operates in more than 3,000 cities and communities. The global criteria for UNICEF recognition include:

- Demonstrated results for children – to ensure a child rights approach
- Meaningful and inclusive child participation
- Commitment to eliminate discrimination against children

What is a child-friendly city?

A child-friendly city is a city, town, community or any system of local governance committed to improving the lives of children within their jurisdiction by realizing their rights as articulated in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

In practice, it is a city, town or community in which the voices, needs, priorities and rights of children are an integral part of public policies, programmes and decisions. Broadly speaking, it is a city, town or community where children:

- Are protected from exploitation, violence and abuse
- Have a good start in life and grow up healthy and cared for
- Have access to quality social services
- Experience quality, inclusive and participatory education and skills development
- Express their opinions and influence decisions that affect them
- Participate in family, cultural, city/community and social life
- Live in a safe secure and clean environment with access to green spaces
- Meet friends and have places to play and enjoy themselves
- Have a fair chance in life regardless of their ethnic origin, religion, income, gender or ability

While the primary responsibility for ensuring that children’s rights are realised lies with governments, other stakeholders such as civil society organizations, the private sector, academia and the media, as well as children themselves, also have an important role to play in building child-friendly cities.

Source: Available from https://childfriendlycities.org.
1. City profiles
Bangkok, Thailand

Key facts:

Total child population (0-18):
1.04 million (2017)
(Office of Statistics Registration System)

Total population:
5.69 million (2017)
(Office of Statistics Registration System)

Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):
25% (2014)
(World Development Indicators)

Thailand GDP per capita (current US$):
$5,910 (2016)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Bangkok intra-urban inequalities, Gini index:
40 (2011)
(World Bank (2017). Expanding Opportunities for the Urban Poor – East Asia and Pacific Cities.)

Thailand Gini index:
37.8 (2013)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Bangkok is the fifth largest urban area in East Asia and the ninth largest in population. The ‘mega-city’ has dominated the urbanization process in Thailand and was presented by Vallop Suwandee, Chair of Advisors to the Governor of Bangkok, as a financial, commercial, infrastructure investment and communication hub. The city offers education and employment opportunities, good wages and a range of social services.
Changsha, China

**Key facts:**

**Total child population (0-17):**
1.44 million (2017)
(Changsha Public Security Bureau)

**Total population:**
7.65 million (2016)
(Changsha Statistical Yearbook 2017)

**Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):**
25.2% (2014)
(World Development Indicators)

**Changsha GDP per capita (current US$):**
$20,052 (2017)
(Changsha Statistical Communiqué 2017)

**China GDP per capita (current US$):**
$8,123 (2016)
(World Bank national accounts data)

**China Gini index:**
42.2 (2012)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Changsha is China’s first city to prioritize child safety and mobility as part of the city’s urban planning and policies. Song Wenzhen, Deputy Director General, Office of the National Working Committee for Children and Women of State Council, Changsha, presented Changsha as a Child Friendly City. The principles are an integral part of the Changsha Long-Term Development Plan 2050, which involves a series of ‘child-friendly’ transit improvement initiatives, among others.
Chiang Mai, Thailand

**Key facts:**

**Total child population (0-18):**
19,328 (2017)
(Civil registration system, Ministry of Interior)

**Total population:**
130,268 (2017)
(Civil registration system, Ministry of Interior)

**Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):**
25% (2014)
(World Development Indicators)

**Thailand GDP per capita (current US$):**
$5,910 (2016)
(World Bank national accounts data)

**Chiang Mai intra-urban inequalities, Gini index:**
58 (2006)
(World Bank (2017). Expanding Opportunities for the Urban Poor – East Asia and Pacific Cities.)

**Thailand Gini index:**
37.8 (2013)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Chiang Mai is the largest city in Northern Thailand, and means “New City”. Soontorn Yamsiri, Deputy Mayor, Chiang Mai, shared the fact that the city was awarded the UNESCO title of Creative City, and has also been listed as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. The Digital Economy Promotion Agency is promoting the ‘smart city’ initiative and Chiang Mai will be developed into an innovation driven ‘smart city’.

Chiang Mai Provincial Education authorities promote an array of initiatives to provide access to education for migrant children.
Da Nang, Viet Nam

**Key facts:**

**Total child population (0-16):**
234,000 (2017)
(Da Nang presentation, GUUS 2018)

**Total population:**
1.03 million (2017)
(Da Nang presentation, GUUS 2018)

**Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):**
27.2% (2014)
(World Development Indicators)

**Viet Nam GDP per capita (current US$):**
$2,171 (2016)
(World Bank national accounts data)

**Viet Nam Gini index:**
34.8 (2014)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Da Nang City is located in the central region of Viet Nam. Trần Công Nguyên, Deputy Director, Department of Labour, Invalid, and Social Affairs, Da Nang, presented the city’s priorities. These included the city’s health programmes, essential services, protection of children from dropping out of school due to economic hardship, strict restrictions in child labour, investments in infrastructure and strong private sector engagement, particularly to support entertainment and sport centres for children. The city has initiated some functional models to promote children’s right to participation, such as the Children’s Rights Club and the Children’s Forum.

Rehabilitation for children with disabilities and childhood injury prevention.
Dumai, Indonesia

Key facts:

**Total child population (0-18):**
87,572 (2017)
(Central Bureau of Statistics)

**Total population:**
291,908 (2017)
(Central Bureau of Statistics)

**Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):**
21.8% (2014)
(World Development Indicators)

**Indonesia GDP per capita (current US$):**
$3,570 (2016)
(World Bank national accounts data)

**Indonesia Gini index:**
39.5 (2013)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Dumai is located on the island of Sumatra and is a centre of trade and transport. The local government, as indicated by H. Zulkifli AS, MSi, Mayor of Dumai, developed an early warning system to alert residents of haze or floods. Another key city initiative is the informal education services provided to support children who are living on the streets.

Ensuring children’s voices are incorporated into the planning process in Dumai
Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam

Key facts:

Total child population (0-15):
3.48 million (2010)
(Ho Chi Minh City Sitan Template, GUUS)

Total population:
7.39 million (2010)
(Ho Chi Minh City Sitan Template, GUUS)

Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):
27.2% (2014)
(World Development Indicators)

Viet Nam GDP per capita (current US$):
$2,171 (2016)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Ho Chi Minh City intra-urban inequalities, Gini index:
53 (2012)
(World Bank (2017). Expanding Opportunities for the Urban Poor – East Asia and Pacific Cities.)

Viet Nam Gini index:
34.8 (2014)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Ho Chi Minh City is one of East Asia’s fastest growing cities and the second largest city in Viet Nam. As illustrated by Tran Ngoc Son, Standing Deputy Chief of Ho Chi Minh City Child Care and Protection Committee and Deputy Director of the Department of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs, the city is the financial and technology centre of Viet Nam. In 2015, Ho Chi Minh City People’s Committee committed to create Viet Nam’s first ‘child-friendly city’ at a high-level round-table conference. The city has a growing migrant population and the city has experienced increased incidences of extreme climatic events such as floods, droughts and storms.
Jayapura, Indonesia

**Key facts:**

**Total child population (0-18):**
81,763 (2017)
(Central Bureau of Statistics)

**Total population:**
272,544 (2017)
(Central Bureau of Statistics)

**Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):**
21.8% (2014)
(World Development Indicators)

**Indonesia GDP per capita (current US$):**
$3,570 (2016)
(World Bank national accounts data)

**Indonesia Gini index:**
39.5 (2013)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Benhur Tomi Mano, M.M., Mayor of Jayapura, represented his city, the capital of Papua, Indonesia on the island of New Guinea. District leaders, village chiefs and national health ministry officials worked together to implement a national sanitation programme that encourages communities to change their attitude towards open defecation. Through community-based total sanitation (STBM) trainings established in community health centres across Jayapura, many communities were able to effectively improve their health outcomes.²

---

Magelang, Indonesia

**Key facts:**

- **Total child population (0-18):**
  37,655 (2016)
  (Central Bureau of Statistics)

- **Total population:**
  120,995 (2016)
  (Central Bureau of Statistics)

- **Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):**
  21.8% (2014)
  (World Development Indicators)

- **Indonesia GDP per capita (current US$):**
  $3,570 (2016)
  (World Bank national accounts data)

- **Indonesia Gini index:**
  39.5 (2013)
  (World Bank national accounts data)

Magelang is one of the most densely populated regions in Central Java. Although Java is the thirteenth largest island in the world in terms of land area, it is ranked first among islands, in terms of total population. The population of Java island has reached 160 million people. Joko Soeparno, Head of Regional Planning and Development, Magelang, emphasized the importance of people’s participation, illustrated by the process of drafting the Municipality Strategic Development plan, which involved the private sector, academia, child and youth councils, and people with disabilities.
Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Key facts:

Total child population (0-18):
697,984 (2010)
(Common Database)

Total population:
1.095 million (2010)
(Common Database)

Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):
55.1% (2014)
(World Development Indicators)

Cambodia GDP per capita (current US$):
$1,269 (2016)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Phnom Penh intra-urban inequalities, Gini index:
37 (2004)
(World Bank (2017). Expanding Opportunities for the Urban Poor – East Asia and Pacific Cities)

Phnom Penh, is the capital city of Cambodia and the economic and cultural centre of the country. Nuon Pharath, Deputy Governor of Phnom Penh, noted the increase in the number of poor and at-risk children, as well as migrant children in the city. There is hence a need to explore public-private partnerships, to expand pre-school education and promote WASH in poor communities, as well as develop more green-space, to address the needs of children living in the city.

Teaching children to read and write
Shenzhen, China

Key facts:

**Total child population (0-17):**
1.95 million (2017)
(Shenzhen’s Statistical Yearbook 2017)

**Total population:**
12.528 million (2017)
(Shenzhen’s Statistical Yearbook 2017)

**Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):**
25.2% (2014)
(World Development Indicators)

**Shenzhen GDP per capita (current US$):**
$27,123 (2017)
(Shenzhen Statistical Communiqué 2017)

**China GDP per capita (current US$):**
$8,123 (2016)
(World Bank national accounts data)

**China Gini index:**
42.2 (2012)
(World Bank national accounts data)

**Shenzhen intra-urban inequalities, Gini index:**
49 (2004/5)
(World Bank (2017). Expanding Opportunities for the Urban Poor – East Asia and Pacific Cities.)

Shenzhen is a south-eastern coastal city in China, and one of the most economically vibrant cities. It also happens to be one of the most densely populated cities in the world with 10,000 people per km². Ma Hong, Deputy Director-General, Shenzhen Working Committee for Women and Children and the President of the Shenzhen Women’s Federation presented the city’s elaborate strategy to become a child-friendly city. In addition, the city initiated a ‘Thousand-park’ programme starting in 2005, which is a three-level park system implemented throughout the city.
Surabaya, Indonesia

**Key facts:**

**Total child population (0-18):**
917,330 (2017)
(Central Bureau of Statistics)

**Total population:**
3.057 million (2017)
(Central Bureau of Statistics)

**Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):**
21.8% (2014)
(World Development Indicators)

**Indonesia GDP per capita (current US$):**
$3,570 (2016)
(World Bank national accounts data)

**Indonesia Gini index:**
39.5 (2013)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Surabaya is Indonesia’s second largest city. Tri Rismaharini, Mayor of Surabaya, shared the city’s unique experience in creating a community-driven process where spaces and opportunities are provided for children to develop positive, twenty-first century skills to address issues of radicalism, poverty and vulnerability. Other child-friendly spaces include parks, libraries, language houses, mathematics houses, sports fields and skills and talent centres, as well as public spaces.

Surabaya ensures every citizen receives a free education from pre-school to high school.
Surakarta (Solo), Indonesia

**Key facts:**

**Total child population (0-18):**
171,262 (2017)
(Central Bureau of Statistics)

**Total population:**
570,876 (2017)
(Central Bureau of Statistics)

**Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):**
21.8% (2014)
(World Development Indicators)

**Indonesia GDP per capita (current US$):**
$3,570 (2016)
(World Bank national accounts data)

**Indonesia Gini index:**
39.5 (2013)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Surakarta, also known as Solo, is located in Central Java. Fransiskus Xaverius Hadi Rudyatmo, Mayor of Solo, emphasized the city’s focus on promoting family values and children’s rights. In addition, specific extracurricular activities are organised for children to address radicalism and to improve the lives of the most vulnerable children.
Yangon, Myanmar

**Key facts:**

**Total child population (0-17):**
1.48 million (2014)  
(Yangon Census 2014)

**Total population:**
5.14 million (2014)  
(Yangon Census 2014)

**Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):**
41% (2014)  
(World Development Indicators)

**Yangon GDP per capita (current US$):**
$1,256 (2014)  
(Yangon Presentation, GUUS)

**Myanmar GDP per capita (current US$):**
$1,263 (2014)  
(Yangon Presentation, GUUS)

**Myanmar Gini index:**
38.1 (2015)  
(World Bank national accounts data)

Yangon is the largest city and capital of Myanmar. Maung Maung Soe, Mayor of Yangon, emphasized the importance of a multisectoral minimum package of support for children and families through a well-defined financing mechanism and monitoring and evaluation system. Child participation has been an important part of this process. Furthermore, partnerships are important in promoting child rights, particularly across the parliament, government ministries, religious leaders, international organizations and donors.

Ensuring children have access to entertainment activities including football fields, cinemas, and parks.

Providing access to quality health care services.
Zamboanga City, Philippines

Key facts:

Total child population (0-18):
290,538 (2010)
(2010 Philippines Statistics Authority)

Total population:
675,670 (2010)
(2010 Philippines Statistics Authority)

Population living in informal settlements (percentage of urban population):
38.3% (2014)
(World Development Indicators)

Philippines GDP per capita (current US$):
$2,951 (2016)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Philippines Gini index:
40.1 (2015)
(World Bank national accounts data)

Zamboanga City is the sixth most populous city in the Philippines and is an ethnically heterogenous community. Maria Isabelle Climaco Salazar, Mayor of Zamboanga City, spoke of the importance of listening to young voices and giving them a place at the policy table, as they are the most dynamic and dominant sector in society. A key aspect of programmes delivered is to provide livelihood training and education opportunities for the youth, particularly from indigenous communities. The city has the Seal of Child-Friendly Local Governance, which is a tool to assess the effective delivery of social services for children.

Listening to children’s voices, as important stakeholders of the administration

The city is committed to providing effective, efficient culturally sensitive programme and services that will promote the best interest of children.

Internally displaced families after the Zamboanga Siege in 2013
Part III. The Themes of the Meeting

1. The urban paradox and investments in children

“Investments in children, particularly in the earliest years, yield dividends that realise human rights and slay today’s giants of inequality, deprivation and economic stagnation.”

The urban advantage fuels economic growth and poverty reduction. Cities are centres of opportunity, population growth and economic prosperity. They attract and generate wealth, jobs and investments. Due to their higher population density, connectivity, proximity of services, lower transport costs and flexible, large labour markets – known as ‘agglomeration economy effects’ – cities tend to enjoy a considerable edge over rural environments in terms of income, access to services, infrastructure and growth opportunities for their citizens. Indeed, the strong economic growth, increasing labour productivity and higher income growth over the last decades in East Asia have largely been the result of people moving from jobs in rural agriculture to employment in urban manufacturing and service sectors. A World Bank analysis of 17 cities in East Asia and the Pacific has shown that city-led growth has helped lift more than 650 million people out of poverty over the last two decades.

However, inequity and exclusion can lead to the urban paradox in which disadvantaged urban citizens fail to benefit from the urban advantage. Income inequality weakens the beneficial effects of poverty reduction and access to key services and infrastructure. Moreover, the urban poor often lacks access to safe water, proper sanitation, housing and quality education due to social barriers and unequal rights related to citizenship, ethnicity and residency status.

This risk is very real in East Asia and Pacific where a recent analysis found high intra-urban income inequality. As shown in part II of this meeting report, several of the cities participating in the Growing Up Urban meeting in Surabaya are small or mid-size with high Gini indicators. Of the 17 cities in the World Bank research, 15 had a Gini coefficient close to or beyond the “international alert line” of 0.4, and many small and medium-sized Asian cities experience particularly high inequality.

The urban paradox can turn the urban advantage into an urban penalty for children. The UNICEF Director for Data, Research and Policy presented the initial results of a global investigation at the meeting in Surabaya, which showed that children do not benefit from the ‘urban advantage’ once the effect of household wealth is removed from the equation. The impacts of unplanned urbanization, environmental, social and health hazards, lower resilience and exclusion through informality and insecure tenure may derail, block or counteract the potential beneficial effects of urban environments for children in low and middle-income countries.

7 Ibid, p. 17.
Based on data from nearly 70 Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) and demographic and health surveys (DHS) carried out between 2011 and 2016, UNICEF evaluated the following nine child welfare indicators:

- Skilled births attendants rate
- Birth registration rate
- Coverage of access to at least basic drinking water services
- Coverage of access to at least basic sanitation services
- DPT3 Immunization rate
- Stunting rate
- Under-five mortality rate
- Comprehensive knowledge about HIV/AIDS (young women and men)
- Primary education completion rate

On average, results were better for children in urban areas in comparison to their rural peers, especially for infrastructure-related indicators (see Figure 3.1). Importantly, both urban and rural averages mask large inequalities by household wealth. As pointed out above, the research has found that removing the effect of wealth largely removes the urban advantage (see Figure 3.2).

Policies and context matter: The analysis of nearly 70 countries suggested a tendency that higher national income reduces wealth-related disparities in the nine indicators. However, this effect has been anything but an iron rule: Countries at similar levels of gross national income often show very different results. This attests to the importance of integrated social protection (see section 2) and effective public financial management systems (see section 3) as most of the 70 countries have national programmes to facilitate access to basic social services for children. Ideally, national programmes should be promoted and well-implemented locally and supplemented by further services as the local context requires. A good example is the city of Surabaya’s Education for All initiative, which grants free schooling from preschool through high school for all children, including those living with disabilities. In addition to education, the city provides free meals and supplementary food for nearly half a million children and pregnant women. Additionally, as its Mayor noted at the meeting, the city of Surabaya also provides vaccinations and free health check-ups to youth and pregnant women.
Figure 3.1: Median levels of selected child welfare indicators by geographical area in low and middle-income countries


Figure 3.2: Comparing median gaps between urban-rural averages and gaps between national middle wealth quintiles (Q3) only living in urban and rural areas

Upgrading urban development and economic growth is closely linked to upgrading child development in East Asia, as the Director of the Economic Policy Research Institute (EPRl) emphasized in his keynote speech in Surabaya. He argued that sustaining growth in the region will require much stronger investments in human capital. The most important cognitive and noncognitive skills, known as cognitive capital, are established in early childhood and adolescence. In the twentieth century ‘human capital’ was considered the result of fertility and formal education. Now, brain science adds to the understanding of cognitive capacity: Early neural connections in the brain have lasting windfall effects and lay the foundation for human capability throughout the lifecycle.

The intellectual and socio-emotional skills that build collective intelligence and which jointly enable creativity, flexibility, and ability to work collaboratively are chiefly established in early childhood when the brain develops and shows high plasticity (see Figure 3.3). It is therefore of utmost interest that all children have access to the support and services needed in this period to build the skills that are necessary in today’s world and will be even more important in the future.

Figure 3.3: The first 1,000 days lay a life-long foundation

Adolescence offers a second chance for interventions with lasting effects. As body growth accelerates, plasticity of the brain increases again and structural changes occur in the human brain during puberty (see Figure 3.4).

**Figure 3.4:** Early adolescence offers a ‘second window’ of opportunity for cognitive development

![Graph showing growth in height gain by age and gender.](image)


While decision-makers in Asia fully recognize the importance of human capital, supporting all families and children during the earliest years is often not sufficiently prioritized, as indicated by cities participating in Surabaya. Access to nutrition, health, early childhood and welfare services is particularly important for children and families from disadvantaged backgrounds. This is not just good social policy – it is also good economic policy and good urban policy. As Figure 3.5 shows, the earliest investments in cognitive capital generate the highest returns: The return on investment ratio could be as high as 1 to 18 in this period. Moreover, returns are not just high but also multi-dimensional and long-lasting. Improved brain development results in improved health and well-being, educational outcomes, skills, employment and quality of life. By contrast, “negative stimuli lead to depreciating cognitive capital, poorer mental and physical health and educational outcomes, and decreased life chances.”

---

Cities can support the development of cognitive capital by addressing the challenges faced by pregnant mothers, young children and caregivers and developing strategies to improve their safety, health and mobility and create information feedback loops (see section 4 for city action plans). Investing in programmes that target the prenatal and early years as well as adolescence, is instrumental to ensure children grow into healthy, strong and smart adults who also have access to a knowledge-oriented labour market. Cognitive capital is behind the success of rapidly growing twenty-first century economies, and cities provide the best environment for nurturing these key skills.\(^9\)

Investing in young children globally is a primary means of achieving sustainable human, social and economic development. The failure to invest in the developmental potential of children locks families, communities and nations into poverty and threatens global security. Evidence from across disciplines—from neuroscience to biological and developmental science to economic science—has clearly demonstrated that investing in young children’s well-being is a proven pathway out of poverty.\(^10\)


per cent of children are enrolled in a child health-care programme. In schools, more than 72 per cent of seats are provided to non-registered (migrant) students, including an allowance of RMB 1,500 per year for the healthy growth of preschool children. In Surabaya, the city provides subsidized social services to needy families which reduce stress for parents and caregivers and allow them to focus on positive parenting.

Building on the key takeaways around cognitive development, the Bernard van Leer Foundation presented concrete ways that cities could nurture cognitive development through the spatial design of the built environment. Densely populated urban environments can pose certain risks and stresses for children and families, such as loneliness and isolation, congestion, a general lack of places to play, and concerns around safety. However, when planned well and from the perspective of a child, cities can also offer opportunities for stimulation, improved access to services, infrastructure and mobility, which in turn improve quality of life for all.

Making cities easier to navigate, and more amenable to play and to independent exploration, makes it possible for children to reach their full potential. Small interventions in urban spatial design can directly impact the development of a young child’s (prenatal to age 5) brain and cognitive function. If spaces where young children spend time are prioritized, mobility, walkability, transit systems for pregnant women and young children can be improved. The presenter highlighted places for stimulation, such as underutilized spaces like empty city lots and bus stops, that can be turned into public spaces for play, learning and conversation. Such spaces nurture the developing brain in early childhood and provide opportunities for children to interact with caregivers. However, factors such as poor air quality, affecting brain and lung development as well as increasing risks for cancer and pneumonia can negatively impact the quantity and quality of time small children spend outside.

There are encouraging examples in the region of cities making public spaces more welcoming and suitable for children. The Mayor of Surabaya explained how the city has dedicated 133 hectares of land for parks and public spaces that incorporate features to accommodate the disabled and hearing impaired. Opportunities for traditional and digital literacy and learning, are integrated in public spaces, within public health centres and government offices. The Deputy Director-General of the Working Committee for Women and Children of Shenzhen related how eco-environments are prioritized in the city to nurture children’s growth. Through strict zoning measures and land use policies, the city has improved its ecological sustainability through its Thousand-Park Program as part of its Green System Plan 2009-2020. Through this programme, Shenzhen allocates 50 per cent of the city’s land to the ecological control line, or an urban growth boundary, consisting of a three-level park system inclusive of outskirt parks, city parks and community parks. The ecological control line permanently prohibits development in a defined area of the city to maintain ecological security in the face of rapid urbanization.

Mr. Tran Ngoc Son, Standing Deputy Chief of Ho Chi Minh City Child Care and Protection Committee, Deputy Director of DOLUSA (Credit: Ilham Akbar)
Box 6: Urban 95

If you could experience a city from 95cm—the height of a 3-year-old: what would you change?

The Bernard van Leer Foundation, a private foundation focused on developing and sharing knowledge about what works in early childhood development, established the Urban95 initiative to respond to challenges young children and their caregivers face in an urban environment. Focusing on the relationship between Early Childhood Development and Urban Planning, Urban95 seeks to make lasting change in the landscapes and opportunities that shape the crucial first five years of children’s lives. Urban95 is rooted in the belief that when urban neighbourhoods work well for pregnant women, babies, toddlers and young children, they also tend to nurture strong communities and economic development. Urban95 is working to pilot and scale cost effective innovations in green public space—transforming existing physical spaces to play and explore nature, for caregivers to meet and rest; Mobility for families—enabling caregivers and young children to walk, cycle to key service destination such as healthcare and childcare, spaces to play and sources for healthy food; Data—collecting neighbourhood level data on spaces used by young children and care givers to better target resources and facilitate coordination across sectors; and Parent coaching—providing parents with ideas to incorporate play and storytelling into daily routines and nurturing fast developing brains. In a network of cities, the Foundation is providing technical and financial support to multi-year, citywide initiatives testing out various urban development strategies, with the objective to get data and to define indicators to measure progress. City leaders that are committed are offered training at Harvard on Early Childhood Development.

To counter challenges linked to rapid urban development and climate change, Ho Chi Minh City has been piloting community-based child protection systems, such as the community-based approach to child participation. This approach is effectively advancing child participation through the establishment of a biannual Children’s Council to raise awareness on child law and child participation. The Children’s Council is a platform that connects children to government members to discuss and propose solutions to children’s issues. Council members include various groups of children, including those living in social protection centres and shelters. The first meeting, which took place in 2017, resulted in discussions on a wide array of issues and recommendations, including on traffic congestion, air pollution, flooding, public transportation, child abuse, poverty, and affordable opportunities for leisure, including those for poor households. Children also proposed that “The authorities should launch classes on self-protection in urban areas and publish articles in newspapers to teach children how to protect themselves from child abuse.” The Children’s Council seized the opportunity for their voice to be heard, and encouraged the government to continue their efforts by setting up a website where more children could engage in this initiative.


2. Confronting the urban paradox: Improving equity and access to services

City boundaries in Asia are rapidly changing and incorporating smaller settlements. This process, occurring formally and informally, leads to greater sprawl and places huge burdens upon service delivery. While political, social and economic factors influence equity in access to services, the geography and spatial layout of a given city greatly impact the delivery of services. The urban poor, who often live in peri-urban and informal neighbourhoods, are often highly vulnerable to exclusion and neglect with spatial inequalities worsening marginalization. Cities should leverage the economies of scale made possible by high population density to provide greater access to quality services. Unplanned urbanization and/or siloed planning of social services and infrastructure indeed often place a burden on social protection services and support needs that could have been avoided by more integrated and coordinated advance planning.

For children, spatial inequalities can be observed in three dimensions: in the provision of urban services, in the built environment and in the distribution of land and urban space. Urban services critical for children include green spaces, transportation, water, sanitation and waste management, clean energy, healthy food and access to information and communication technology networks. For the built environment, the concentration of poverty and the characteristics of the physical environment contribute to socioeconomic and environmental vulnerabilities. Children from urban poor families are most
vulnerable to shocks from poverty. The distribution of urban spaces in the built environment help to also define spatial inequalities (see Figure 3.5).

Analysing spatial inequities using these three dimensions also provides insight into complex land value and tenure arrangements.

**Figure 3.6: Children\’s vulnerabilities and the built environment**

![Diagram showing vulnerabilities and the built environment](source: UNICEF, Shaping Urbanization for Children: A handbook for child-responsive urban planning. May 2018.)

The City Form Lab delivered a presentation on spatial accessibility, or the ease of getting from one place to another using a given travel mode. Defining and measuring accessibility to services can help reduce inequities arising from spatial dynamics. Access can be defined by proximity to origin and walkability. The following five dimensions were presented for consideration when measuring access to services:

- **Cost of travel:** In determining the accessibility of a destination using costs, distance and quality of the route will most likely be determinant. A physical map that indicates the location of the child population and the key destinations that need to be reached, such as schools, health care facilities, early childhood centres, green spaces, transit options, to name a few, could help in calculating the distance of services to where children live in a city.

- **Destination attractiveness:** The attractiveness of a destination is determined both by the quality and quantity of services. From the perspective of children\’s needs, the quantity

---

of healthcare facilities and public outdoor recreational spaces available for use are crucial in determining a destinations’ attractiveness. However, if a healthcare clinic provides suboptimal services, or if an outdoor recreational space is isolated or not deemed secure, the likelihood that it will be used decreases.

- Transport options: For a child living in a city, walking, biking and transit are the main modes of movement. It is critical to develop these modes of mobility in a city to improve safe and independent access for children.

- Individual characteristics: The willingness to walk, bike or use any form of non-motorized transport is dependent on a child’s or caregiver’s characteristics. Willingness to walk is influenced by the quality and safety of the built environment.

- Built environment: A strong correlation exists between the built environment and high vulnerability. Proper planning, design and construction measures can improve access to urban services for children and their caregivers while also reducing urban-specific environmental health problems and promoting healthier, more active societies. The built environment influences the extent to which children can participate in society.\(^\text{16}\)

The presenter recommended using these five dimensions of accessibility to develop indicators for measuring how child-friendly a city is in providing services for children and their caregivers.

Urbanization can be in harmony with children’s needs. To improve access to services, child-responsive urban planning can shift the focus of the design of cities and of the infrastructure they offer to cater for children’s needs. For example, as pedestrians, cyclists or passengers, children are vulnerable road users, especially those who are disabled. In most cases, children do not travel independently. They face huge risks and hazards from road traffic resulting in millions of injuries and fatalities every year. The World Health Organization (WHO) and UNICEF report that in most countries, road traffic injuries are one of the top two causes of death from unintentional injury, with the highest rates among youth age 15-19 years.\(^\text{17}\) Globally, children age 5-14 years suffer the highest incidence of road traffic injuries, and two thirds of all child road traffic injury deaths take place in South-East Asia and the Western Pacific. There are proven interventions that help reduce road traffic injuries and cities can be effective by putting in place child-responsive transport infrastructure.

The city of Changsha, for example, is a leader in China in creating better transport infrastructure for children. As a part of its Long-term Development Plan, the Changsha Urban Planning Bureau has committed to improving walking spaces, crossings, traffic organization and public spaces around schools.\(^\text{18}\) For any newly-developed or regenerated school development, the city also implements interventions that improve overall safety in the surrounding area. Recognizing the importance of child road safety, the Director General of the Changsha Bureau of Education has allocated adequate resources and budget for children under its Child Friendly Cities Initiative (CFCI) to improve not only road safety but also other child-friendly infrastructure.\(^\text{19}\) Planning urban spaces should be participatory; children, caregivers and urban local stakeholders should co-produce solutions for child-responsive cities.

\(^{18}\) Institute for Transportation and Development Policy, Child-friendly cities are friendly cities for everyone. August 2017.  
\(^{19}\) Ibid.
To learn more about what cities like Changsha are doing to support children’s development and create child-responsive urban environments, UNICEF developed a set of 10 principles for incorporating children’s rights into urban planning (see Box 8). UNICEF recommends cities prioritize the following areas: planning urban space at various scales; engaging children and other local stakeholders; and using geospatial and other urban data platforms to drive evidence-based and child-centred decision-making and developing a vision for a child-responsive city. The vision would need to consider the key services all children, the environment, both physical and regulatory, and the infrastructure required to make a city work for all children.

Box 8: Children’s rights and urban planning principles

Principle 1 Investments
Principle 2 Housing and Land Tenure
Principle 3 Public Amenities
Principle 4 Public Spaces
Principle 5 Transportation Systems
Principle 6 Integrated Water and Sanitation Systems
Principle 7 Food Systems
Principle 8 Waste Cycle Systems
Principle 9 Energy Networks
Principle 10 Data and ICT Networks

Comprehensive and integrated approaches are best to achieve complex outcomes. Taking the stage for the second time on the first day of the meeting in Surabaya, the Director of EPRI suggested that cities offer the best mechanisms for delivering equitable and quality services for children. Cities should build bridges across service delivery sectors to tackle development challenges, promote child and youth opportunities, reduce inequalities and sustain economic growth. As discussed by the presenter, while East Asian cities have prospered, there are still many pockets of child malnutrition, stunting, youth unemployment and inequality (see Box 9). Combined and adequate investments are needed in multiple sectors to achieve positive outcomes in reduced stunting and greater human capital development and overall child well-being.
Box 9: Improving services for children and migrant families in Bangkok

City Profile

Population: 5.69 million people
Children aged 0-18 years: 1,044,778

Bangkok is home to a non-registered migrant population estimated to be around 3.7 million people. To assist the children from these migrant families, the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (BMA) has emphasized inclusive services and education. In 2018, 4,497 non-registered-alien students were found to be studying in 386 BMA-affiliated schools; a number that is constantly increasing. This figure represents a 76 per cent increase in enrolment for migrant children since 2009. Many of these students are migrants from Cambodia and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Myanmar. Moreover, there are currently 302 early-childhood centres with more than 25,000 children. The government provides the opportunity for low-income students to experience English study programmes abroad and organizes volunteers to look after homeless and high risk children. Despite these accomplishments, obstacles remain in the quality of the education system and services provided, including the qualifications of child-care volunteers, limited space for social-welfare, complex coordination with neighbouring provinces and limited coordination with other agencies. Additionally, a large majority of migrant children enrolled in BMA-affiliated schools are in kindergarten and primary school, showing that few older children stay enrolled in secondary school. Understanding why children do not stay in school and offering non-formal education and skills training are ways to address this trend and ensure children are still learning when they have to drop out.¹


Child grant and family support programmes, such as the Child Support Grant in Thailand, the Philippines’ cash transfer Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps), Myanmar’s universal Child and Maternal Grant and new child-focused grants in Cambodia and Viet Nam are a very important part of the integrated social protection systems that cities should embrace. Impact evaluations have found that child and maternal cash grants make a tangible difference in strengthening and deepening the impact of health, nutrition and other early childhood development interventions. These and other social protection programmes facilitate long-term economic growth, boost workplace productivity and lead to reduced inequities. Integrated social protection systems have the potential to strengthen planning and service delivery, achieve common goals and have a direct impact on the stability and prosperity of the region.

City planning and budgeting structures and processes need to be spelled out and well understood to increase horizontal collaboration among sectors, to encourage institutional change, and to establish modalities for joint implementation. As highlighted by the presenter, the intersectionality of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) presents an opportunity for cross-collaboration and setting up frameworks for joint implementation. For example, planning ministries and national councils...
on sustainable development can engage stakeholders in the creation, implementation and monitoring of national strategies and help build consensus and ownership of plans. Beyond intra-governmental cooperation, other groups such as civil society, the business sector, academia and non-governmental stakeholders could be a part of this process. While the SDGs and other global goals are cross-sectoral, the challenge lies in the fact that each goal is tied to separate ministries, separate government offices with separate budgets and levels of expertise. There is a need to find ways to create joint frameworks and action plans that incorporate overlapping targets and goals. It is also important to ensure data are collected in an integrated manner with the national statistics offices.

3. Unpacking urban governance, policy and fiscal space

Ensuring each child can develop to his/her potential is an ambitious agenda which requires unwavering support and investment from parents, families and communities. Because urban areas enjoy comparatively high levels of gross domestic product (GDP) per capita in every country, one could assume that urban households and urban governments tend to be in a good position to bear the costs of raising children and to address the 12 major risks identified in the Urban Risk Framework (see Box 2). Indeed, globally 80 per cent of GDP is produced in urban areas, mostly in services and industries that benefit from population density.21

Cities tend to be net contributors to the general government budget and could be penalized by unclear expenditure assignment and management. The literature on decentralization frequently identifies the problem of so called ‘unfunded mandates’ in which the central government transfers responsibility for service provision to cities without transferring adequate funds and/or policy space to raise and use revenues locally, such as property/business taxes and user fees to finance health and social welfare provision. Information collected before the Surabaya meeting, however, suggested that the 14 city administrations participating at the meeting share central priorities and receive considerable transfers from their central government, so the are little penalized by the issue of unfunded mandates. Nonetheless, the presentations and discussion led to a more nuanced picture, which highlighted the need for better information systems and clearer mapping of central and local accountabilities for child outcomes.

Cities are leading poverty reduction in East Asia. The presentation by the Mayor of Surakarta at the Growing Up Urban event in Surabaya have added further evidence that cities in East Asia tend to have lower rates of extreme poverty than neighbouring rural areas and are, indeed, leading poverty reduction (see data for Indonesia and Surakarta in Figure 3.6).

Mr. Fransiskus Xaverius Hadi Rudyatmo, Mayor of Surakarta (Solo) (Credit: Ilham Akbar)

Urban policy gaps and inequalities in outcomes often persist. As discussed earlier, the fact that on average urban poverty rates are lower than rural rates can hide deep pockets of poverty in urban areas, especially among populations that face special barriers. For one reason or other, not all urban habitants are citizens, have entitlements to services and/or are able to use these rights. Moreover, working and living in urban areas is often a household coping strategy with mixed results: parents may earn better wages but face worse conditions for family stability and child-rearing. Most young urban families will, therefore, need public services and support from local governments; especially when confronted with expensive private services and weak urban family networks. Therefore, good policies, attentive and caring public administration and adequate fiscal space for services matter to urban children and families.

Managing urbanization requires a coordinated approach and clear policy directions. According to the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), “this is lacking in many countries, where several government departments are in charge of dealing with different aspects of the urbanization challenge”. Indeed, urbanization policy is inextricably linked to all major policy areas such as economic growth, industrial development, poverty reduction, security, migration, employment, property rights, the environment, health, education and social protection. Decisions made in these areas tend to have far reaching implications for the speed and quality of the urbanization process; and urban leaders are nearly always confronted with the need to manage the aggregate, dynamic result of all these central economic and sector policies. Meanwhile they will often have limited authority – so-called ‘policy space’ – to shape the quality of people’s lives and the development of their cities.

Problem awareness, objective setting and attentive action is key to results. The UNICEF EAPRO Regional Adviser on Social Policy and Economic Analysis highlighted in his presentation how, despite the intricate urban policy map, governments’ public financial management could help families most effectively by creating and sustaining a feedback loop that monitors child outcomes and analyses causality. In a results-based budgeting system, decision-makers and implementing agencies need outcome information to adjust inputs (resources) and manage the

Figure 3.7 Poverty reduction in Indonesia: National, Surakarta and its province
process of service delivery (outputs). When parents and their network or employer fail, it is local governments that are best placed to assist children.

Local outcomes monitoring, awareness and action are essential because the asymmetry between better-off and disadvantaged groups in terms of income earning opportunities, social networks and access to information on services and benefits can deprive large numbers of children of developmental opportunity. This – as the previous section, Confronting the urban paradox: Improving equity and access to services, attests - could perpetuate negative social outcomes in health, education and income earning capacity leading to a reduced pace of progress in human development nationwide.

**Figure 3.8: Resources and governance for children**

- **Governance:** the way agencies interact, relate to citizens, and how decisions are taken
- **Financing agencies for children**
  - Parents (coping strategies)
    - Employers (civil serv/corporates)
    - Children themselves
    - Other private carers (relatives):
      - NGOs/donors (external/internal)
  - Local government
  - Central government
- **Information on effort and results**


A child-specific lens is needed at local as well as national levels. Local action works best when it is supported by - and reinforces - central government policies and programmes. As Figure 3.7 illustrates, raising children requires good governance – cooperation and collaboration among many actors and duty bearers. Therefore, classic input-centred approaches (such as line item budgeting) tend not to be very effective in reaching and producing adequate results for each and every child. The risk of elite-capture and exclusion of vulnerable groups is high when planning and implementation lacks feedback loops based on information from multiple sources. These latter could take several forms – administrative and survey statistics and reports, digital ‘big data’ sources, citizens’ card reports, feedback from representative bodies and so on – but too often information systems do not work effectively enough to ensure the most efficient and effective use of public resources. As shown in Figure 3.8, similarly to central governments, municipalities need to be aware of the situation of children in their jurisdiction and assess data from their management information systems in light of child outcomes, rather than outputs.
Evidence-based priority setting in public budgets is required to improve results for children. If municipalities start planning with flawed data – for example, without clarity on how many children actually live in the geographical area and under their accountability – the risk that vulnerable children will have unmet needs runs high. Ideally, each municipality should periodically carry out a child situation analysis, combining quantitative and qualitative data to reveal gaps in services and child outcomes. Information provided through the ‘mini-template’ (see Annex C) by city administrations in advance of the meeting in Surabaya identified, for example, “green and safe environments for children in urban areas, adequate child care, and the availability of social care and welfare services for high-risk children and youth” as priority areas where more attention is needed.

Lack of money is not always the main cause of urban policy failure. Urban leaders and senior city administrators who attended the meeting in Surabaya agreed with the conclusion of the presenter that cities can command sufficient resources to secure services for children. The representative of Bangkok, for example, commented that if further investment is needed, the city has the power to mobilize resources from the private sector and/or form partnerships with employers to address gaps in services. The fact that cities produce an outsize portion of the GDP puts urban leaders in a pole position to argue for increased funds either through intergovernmental transfers, through raising revenues locally, and/or borrowing (when this is possible). When children do not have access to services and support in urban areas, the underlying cause is rarely the absolute lack of money; causality lies more in other steps of the public financial management process.

It is crucial to track and correct gaps and issues across the budget cycle. The public financial management cycle shown in Figure 3.8 could be used as a tool to investigate and correct failures in securing the desired child outcomes. If, for example, monitoring and evaluation reports (stage 6 in the figure) show that a programme is not reaching its objectives there is a chance that the problem lies in implementation (stage 5), possibly due to poor oversight and weak management. However, problems found here could stem from inadequate resourcing, planning and priority setting (stages 4 and 3 respectively). The root causes of these issues could lie in failures to account for children and their needs (stage 1 with links to stage 6).

Participatory approaches and city budget negotiations should complement top down approaches to planning and priority setting. One reason general budget constraints did not seem to translate into urban fiscal concerns could be that cities participating in the Growing Up Urban
meeting in Surabaya manifested a high degree of alignment between policies and national priorities. While the degree of decentralization varies across East Asia, the information provided by urban administrations participating in the meeting suggests that maternal and child health, and education (including preschools) are high in cities’ lists of priorities. This could reflect national commitments established during the era of the Millennium Development Goals. However, cities have indicated low priority for issues such as clean air, care for children under two-year-olds, and support to high risk groups. These issues – which are very important for early childhood development and national cognitive capital as discussed in the previous section of this report – feature strongly in the SDGs. However, it may require more time to ensure these goals and targets are well-established as subnational priorities in the region. City budget negotiations with central authorities would be livelier, better founded and more successful with stronger, well-prepared participation of families, children and adolescents.

Child participation in policy formulation must be strengthened. Participation in decisions affecting children and young people was reported as a low priority in most cases by city administrations at the Surabaya meeting. However, as the presentation by the Mayor of Jayapura illustrated, there are several initiatives in the region to nurture child and youth participation. The Jayapura City Children’s Forum was established by a 2017 Jayapura Mayor’s Decree to “popularize and fight for child rights, provide a platform for children to be creative and able to express their opinions openly”, under a nationwide initiative to create Child Forums in Indonesia. It is clear that without strong support from urban leaders, children and adolescents will find it difficult to influence cities’ decision-making.

UNICEF suggests the following principles for children and young people’s involvement in public decisions:23

Place the main emphasis on children and young people’s involvement in decisions at the community level rather than the national or international level.

- Create and sustain mechanisms at local and national levels for children and young people to be consulted and to have influence over public decisions and resource allocations, rather than focusing on high-level events that bring children and young people together with decision-makers but fail to take their opinions into account.
- Offer opportunities for children and young people to provide feedback on the quality, accessibility and appropriateness of public services.
- Take a long-term approach to gradually increasing children and young people’s control over decisions and to strengthen sustainable mechanisms for their involvement in decision making.

More attention should be paid to expenditure in the social sectors, which often do not benefit as much as some other sectors do from overall fiscal windfalls during the fiscal year. UNICEF estimates based on the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) reports of the International Monetary Fund suggest that Governments in East Asia tend to spend eventually more than what was originally budgeted. The deviation in actual expenditure from approved budget was, for example, 10 per cent in Viet Nam, 14 per cent in Myanmar and 17 per cent in the Philippines per the most recent reports. In countries where fiscal prudence rules but where GDP (and therefore government revenue) is rising at healthy rates, this discrepancy is quite frequent: As the initial forecasts on economic growth and revenues appear too cautious in light of actual data, fiscal discipline is loosened and central Governments allow positive, upward spending adjustments mid-year across the system. This does not seem to apply as readily, however, to the social sectors.

Health, education and social welfare agencies generally underspend in comparison with other sectors, and frequently show poor budget execution rates. PEFA data show that in Viet Nam social sectors were unable to absorb fully the

---

budget which was allocated to them. In Myanmar, the Philippines and Viet Nam, health and education sectors significantly lag behind the strong dynamics observed in general government expenditure. For a number of reasons within and outside of the concerned sectors, it appears to be the case that all too often the social sectors are unable to spend the funds they were allocated in the original budget plan.

Poor budget execution in the social sectors appears to be related to a general bias against current expenditure for local service provision. There is clearly an intergovernmental transfer angle to the issue of low budget implementation in the social sectors. The wage bills of civil servants – doctors, nurses, teachers and social welfare administrators – tend to absorb a significant part of expenditure in the social sectors. Local governments typically have limited policy and fiscal space for increasing public sector wages and hiring more civil servants, compared with initiating infrastructure projects, for example. This bias against social spending underlines the need for better planning, timely implementation and increased quality in these sectors, which in turn requires strengthening local government data and reporting systems and capacity in public financial management.

While investment in relatively large infrastructure projects does not face the same negative bias as current expenditure for service provision, it still faces a significant financing gap. A presentation from the World Bank on sustainable financing for Indonesia’s cities illustrated the strong demand for infrastructure development across the region. The presentation called attention to the fact that, despite the trend toward fiscal decentralization, cities in Asian countries, including Indonesia, still rely mostly on central government transfers, with their own revenue raising capacity remaining low by international standards (see Figure 3.9). This results in a large financing gap for large, multi-year investment in small and medium-sized cities, which often require resources well beyond local budgets, but do not have access to other financing avenues (for example, the public-private partnerships that help finance many viable large infrastructure projects such as toll roads, airports and ports, or the direct market borrowing available for other large and commercially viable projects in creditworthy, large cities). This financing gap tends to affect projects that are important for residents – especially low-income families with children - such as water and sanitation, waste management, affordable housing and urban transport (see Figure 3.10.).

Figure 3.10: Subnational own revenue as share of total government revenue

Note: Data from 2013 for Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines. All other data from 2014.

4. Shaping urbanization for children

“Innovation is in our blood.”

- Ms. Ma Hong, Deputy Director-General, Shenzhen Working Committee for Women and Children; President of Shenzhen Women’s Federation

Shaping urbanization for children in the region requires strategies, planning, resources and vision. On the second day of the meeting, city leaders participated in a visioning workshop, together with UNICEF country office representatives, technical staff and other meeting participants, to articulate immediate and high-level priorities and present a common vision for child-responsive urban development in the region. The workshop discussion was guided by the following four questions:

1. High-level vision: What main results should urban development deliver to all children in East Asia over the next decade? (What needs to be done better for improved results)
2. Immediate priorities: Which are those priority issues in your city where you want to see improved results for young children and adolescents in the short term?
3. Follow up action: How can mayors/governors work on these high-level and immediate level results? (How to make these changes happen?)

4. Partners: Which agencies in what capacity could help delivering these results?

City leaders rolled up their sleeves to create a compelling and powerful vision, and discuss how policies, resources and action can be centred around and lead to results for children.

These workshop results are presented in this section of the report by city and by theme. As an output of the meeting, the participants created plans representing the priority issues, actions and partnerships that can support their high-level vision. The city action plans are presented in Table 4.1. The table is followed by a narrative description of the main themes and areas of overlap among the 14 cities on urban planning from the child perspective.

Furthermore, the ‘Surabaya Vision’ emerged from the presentations of the 14 delegations. It portrays children as citizens with rights and the greatest asset of East Asian cities who should have access to quality services and safe and child-friendly urban environments. The Surabaya Vision is discussed further in section 5.

**Table 4.1: City action plans: Summary points from the discussion during the meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Action plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bangkok  | **High level vision**: Develop skills for tomorrow’s world: innovation, creativity, resilience, social awareness, critical thinking and technology.  
**Priority issues**: Children and Youth skills for Thailand 4.0: using technology and social media in safe and productive way  
**Action points**:  
1. Allocate budget for building innovation and technology skills  
2. Improve digital media literacy and digital safety  
**Partnerships**: National level government working with municipalities; private sector for budget and expertise; youth councils/ student councils to understand needs of young people and raising awareness; bring in UNICEF for knowledge sharing and global experience |

Yangon city’s group work from visioning workshop
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Action plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Changsha** | **High level vision:** To eliminate poverty and break the intergenerational transmission of poverty through equitable urban planning; provide better quality public services for children; improve institutional capacity; and raise social awareness on child rights  
**Priority issues:** Equitable and quality education; increasing the quality and appeal of urban spaces for children; advocacy for child participation in city planning; and evidence-based planning for the allocation of public services  
**Action points:**  
1. Promote integrated development of compulsory education in urban and rural areas to cover more children  
2. Encourage and enable children’s participation in urban planning decision-making processes  
3. Increase investments in public spaces  
**Partnerships:** UNICEF, other cities, civil society and private sector to establish child friendly cities. Knowledge and experience sharing forums organized by UNICEF. |
| **Chiang Mai** | **High level vision:** Child Safe Spaces / Child Friendly Spaces  
**Priority issues:** Migrant children of laborers, children living on the street, child safety and child exploitation; early childhood; embedding cultural activities in public life  
**Action points:**  
1. Strengthen connections between temple (religious), school (education) and home (community)  
2. Promote youth/ community and private participation  
3. Campaign to raise awareness around culture  
**Partnerships:** National-level ministries in Social Development and Education; Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)/ local community organizations; Youth councils; and UNICEF, to share good practices from other countries and guidelines on child-responsive urban planning |
| **Da Nang** | **High level vision:** “4 Safety” Programme: Security Safety, transport safety, food safety and social safety  
**Priority issues:** Early childhood; health and social education services; long-term urban planning for children (to 2035); children with disabilities (focus on teachers’ and parents’ knowledge and skills); and road safety  
**Action points:**  
1. Increase budget allocated to children services  
2. Expand early learning centres model  
3. Increase sidewalks, playgrounds and improve road safety for non-motorized transport (cycling and walking)  
4. Implement short-term target plans for children  
5. Raise awareness around children’s rights  
**Partnerships:** Closer technical cooperation with UNICEF; NGOs; private sector and social responsibility; increase community and child participation |
<p>| <strong>Dumai</strong> | <strong>High level vision:</strong> Improving family environment by supporting parents with coping mechanisms and information. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Action plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ho Chi Minh City | **High level vision:** Child-friendly city for all children  
**Priority issues:** Accessible and safe public places for all children in the city; effective multi-stakeholder engagement and inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms; provision of quality children’s services; participation in decision-making among stakeholders, including families and communities  
**Action points:**  
1. Increase budget allocation for children’s issues across all public departments  
2. Increase the availability of public spaces  
3. Develop advocacy and behaviour change communication strategy on prioritizing children’s issues, including at the level of the community and the family  
**Partnerships:** Business community for resources and volunteers; Community to provide social support services; UNICEF, NGOs for technical and financial support; Academic sector for technical expertise and innovation |
| Magelang        | **High level vision:** Participatory budgeting with children and youth to support policy development.  
**High level vision:** Cities are safe, provide opportunities for all citizens and are designed to be child-friendly  
**Priority issues:** High-risk groups: poor and migrant children; social-housing; pre-school education; WASH, electricity for urban poor communities; and recreational space and clean air  
**Action points:**  
1. Increase support to poor and migrant children (high risk groups)  
2. Expand social housing through public private partnerships  
3. Expand pre-school learning opportunities  
4. Improve access and coverage to WASH in urban poor communities  
5. Improve access to recreational space and clean air  
**Partnerships:** Continue and strengthen the work with UNICEF, World Bank and Japan (JICA); social housing – work closer with the Ministry of Land Management and Urbanization and Construction; connect private sector and local government; engage and promote citizens’ participation |
| Phnom Penh      | **High level vision:** Provide more diverse, comprehensive and high-quality public services for children  
**Priority issues:** Child-friendly spaces; universally accessible public services, such as health and education; social protection; migrant population; collaborate across multiple sectors  
**Action points:**  
1. Improve quality of social protection  
2. Increase child-friendly spaces  
3. Promote multi-sectoral development coordination for the development of the CFCI and implement nine building blocks of the initiative  
**Partnerships:** Media, NGOs, UNICEF and other cities in Asia |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Action plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Surabaya   | **High level vision**: No child left behind  
**Priority issues**: Ensure the provision of children’s basic rights; vulnerable, special needs and most at-risk living under poverty and lack legal identity; and ensuring sustainability of “No Child Left Behind” through political cycles  
**Action points**: Engage United Cities and Local Governments Asia-Pacific (UCLG ASPAC) special committee for children and knowledge management to pursue regional vision  
**Partnerships**: Make use of inter-mayor alliance to exchange best practices on child-friendly policy implementation among cities; assistance by UNICEF to city authorities/pemerintah kota to create best policies to support children |
| Surakarta  | **High level vision**: Quality education for all, especially those who are underserved  
**Priority issues**: Non-resident children; anti-radicalism; mental education for children; extracurricular after-school activities; city budget more responsive to children  
**Action points**: Address fiscal/financial policy and city government budget  
**Partnerships**: Central government collaboration |
| Yangon     | **High level vision**: Provide multi-sectoral, minimum standards package of support for children and families; participatory processes, financing mechanisms and monitoring and evaluation  
**Priority issues**: Transparency and openness; information to public including on budget; poor families and children; poverty and debt reduction; social protection; environment  
**Action points**: Education, health, nutrition, WASH, protection  
**Partnerships**: Parliament; government ministries; religious leaders; international organizations; donors |
| Zamboanga City | **High level vision**: Evidence-based spatial planning that considers physical and psychosocial impact on children and delivery of integrated services for families  
**Priority issues**: Violence against women and children; teen pregnancy; data collection and analysis of child focused data  
**Action points**:  
1. Investigate evidence-based spatial planning  
2. Integrate services focused on violence and teenage pregnancy.  
3. Costing of early childhood interventions  
**Partnerships**: Schools and universities; sangguniang kabatan and youth groups; child-focused NGOs and civil society organizations. Private sector, children and communities |
Urban leaders in Surabaya highlighted the need for greater awareness on rights as well as voice at the policy table so that all children can access services and urban spaces and grow up to their full potential. The delegation from Changsha, China suggested to raise social awareness on child rights; Magelang, Indonesia and Yangon, Myanmar stressed the importance of openness and participatory budgeting; Ho Chi Minh City and Surabaya emphasized that child-friendly cities should serve all children and secure participatory policy processes. Proper information flows and data were seen as major enablers: The Mayor of Dumai, Indonesia said supporting parents with coping mechanisms and information should be a priority and the Mayor of Zamboanga, Philippines noted that urban data collection and analysis should have a child focus.

The concern that some vulnerable groups of children may be left behind by rapid urban development was unequivocal at the meeting. The Deputy Governor of Phnom Penh said cities should provide opportunities for all citizens and suggested priorities should include preschool education, water and sanitation, electricity, recreational space and clean air for all, especially for high-risk groups such as migrant children and children living in extreme poverty. Surabaya and Surakarta, Indonesia added concern for children without legal identity and/or residency entitlement. Indeed, the children of migrant urban workers generally were considered to face a high risk of exclusion from access to services and participation.
The need for equitable, child-friendly urban planning and financing emerged clearly from the presentations and discussions in Surabaya. Child-friendly urban infrastructure which is accessible for all – breaking down spatial and social barriers – emerged as a central tenet of the Surabaya Vision.

Dr. Vallop Suwandee, Chair of Advisers to the Governor of Bangkok (Credit: Ilham Akbar)

As presentations by delegations attested throughout the meeting, city governments enjoy significant decision-making power (policy space) in infrastructural investments and see the potential for long-term impact in shaping the future of their cities. The responsibility of central and local governments for children and youth, however, does not stop at creating spaces and facilities through evidence-based spatial planning (Zamboanga).

Developing skills for tomorrow’s world requires investments in children’s cognitive capital in concerted ways. ‘Thailand 4.0’, as the Chair of Advisers to the Governor of Bangkok referred to, implies going beyond the twentieth century model of industrialization and addressing the three traps that several countries now face in East Asia – the ‘middle income trap’, the ‘inequality trap’, and the ‘trap of imbalanced development’. Cities could, indeed, be the key actors in updating the ‘Asian model of development’ by adopting a fresh vision on human capital development and increasing the urban advantage to full capacity for the twenty-first century. Among others, this will require allocating bigger budgets for innovation and digital technology skills among children and adolescents (Bangkok); prioritizing early childhood development, universally accessible public services (Changsha, Da Nang, Phnom Penh), increasing investments in public spaces (Changsha, Shenzhen), campaigns for culture (Chiang Mai) and for religious tolerance and against teen pregnancy and violence against women and children (Zamboanga).

Mr. Trân Công Nguyên, Deputy Director, Department of Labour, Invalid, and Social Affairs, Da Nang City (Credit: Ilham Akbar)
The commitment to not leaving any children behind requires alliance-building. The vision of the host city, Surabaya, No Child Left Behind — which highly resonated with other city delegations at the meeting — requires coordination across different levels and sectors of government as well as collaboration with civil society, the private sector, and international agencies, like UNICEF. Religious leaders, business leaders, government ministries and parliament should be united to provide multi-sectoral, integrated package of support (Yangon, Zamboanga); or, as the representative of Da Nang suggested, putting in place a cash transfer like the one in the Philippines known as ‘Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program’ (4Ps) - for security, transport, food and social safety for all children.
5. Conclusions and way forward

“Local government is the first level children can turn to, to help solve their problems.”

- Dr. Bernadia Tjandradewi, Secretary General, United Cities and Local Governments, Asia Pacific

Child-friendly cities depend on political will and leadership. The Secretary General of United Cities and Local Governments, Asia Pacific (UCLG ASPA) delivered the closing keynote address, which highlighted the importance of political will and the need to localize global goals. The SDGs provide a framework for coordinated and integrated action, especially for local governments. Some 65 per cent of the SDGs, particularly Goal 11, can only be achieved if local and territorial governments are involved at all stages of the decision-making process. Localizing the SDGs allows for unique challenges, opportunities and capacities to be considered when establishing goals and targets for implementation, monitoring and reporting.

The Growing Up Urban meeting gave important signposts to UNICEF for its urban advocacy and partnerships agenda. The meeting provided an opportunity for UNICEF to launch a dialogue with urban leaders on a range of topics that particularly matter for children in East Asia – such as access to child friendly urban services and spaces – and to investigate the prioritization, planning and budgeting processes that shape results for every child.

Participating cities in Surabaya expressed a desire to strengthen the partnership they have with UNICEF and other development actors. The Regional Director of UNICEF EAPRO committed to work with cities to do the following:

- Improve data and knowledge sharing
- Explore, document and create better awareness on how urban planning, central and local resources and initiatives can be used in effective and efficient ways to enhance child nutrition, health, early development, education and protection for all children
- Involve young people and their families in the design of services and urban environments

The stimulating discussion confirmed the need for UNICEF to facilitate further exchanges on best practices regionally as well as globally. To this end, the UNICEF Director for Data, Research and Policy committed to updating the Child-Friendly Cities framework and to develop improved indicators for measuring urban commitments and the dynamics of child well-being.

UNICEF also committed to work with the regional cities’ alliance – UCLG ASPA – and its members to establish a committee on children and youth to promote the Surabaya Vision and facilitate that:

- thorough central and local public finance management processes secure adequate resources to secure and implement integrated and comprehensive services for all children;
- child-friendly infrastructure is made a priority, and;
- cities protect children rights also through encouraging their meaningful participation.

The Surabaya Vision. As discussed in the previous section and presented in the overview of this report, the Surabaya Vision, prepared based on participants’ discussions, may be summarized in three headlines:

- Services for all children
- A society for all children
- Infrastructure and sustainable urban environments for all children
The City Action Plans presented by mayors, governors and senior urban administrators on the second day of the meeting – shown in section 4, Table 4.1 – include both immediate next steps and longer-term commitments to turn the vision of urban leaders into reality. Individually in their context, and taken together as a regional platform, the action points presented will facilitate urban planning from the child perspective, using evidence -- and ultimately resources and partnerships -- to keep urban risks at bay and to maximize the urban advantage for children and nations. The meeting ended with a strong understanding that the exchange and learning between cities that took place in Surabaya will continue in the future, stimulating child-friendly governance across East Asia and possibly bringing more and more cities into the ‘Surabaya group’ of child-friendly East Asian urban governments.
ANNEX A: Meeting agenda

Growing Up Urban
A conversation with Mayors on
Making cities safe and sustainable – for every child
Surabaya, 7-8 May 2018

Purpose

The ‘Growing Up Urban’ meeting will bring together Mayors, Governors and senior urban planners and decision-makers from 8 countries in East Asia. Recognized for their catalytic roles and achievements in championing child rights in their cities, these representatives of fast-growing Asian cities will discuss how urban services, planning and budgeting for children could further be improved and made more equity-oriented. The meeting will facilitate discussing urban trends, risk and opportunities and how these impact the rights of children and women; exploring partnerships, financing and innovative solutions towards ensuring child and adolescent responsive urban policy and planning; crafting a vision how urban administrations in East Asia could prioritize action for all children, including young children and adolescents from disadvantaged backgrounds.

The 1.5-day meeting will host Mayors, Governors and other senior representatives of 12 city administrations delivering two main types of contributions: (1) short presentations prepared in advance which should offer insights into the urban challenges and city responses in large metropolitan areas as well as in relatively smaller but rapidly developing cities in East Asia today; (2) participation in general discussion following these pre-arranged contributions. A limited number of subject-matter experts will join the forum to share specific insights and stir further discussion especially on these interconnected issues: equitable access to services for all children growing up urban, in the critically important early years and through adolescence; adapting urban planning and budgeting for children living in urban settings, with attention on those living in poverty and/or part of marginalized groups.
Background

East Asia is one of the most highly urbanized regions globally. Home to both vibrant growth and emerging challenges, there is an inextricable link between the growth of safe and sustainable cities in East Asia and the well-being of the region’s children. The region is home to some of the fastest growing and most populated mega cities in the world. It is also experiencing dramatic growth in small and medium-sized cities where more than half of the urban population lives. By 2030 more than 70 per cent of people living in the region will live in urban areas.

This shift creates incredible developmental opportunities across the region. Children and adolescents – whose personal, cognitive, physical and socioemotional development is powerfully influenced and ‘sculpted’ by the new urban experience – should be the clear winners of this urban century. Making urbanization work for every child will yield dividends for all citizens.

The 2030 Sustainable Development Goals is a globally agreed roadmap, with a universal agenda to leave no one behind. How can we make cities safe and sustainable for every child in East Asia, to ensure the urban advantage avoid becoming an urban penalty for millions of children?

Making cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable (Goal 11) implies addressing urban risks such as high exposure to air pollution, road accidents, flooding and other disasters, high living costs, drug-use, gaps in safety nets and exclusion from basic health, education, social and child protection services. Without community networks and protective factors such as traditional care systems, the urban child may be unable to access support when they experience violence, abuse or neglect. Without inclusive services, disability and gender-sensitive infrastructure, cities may exclude the opportunity and participation of every child. However, where urban agendas facilitate strong investments in holistic early childhood development and unleash the potential of adolescents’, where children grow up in safe and sustainable environments, free of poverty, stress and threats to personal security a virtuous cycle is created with immediate and long-term benefits to all.

Meeting Agenda

Day 1 - Monday, May 7

08.00-8.30 Registration
Master of Ceremony throughout the meeting: Ahmad Rifai, Kota Kita Executive Director

8.30 –10.30 Plenary Session 1. The urban century in East Asia – why investments in children and adolescents are important for cities
Chair: Gunilla Olsson, Representative, UNICEF Indonesia
Session Rapporteur: Jens Aerts

Opening:
The I, You, and We Aspect of Urban Policy in Surabaya
Dr. Ir. Tri Rismaharini 10’

Sustainable Urbanization: Opportunities and Challenges for Children
Karin Hulshof, Regional Director, UNICEF EAPRO 10’

---

24 The State of Asian and Pacific Cities 2015: Urban transformations: shifting from quantity to quality. UNESCAP and UN-Habitat, 2015. The report notes that collectively growing at a faster rate than large cities, small and medium-sized urban areas need resources to address urban poverty and realize their potential often even more acutely than large cities do.
Keynote: Opportunities in the Early Years and Adolescence for Urban Policies
Michael Samson, Director, Economic and Policy Research Institute (EPRI) 20’

Discussion Forum:
Yangon: Importance of Investing in Children in Youth
H.E. Dr. Maung Maung Soe, Mayor of Yangon 8’

Shenzhen: Investment in Building a Child Friendly City for Sustainable Development
Ms. MA Hong, Deputy Director-General Shenzhen Working Committee for Women and Children; President of Shenzhen Women’s Federation, China, 8’

Ho Chi Minh City: Child Protection System Building and Child Participation Through Children’s Council
Mr. Tran Ngoc Son, Standing Deputy Chief of Ho Chi Minh City Child Care and Protection Committee, Deputy Director of DOLISA, 8’

Planning for Early Childhood Development
Patrin Watanatada, Knowledge for Policy Director, Bernard Van Leer Foundation, 8’
General discussion 30’

Concluding words – Chair 3’

10.30 – 10.45 Group photo and Press Conference

10.45 – 11.00 Coffee and tea

11.00 – 12.30 Plenary Session 2. Confronting the urban paradox: equity and access to services
Chair: Ahmad Rifai, Executive Director and Cofounder, Kota Kita
Session Rapporteur: Henky Widjaja

The Urban Paradox
Laurence Chandy, Director, Data, Research and Policy, UNICEF headquarters 15’

Discussion Forum
Bangkok: Improving Access to Services for Disadvantaged Children, including Migrant Children
Dr. Vallop Suwandee, Chairman of Advisers to Governor of Bangkok 8’

Danang: Providing Respite Care Services for Children with Disabilities
Mr. Trần Công Nguyên, Deputy Director, Department of Labour, Invalid, and Social Affairs, Da Nang City, Viet Nam 8’

Phnom Penh: Reintegration of children from residential care institutions to families and communities
H.E. Nuon Pharat – Deputy Governor of Phnom Penh Capital 8’
General discussion 40’

Concluding words – Chair 3’

12.30 – 14.00 Lunch
14.00-15.30 Plenary Session 3. Towards lifting barriers to sustainable urbanization and equitable access to services

Chair: Kioe Sheng, Yap, Urban Anthropologist
Session Rapporteur: Jens Aerts

Addressing Spatial Barriers to Services: Equity and the Urban Form
Andres Sevtsuk, City Form Lab, Harvard School of Design 10’

Designing Inclusive and Integrated Services
Michael Samson, EPRI 10’

Discussion Forum:
Changsha: Setting Up and Operation of Child Friendly Schools
Mr. LU Hongming, Director General, Changsha Bureau of Education 8’

Zamboanga City: Equitable Access to Services
Ms. Maria Isabelle Climaco Salazar, Mayor of Zamboanga City 8’

Dumai: Involving Children and Improving Access to Services
Dr. H. Zulkifli AS, MSi, Mayor of Dumai 8’

Public spaces in rapidly urbanizing cities
Belinda Yuen, Lee Kuan Yew Centre for Innovative Cities 8’

General discussion 35’

Concluding words – Chair 3’

15.30 – 16.00 Coffee/ Tea

16.00-17.30 Plenary Session 4. Unpacking urban policy and fiscal space

Chair: Wivina Belmonte, Deputy Regional Director, EAPRO, UNICEF
Session Rapporteur: Sharmila Kurukulasuriya

Public Finance and Governance for Children
Gaspar Fajth, Regional Adviser, Social Policy and Economic Analysis, UNICEF 10’

Discussion Forum:
Surabaya Learning City: Innovative Financing through the Triple Helix Model
Dr. Ir. Tri Rismaharini, Mayor of Surabaya 8’

China National Working Committee on Women and Children: prioritizing and investing in children’s development
Ms. Song Wenzhen, Deputy Director General, Office of the National Working Committee for Children and Women of State Council 8’

Solo: Child friendly fiscal policy – planning for the next 20 years
Mr. Fransiskus Xaverius Hadi Rudyatmo, Mayor of Solo 8’
Strategies for improved urban financing
Thalyta E. Yuwono, Senior Urban Economist, World Bank Jakarta 8’

General discussion, 40’

Concluding words – Chair 3’

19.15 – 21.15 Surabaya Night Boat Tour

Day 2 - Tuesday, May 8

08.00 – 08.45 City delegates breakout time

09.00 – 10.30 Plenary Session 5. Addressing the Urban Paradox: shaping urbanization for children
Chair: Bernadia Tjandradewi, Secretary General, United Cities and Local Governments Asia Pacific
Session Rapporteur: Sharmila Kurukulasuriya

Keynote: Shaping Urbanization for Children
David Anthony, Chief, Policy Analysis, Data, Research and Policy, UNICEF headquarters, 15’

Questions and Comments 15’

Mayors’ Workshop: Crafting “A Vision for Growing Up Urban” 60’

City leaders will be asked to present proposals along four questions:

- What main results should urban development deliver to all children in East Asia over the next decade? (High-level vision what needs to be done better for improved results)
- Which are those priority issues in your city where you want to see improved results for young children and adolescents in the short term? (Immediate priorities)
- How Mayors/Governors could work on these high-level and immediate level results? (A vision for action: How to make these changes happen?)
- Who and in what ways could help delivering these results? (Partners – including role for UNICEF)

City delegations will be asked to arrive to Session 5 with short proposals and suggestions along these four questions. At the “Workshop” they will be asked to present their answers, placing four VIP cards on the wall. The moderators will group these and propose a short summary (integrated version) of these proposals for the “Surabaya Vision”. The Surabaya Vision will be call for action pointing towards areas where cities in East Asia could make stronger progress for children and adolescents indicating also how this could happen.

Moderators for the Workshop session respectively: Jens Aerts, Urban Specialist, UNICEF headquarters and Kioe Sheng Yap.

11.00-11.30 Coffee and Tea

11.30 – 12.15 Plenary Session 5 (continued)
Voices of Children
Video from Surabaya 5’
Commentary from Ms. Fildzah Husna Amalina, Youth Representative, 5’
Commentary from Mr. Joshua Rommel H. Vargas, Youth Representative, 5’

Presentation of the proposed Surabaya Vision - Session moderators 10’

Discussion 15’

Concluding words – Chair 5’

12.15 – 13.00 Session 6 Conclusions and Way Forward
Chair: Mr. Fransiskus Xaverius Hadi Rudyatmo
Session Rapporteur: Kinanti Pinta Karana

Closing Keynote: The Role of Local Governments in improving the quality of life for children and adolescents
Dr. Bernadia Irawati Tjandradewi, United Cites and Local Governments, Head of the General Secretariat 10’

Final remarks
Each city delegation head will be requested to provide a brief, final remark – 2’ per speaker
Concluding words
Ms. Karin Hulshof, UNICEF Regional Director 2’
Mr. Fransiskus Xaverius Hadi Rudyatmo, Mayor of Solo and Session Chair 5’

13.00 – 14.00 Lunch

14.00 – 17.00 Time reserved for field trip
Destinations: KAMPUNG LAWAS, a preserved cultural village in the middle of the city and SIOLA City Command Centre
Cities invited:
1. Phnom Penh, Cambodia
2. Changsha, China
3. Shenzhen, China
4. Dumai, Indonesia
5. Jayapura, Indonesia
6. Magelang, Indonesia
7. Surabaya, Indonesia
8. Surakarta (Solo), Indonesia
9. Yangon, Myanmar
10. Zamboanga City, Philippines
11. Bangkok, Thailand
12. Chiang Mai, Thailand
13. Da Nang, Viet Nam
14. Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam

Dignitaries expected to attend:
1. H.E. Mr. Nuon Pharath, Deputy Governor of Phnom Penh, Cambodia
2. Ms. Song Wenzhen, Deputy Director General, Office of the National Working Committee for Children and Women of State Council, Changsha, China
3. Ms. Ma Hong, Deputy Director-General, Shenzhen Working Committee for Women and Children; President of Shenzhen Women’s Federation, Shenzhen, China
4. Dr. H. Zulkifli AS, MSi, Dumai Mayor
5. Dr. Benhur Tomi Mano, M.M., Mayor of Jayapura
6. Mr. Joko Soeparno, Head of Regional Planning and Development, Magelang
7. Dr. Tri Rismaharini, Mayor of Surabaya, Indonesia (Host)
8. Fransiskus Xaverius Hadi Rudyatmo, Mayor of Solo, Indonesia
9. H.E. Dr. Maung Maung Soe, Mayor of Yangon, Myanmar
10. Ms. Maria Isabelle Climaco Salazar, Mayor of Zamboanga City, Philippines
11. Dr. Vallop Suwandee, Chairman of Advisers to Governor of Bangkok, Thailand
12. Mr. Soontorn Yamsiri, Deputy Mayor Chiang Mai, Thailand
13. Mr. Trần Công Nguyên, Deputy Director, Department of Labour, Invalid, and Social Affairs, Da Nang City, Viet Nam
14. Mr. Tran Ngoc Son, Standing Deputy Chief of Ho Chi Minh City Child Care and Protection Committee, Deputy Director of Department of Labor, Invalids and Social Affairs

Master of Ceremony throughout the meeting: Ahmad Rifai, Kota Kita Executive Director
Meeting organizer/UNICEF technical officer: Lusungu Kayani
Logistics Officers: Rowena Gonzalez and Wahyoe Boediwardhana
## ANNEX B:
List of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Lastname</th>
<th>Position/ Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>DEBORA</td>
<td>COMINI</td>
<td>Country Representative, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E. NUON</td>
<td>PHARATH</td>
<td>Deputy Governor of Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOM</td>
<td>CHANDANY</td>
<td>Director, Capital Department of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PATH</td>
<td>HEANG</td>
<td>Chief Field Office, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>FENG</td>
<td>YIGANG</td>
<td>Director General, Bureau of Urban and Rural Planning, Changsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Programme Officer, National Working Committee for Women and Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>LENGNI</td>
<td>Research Assistant, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LU</td>
<td>HONGMING</td>
<td>Director General, Bureau of Education, Changsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>HONG</td>
<td>Chairwoman of Shenzhen Women’s Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>MAO</td>
<td>Partnership Officer, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PENG</td>
<td>YUAN</td>
<td>Deputy officer of Shenzhen Work Committee for Women and Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RANA</td>
<td>JANE FLOWERS</td>
<td>Country Representative, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SONG</td>
<td>WENZHEN</td>
<td>Director General, National Working Committee for Women and Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WENGFENG</td>
<td>HUANG</td>
<td>Secretary General, Shenzhen Women and Children Development Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YAN</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Family and Children’s work of Shenzhen Women’s Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>AGUS IMAM</td>
<td>SONHAJI</td>
<td>Head of Communications and Informatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHYANI</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>Solo Head of Planning and Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANGGI SUKMA</td>
<td>BUANA</td>
<td>Aide of the Mayor of Dumai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANTIEK</td>
<td>SUGIHARTI</td>
<td>Head of Women Empowerment, Child Protection and Family Planning Office, City of Surabaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>ZULKIFLI</td>
<td>Mayor of Dumai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BENHUR</td>
<td>MANO</td>
<td>Mayor of Jayapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAMARIA</td>
<td>SKM. M. Si.</td>
<td>Head of Department, Department of Women Empowerment and Child Protection, Dumai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEWI WAHYU</td>
<td>WARDANI</td>
<td>Head of Cooperation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FILDZAH</td>
<td>AMALINA</td>
<td>Youth Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANSISKUS</td>
<td>RUDYTAMO</td>
<td>Mayor of Solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HENDRO</td>
<td>GUNAWAN</td>
<td>City Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Lastname</td>
<td>Position/ Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>HIDAYAT</td>
<td>SYAH</td>
<td>Head of Surabaya Development Planning Agency/ Assistant to the Mayor on General Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ILHAM</td>
<td>AKBAR</td>
<td>Head of Culture and Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIDYANTO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUNIOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of Regional Planning and Development, Magelang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOEPARNO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LENNY</td>
<td>NURHAYANTI</td>
<td>Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection, Republic of Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRI</td>
<td>RISMAHARINI</td>
<td>Mayor of Surabaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRIHANTO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of Women Empowerment, Child Protection and Community Development Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>KUNUGI</td>
<td>Myanmar Country Representative, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAUNG</td>
<td>MAUNG SOE</td>
<td>Mayor of Yangon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THAN TUN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Head of Department - Health Department, YCDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>ANJANETTE</td>
<td>SAGUISAG</td>
<td>Chief of Policy and Advocacy, UNICEF Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOSHUA</td>
<td>VARGAS</td>
<td>Youth Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOTTA</td>
<td>SYLWANDER</td>
<td>Philippines Country Representative, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARIA</td>
<td>ISABELLE G. CLIMACO</td>
<td>City Mayor, Zamboanga City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA. SOCORRO</td>
<td>A. ROJAS</td>
<td>City Social Welfare and Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>DARKA</td>
<td>TECHAWANG</td>
<td>Chief, Sub-division of Children and Youth Affairs, Bureau of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORNTINA</td>
<td>KULARB</td>
<td>Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PANNARAI</td>
<td>CHINGCHITR</td>
<td>Chief of city capacity Development Section, International Affairs Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RANGSUN</td>
<td>WIBOONUPPATUM</td>
<td>Education Specialist, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RUNGGANDA</td>
<td>PHONGTARAKULPANIT</td>
<td>Director of Social Work and Social Welfare Office, Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOONTRON</td>
<td>YAMSIRI</td>
<td>Deputy Mayor of Chiang Mai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUPORN</td>
<td>KHUMWONG</td>
<td>Director of Educational Strategy, Education Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THAWEESAK</td>
<td>LERTPRAPAN</td>
<td>Deputy Governor of Bangkok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VALLOP</td>
<td>SUWANDEE</td>
<td>Chairman of Advisers to Governor of Bangkok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VEERANUCH</td>
<td>NAOOWASAK</td>
<td>Foreign Relation Officer, International Affair Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Lastname</td>
<td>Position/ Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>LESLEY</td>
<td>MILLER</td>
<td>Deputy Country Representative, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRAN CONG</td>
<td>BINH</td>
<td>Programme Partnership Specialist, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRAN CONG</td>
<td>NGUYEN</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Department of Labour, Invalid, and Social Affairs (DOLISA), Da Nang City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRAN NGOC</td>
<td>SON</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Department of Labour, Invalid, and Social Affairs (DOLISA); Standing Deputy Head of Ho Chi Minh City Child Care and Protection Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRAN THI KIM</td>
<td>THANH</td>
<td>Head of Child protection and gender equality, Department of Labour, Invalid, and Social Affairs (DOLISA); Head of Programme Coordination Group of the City Child Care and Protection Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRAN THI PHUONG</td>
<td>THAO</td>
<td>Deputy head of the Consular and International NGO Affairs Division, Department of Foreign Affairs, Da Nang City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF EAPRO</td>
<td>GASPAR</td>
<td>FAJTH</td>
<td>Regional Advisor, Social Policy and Economic Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>FAN</td>
<td>Social Policy Specialist, Social Policy and Economic Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KARIN</td>
<td>HULSHOF</td>
<td>Regional Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUSUNGU</td>
<td>KAYANI</td>
<td>Urban Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SARANYA</td>
<td>TANVANARATSKUL</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHARMILLA</td>
<td>KURUKULASURIYA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>WIVINA</td>
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<td>Deputy Regional Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Programme Officer</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Director - Data, Research and Policy</td>
</tr>
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<td>UNICEF headquarters</td>
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<td>RIIFAI</td>
<td>Kota Kita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANDRES</td>
<td>SEVTSUK</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td>YUEN</td>
<td>Lee Kuan Yew Centre for Innovative Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BERNADIA</td>
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ANNEX C:
Growing Up Urban - Situation analysis template

Situation Assessment Template – background for the ‘Growing Up Urban’ meeting

**Purpose:** This Template is a UNICEF tool to collect data and information directly from participating cities’ administration in advance of the “Growing Up Urban” Mayors’ meeting in Surabaya, Indonesia May 6-8, 2018. It is meant to help preparations of the invited cities for meeting discussions and inform the meeting agenda. All data and information provided herewith will remain confidential (the so called “Chatham House rule” applies) and will not be published outside the Surabaya meeting in any way before consulting with respective city administrations. Please note that some of the requested information may require estimates and subjective assessment. Please feel free to use and add space to the template to elaborate on best practices, innovative partnerships, emerging issues for children and adolescents and urban governments in each sub-area.

**Reporting deadline:** no later than 25 April, 2018

City Name:  
Country:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Urban Demographics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.1 Urban definition:** How is urban defined in your local context (may include population size, location, legal status etc.). Please comment on who is included and who is excluded from the total number.  
*please cite source* |  |
| **1.2 Urban population:** Based on the latest official data, what is the total urban population and the total child (age 0-18) population in your city? (please provide numbers and year)  
*please cite source* |  |
2. Emerging Urban Trends, Risks and Opportunities

2.1 Urban Risks for Children and Adolescents: List the top five emerging risks due to rapid urbanization faced by vulnerable children/adolescents in your city (i.e. migration, safety, etc.)

Please rank the order with 1 = highest risk and 5 = lowest risk.
If possible, please also add an estimate on the percentage of the (child and adolescent) population affected by each risk.

How specific are these risks to your city or are they also evident in other urban areas in your country?

2.2 Urban opportunities: List the top five most important opportunities children/adolescents enjoy in your city in comparison with other urban areas (1 = greatest opportunity etc.)

How specific are these opportunities to your city or are they also evident in other urban areas in your country?

3. Access to urban services for children, adolescents and parents

3.1 Quality of services and local capacity. Please put these 18 areas in rank order (first=best, second, third. etc. 18th =worst) from the viewpoint of availability of

| (a) quality services for every child in the city | (b) policy space for the city administration | (c) fiscal space | (d) trained staff and/or local partners to deliver quality service |
| Maternal and child health | Services related to nutrition | Nurseries (children under 2) | Kindergartens (children 3 and above) | Basic education |

Note: Numbers between 1-18 preferred but you can also add a “0” to indicate total lack of policy and/or fiscal space for city administration (with comments in the cells)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maternal/parental and child cash grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social care services for families with newborns and young children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social care/support services, information for adolescents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe public spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean environment/clean air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure, entertainment (sport, movies, theaters, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports to high risk groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to equal opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in decisions affecting them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Please identify the top three gaps in access to services for children and adolescents where the city has made good progress in addressing over the past 3-5 years.

3.3 Please identify the top three gaps in access to services for children and adolescents where the city has found difficult to make progress in addressing over the past 3-5 years.

4. Public Finance and Urban Governance

4.1 Local Service Delivery Arrangements

Please list some typical services for children and adolescents delivered or co-delivered:

- by the city administration
- by higher level of government
- by private sector and/or NGOs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2 Local Finance* (last available year, please indicate ______)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1 Total expenditures by the city administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 Total revenues raised by the city administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3 Total intergovernmental fiscal transfers received by the city administration of which:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- earmarked for a given purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- non-earmarked/general purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4 Total international aid received by the city administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.5 Total borrowing by the city administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.6 Total fiscal balance (deficit or surplus) of the city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.7 List top three sources of revenues raised by the city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*please write N/A if no data/breakdown exists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.3 Institutional arrangements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1 What is the mechanism to ensure the local (city) budget reflects the interests and concerns of the residents?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2 What is the mechanism to ensure the local (city) budget is aligned to national priorities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3 What is the mechanism to ensure public participation in local urban planning and management, including participation by civil society, children and adolescents?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please comment on established mechanisms for participation (such as child and youth councils) and how children and adolescents are involved in shaping local policy plans or budgets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.4 Are there any negotiations between the local (city) and higher level governments in the formulation and approval of the local government budget?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.5 Is the city administration budget approved at the local level or a higher level?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.6 Please describe any mismatches between the city's service delivery responsibilities and the related fiscal needs for child-related services

5. Sustainable Urban Planning and Environment

5.1 Urban Planning

5.1.1 National urban policy: Is there a national urban policy? Is your city part of an urban or regional development plan? If no, please indicate. If yes, please identify:
- the priority sectors articulated in these plans,
- the process of drafting the policy (was it inclusive, main stakeholders involved);
- how it links to global frameworks (SDGs, New Urban Agenda, Paris Agreement, Human rights/child rights conventions).

5.2 Urban Stakeholders: Please list the main urban stakeholders for children and adolescent services (governmental (national and local), non-governmental, community, academic, private, development, media, etc.) and the role they play

ANNEX: SDG Urban targets and indicators reporting status

Please tell us if the following SDG indicators are being reported on in your city, the agency responsible for reporting on each indicator and the agency being reported to on each indicator. If this agency you are reporting to is the same for each indicator, please only state once.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDG Indicator</th>
<th>Reported (Y/N):</th>
<th>Reporting Agency:</th>
<th>Reporting to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of urban population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing (Reference SDG 11.1.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference SDG Target: By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums (SDG 11.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG Indicator: Proportion of population that has convenient access to public transport, by sex, age and persons with disabilities (SDG 11.2.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refers to SDG Target: By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons (SDG 11.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG Indicator: Proportion of cities with direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management that operate regularly and democratically (SDG 11.3.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference SDG Target: By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries (SDG 11.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG Indicator: Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected persons attributed to disasters per 100,000 population (SDG 11.5.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG Indicator:</td>
<td>Direct economic loss in relation to global GDP, damage to critical infrastructure and number of disruptions to basic services, attributed to disasters (SDG 11.5.2)</td>
<td>Reported (Y/ N):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference SDG Target:</td>
<td>By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations (SDG 11.5)</td>
<td>Reporting Agency:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG Indicator:</td>
<td>Proportion of urban solid waste regularly collected and with adequate final discharge out of total urban solid waste generated, by cities (SDG 11.6.1)</td>
<td>Reporting to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG Indicator:</td>
<td>Annual mean levels of fine particulate matter (e.g. PM2.5 and PM10) in cities (population weighted) (SDG 11.6.2)</td>
<td>Reported (Y/ N):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference SDG Target:</td>
<td>By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management (SDG 11.6)</td>
<td>Reporting Agency:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG Indicator:</td>
<td>Proportion of population living in cities that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs, by size of city</td>
<td>Reporting to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG Indicator:</td>
<td>Average share of the built-up area of cities that is open space for public use for all, by sex, age and persons with disabilities (SDG 11.7.1)</td>
<td>Reported (Y/ N):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SDG Indicator: Proportion of persons victim of physical or sexual harassment, by sex, age, disability status and place of occurrence, in the previous 12 months (SDG 11.7.2)

Reference SDG Target: By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities (SDG 11.7)

SDG Indicator: Proportion of population living in cities that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs, by size of city (SDG 11.a.1)

Reference SDG Target: Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning (SDG 11.a)

Reference SDG Target: By 2020, substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels (SDG 11.b)
Ensuring children’s voices are incorporated into the planning process in Dumai
Ensuring children’s voices are incorporated into the planning process in Dumai