

**Name: Gabriela Azócar de la Cruz**

**Title: COORDINATION AS A MECHANISM OF RISK OBSERVATION**

## **1 CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND**

To address the complexity of the phenomenon of urban development in a mega-city such as Santiago de Chile, it is necessary to understand it as a complex society. This means to describe society giving account of its various organizations and systems. Such systems can be understood as action spheres characterized by both their autonomy and their interdependence. From this frame of reference, the city is presented as the material space in which these spheres or systems of society are deployed into institutions and processes aimed at the maintenance and reproduction of the needs of people living in the city (schools, work, regulations, politic institutions such as the state). From this it the generation of different goods and services required for life in the city, is characterized by a strong specialization of particular production processes which, at the same time, are closely linked between themselves. Energy production, for example, must be linked to ways and means of transport, market conditions, means of distribution and reception of these services; the service of education must consider the territorial supply and demand of schools, the requirements of the labor market and the socio-economic conditions of the population it is aimed towards. In each of these spaces, the actors make decisions that are interconnected with decisions in other spaces. Then it can be said that, the production of goods and services required for life in the city is developed from chains of decisions interlinked between different specialized spheres in the production of goods and services required to live in the city.

The repercussions that the close interaction between particular spheres has on individuals, is related with their opportunities to participate in the outcomes and benefits that each one of these spheres generates. Following with one of the aforementioned examples, the participation of individuals in the sphere of education affects their chances of participation in the sphere of work, which in turn affects and conditions their participation in the economic sphere. Such phenomenon of close linkage in the possibilities of participation of individuals in the outcomes of organizations, institutions and systems, can be denominated as "constellation of probabilities of inclusion / exclusion."

The urban development of a mega city represents the interrelationship between the accentuated increase of the population that lives in the city and the consequent

expansion of the space where this population lives (Bergoeing, Piguillem 2006). On the other hand, to talk of a megacity is to talk of the increase in the demand and complexity of the processes of production of goods and services required for the development of life in the city. This means that the urban development of megacities is a phenomenon that requires to be described and analyzed from various dimensions, giving account of how the chain of decisions associated with the production of a social benefit, is interrelated with other functional spheres (Büscher 2009). Then this is about analyzing and comprehending how each decision about the production of a good or service determines the conditions and possibilities of access to its benefits.

The urban development in a megacity aspires to the inclusion of individuals in the benefits of different goods and services that are generated for the reproduction of urban life. The inclusion can therefore be seen as the guiding axis of the various decisions that constitute such production processes. In other words it is an expected consequence of the decisions related to urban development processes. The exclusion for its part represents an unexpected consequence of this kind of decisions. This can be understood as damage, as long as it is a result that negatively affects the conditions and quality of life of individuals.

The probability of damage can be projected when it is part of the knowledge on which a decision is made (Luhmann 1998). This projection has to be understood as risk, and it is a factor inherent to every process of decisions making based on knowledge. When the probability of damage cannot be projected we are talking of danger. This happens when, in the process of decision-making, actors that can contribute with important knowledge about the problem being addressed do not participate. Danger therefore is an external factor, which by not being able to be seen as such, cannot be incorporated as a consequence. An example of this is given in decisions on social housing construction during the 80s. On those, the probability of excluding a significant proportion of the population that aspired to this benefit if their construction and location was made on expensive land was considered as a risk. This explains the use of lower cost land located on the outskirts of the city for the construction of social housing (Galetovic, Jordan 2006). The negative consequences of the socio-spatial segregation that this generated (deficit of urban equipment, difficult access to basic public services, distance, and transportation difficulties with workplace) were dangers of exclusion not observed when making decisions in the design of such public housing policies. To incorporate the danger of those affected in the decision making process means to

convert it into risk, which means being able to project the probability of their occurrence, trying from this to minimize it.

## **2 RESEARCH CONTEXT**

The general context of this research should be placed in the frame of design and implementation of public policies about urban development, and in particular in the design and implementation of public housing policies and the metropolitan regulating master plan of Santiago. Such public policies are conceived as the result of a chain of decisions aimed at resolving problems associated with the population growth of the city of Santiago. Along with this, such policies aspire to respond to the increase of needs, expectations and demands around goods and services required for the development of life in the city. One of the main assumptions from which this research starts says that the ultimate goal of every decision-making process on urban policies is to enhance the probabilities of inclusion of individuals in the outcomes of different spheres involved in the development of life in the city. In an inverse sense this goal can be understood as minimizing the probability of exclusion of people living in urban spaces.

In the frame of this investigation, the state appears as the actor responsible for materializing the processes associated with the design and implementation of the aforementioned public policies on urban development. It is assumed in the analysis, that the strategies used by the state for the development of this function, are associated with ways of conceiving social order and thus represent normative orientations on the model of society to which they aspire. These models can be of two types: centralized-hierarchical or decentralized, oriented to coordination.

Then, there can be distinguished two main strategies of decision making that have characterized the acting of the state in relation to the design and implementation of public policies on urban development. Centralization appears as the first one and consists in placing the state as the main responsible for the decision making process and its implementation. It is a vertical style of action, whereby the state is located in a hierarchical position in relation to other systems. From this position, the estate incorporates the information that it considers as necessary to design public policies to solve problems and requirements relating to the development of the city. A second strategy is denominated coordination. This consists in placing the state in a horizontal position in relation to other institutions and actors involved in the design and implementation of public policies. From this position the state function is established as

the decentralized linkage of knowledge, positions and perspectives that come together in the resolution of problems associated with the urban development of the city.

It is assumed that centralization is a strategy that hinders the incorporation of dangers as risks associated with the decision making. From the centralization strategy, the state is acting as the authority responsible for the welfare of the population. This implies that the estate limits its ability to interact with the environment and hence the inclusion of information required for the minimization of exclusion probabilities.

Coordination on the other hand, appears as a strategy that promotes interaction with the environment and thus the participation of various actors and institutions co-responsible for the decisions making process concerning the design and implementation of public policies. Therefore, through strategies of coordination, the projection of the probability of exclusion associated with the process of decision making itself is made possible. In other words, coordination acts as a mechanism for the inclusion of risks.

As hypothesis we say that, the processes of design and implementation of public policies regarding urban development of the city of Santiago, have evolved from a noticeably centralist logic to a logic of coordination. Despite this, it is stated that centralism still influences the way the state self-describes itself and acts. This results in a coordination deficit in the recent developing processes of such policies.

What this research pursues is to identify and describe this coordination deficit, analyzing the processes of decisions making of public policy regarding the design and implementation of housing policies and the metropolitan regulatory plan of Santiago during the last 6 decades. From this analysis and as research objectives it is intended to:

To identify those risks of exclusion that were not incorporated as risks in the past history of both the housing policies and the metropolitan regulating plan of Santiago, giving account of the negative consequences resulting from this in terms of exclusion.

To identify the actors and institutions involved, directly and indirectly, in the design and implementation of both the housing policies and the metropolitan regulating plan of Santiago, giving account of their level of participation in such process.

To give account of the types and levels of information incorporated into the design and implementation of both the housing policies and the metropolitan regulating plan of Santiago, giving account of potential voids or deficits.

To give account of forms and strategies for incorporating risk in the process of design and implementation of both the housing policies and the metropolitan regulating plan of Santiago.

### **3 FIRST RESULTS**

#### **3.1 Parameters to define the coordination deficit**

Coordination can be understood as the ability to link the making of decisions, conducting this process in function of collective goals (Luhmann 2004). The idea of linkage refers to the interconnection of interests, objectives and expectations. This both from the different actors involved in the decision making process as well as from the functional systems or areas from which it is possible to observe the process of planning and intervention. In the case of the state, such capacity must be deployed in the process of design and implementation of public policies, hence referring to decisions of political order.

The identification of the factors that determine a coordination deficit in public policies about urban development in Santiago, must begin from the description of the characteristics that define coordination as a strategy of design and implementation for modern public policies. From this it is understood that coordination adapts itself to the characteristics of modern society as it allows to observe it as a differentiated society (Lechner 2007). This implies to understand society both for the diversity of expectations and inclusion mechanisms in its systems as well as for the diversity of normative positions of individuals who transit through such systems. A coordination strategy in the design of public policies should meet the following requirements:

*Coordination as linkage:* The state appears as responsible for supervising the processes of negotiation and competition among different actors in function of the establishment of goals to be recognized and accepted as common. This way the state acts as a mediator between contradictory perspectives, moderating conflicts and making the different perspectives involved in the design of public policies visible (Jobert 2004). In the linkage of these perspectives, the levels and forms of knowledge about

the problems to be solved are broadened. This process allows the transformation of dangers of exclusion into risks able to be projected and thus minimized.

*Coordination as a non centralized strategy:* The state is in a horizontal position in relation to other non-state actors and organizations involved in the decision making processes that give shape to public policies. The responsibility of the state ceases to be situated in the decision making. In the frame of coordination the state acts as a guarantor and supervisor of the conditions required for the participation of different actors and organizations in the process of design and implementation of public policies (Jobert 2004, Messner 1999). Each of these actors and organizations represents particular interests, areas and levels of information that come together in the analysis of a common problem that needs to be solved. All these perspectives are considered as equal regarding their relevance. The incorporation of various sources of knowledge allows to identify different types of risks that, by being incorporated into the decision-making, encourage the minimization of exclusion probabilities.

*Coordination as a projection of the future:* The state, acting under the strategy of coordination, should guide the decision-making towards the future. This means that it has to plan the processes of implementation of public policies considering that it is not possible to control their results. Coordination strategies should then be characterized by projecting flexible interventions, able to adapt themselves to different scenarios and able to be evaluated on a permanent basis. The unpredictability of the success or failure of a public policy has to be considered. The planning of the intervention should therefore consider the various risks associated with each stage of implementation and consider that these may risks change, increase or disappear during this process. The future orientation of the coordination is given by its aspiration to reduce negative consequences after consensual decision-making (Scharpf 1994).

### **3.2 Policies of urban development and coordination deficit**

The revision of the housing policies and of the metropolitan regulating plan of Santiago (MRPS), shows that over the past 20 years there has been a tendency to work in a progressive manner under the logic of coordination in the design and implementation of such public policies. Nevertheless, centralist logics in the process of decision making persist. This would be a determining factor in the coordination deficit that characterizes the current models of design of such tools.

The greatest progress in terms of increased coordination is observed in relation to the linking capacity the state has deployed in the implementation of these urban policies. It is observed therefore that the diagnoses from which the decision-making process starts, incorporate different sources, areas and levels of information that previously were not considered as relevant. Thus we can see that the proposals for updating the MRPS were made for the first time in consultation with various non-state actors (SERVIU 2008). The analysis of the needs of expansion of urban territory was made considering the perspective of experts on urban development, which was complemented with the vision and analysis of interstate actors. On the other hand it can be noticed the significance acquired by topics such as the environmental impact of decisions about expansion of urban areas, the need to expand the availability of green areas, the access roads to sub-centers and the negative consequences of socio-spatial segregation.

The first version of the MRPS was focused on the needs of expanding the urban perimeter, basing its analysis on patterns and projections of population growth. Decisions were adopted in function of the value of the land possible to be urbanized for social housing construction and the connectivity of such areas with the city center. Therefore there weren't considered factors such as the provision of public and commercial services, urban infrastructure, nor the expectations of the population that would accede to this social housing in relation to the place they preferred to live in (Galetovic, Jordan 2006). Such variables can be considered as dangers as they were not included as sources of information to support decision making. Subsequent amendments of the MRPS, especially those made during the 80, persisted in this particularistic logic of analysis, thus enhancing socio-spatial segregation of the city. The negative consequences of this phenomenon are related to fewer opportunities for access to quality social benefits in areas such as education, work and recreation as well as to social discrimination and problems associated with crime, drug consumption and traffic (Sabatini 2003). From the 90's decade, such negative consequences resulting from decisions of urban policies adopted earlier began to form part of the dimensions to consider when projecting new housing policies and changes in the MRPS. It is recognized then the need to incorporate and link different analytical perspectives on urban development. As a consequence, the vision has been widened beyond the background of population growth to an integral analysis of what determines the quality of life of people living in the city.

Despite the progress achieved in terms of linkage, the persistence of a centralist logic in the decision making is observed. The state continues to act as responsible for the design of public policies on urban development. The new actors convened to take part in this process appear in a state-assistant quality. Their participation is therefore limited to the delivery of information and expertise. The state is to decide which information it considers relevant and which measures should be taken to solve the problems of the city. This implies a level difference in the position that the consulted actors and the state occupy. This speaks of a coordination deficit given by the centralized and hierarchical structure in which the actors involved in the design process of public policies are organized. Also there is a greater deficit in relation to the participation of the population that is directly affected by housing policies and by the decisions on the expansion of the urbanization of the city. The perspective of these actors is considered on the basis of information gathered by general statistics such as National Statistics produced by the Statistics National Institute, or by the result of impact evaluations and results from urban policies already implemented (MINVIU 2007). The population participates indirectly in the decision making process, taking a position even lower than the one occupied by the experts in urban development. From the data collected it is interpreted which the needs and demands of the population are, thereby limiting the perspective these actors have on the problems of urban life. This reflects the importance given to the problems of the past as background for the design of policies aiming at changes in the future. There is a tendency to react on the negative consequences of actions already implemented, trying to avoid similar mistakes in the future, which shows another form of coordination deficit.

The design of public policies on urban development is the planning of a series of actions that pursue to enhance the population's access to the benefits of life in the city. These actions are thus oriented to the future. This orientation, however, is affected by the weight assigned to the problems created by past policies, which influences in the projection of the future to be seen as the intervention of a current state of problems. While it is necessary to incorporate past experiences as knowledge in the current processes of planning for the future, one should consider that the change processes are not linear and that there will always be new factors to consider as part of an intervention. This means that the projection of the future must consider both the contingent factors that in the shape of dangers will affect the process of implementation of urban policies, as well as the unwanted consequences that come from the intervention process itself. The orientation towards the future which is suggested as part of a coordination strategy, indicates that it is needed to evaluate the results



generated by the implementation of public policies in stages. This means to incorporate new sources and levels of information that arise in this process and to rethink the intervention strategies appropriate to the new scenarios. Both in the housing policies as well as in the MPRS it is seen that past mistakes outweigh potential errors that could be made in the future. This causes changes in the orientations of housing policies to be frequent and that they are generally a reaction to the aspects that appear badly evaluated, thus not achieving to project the risks associated with the changes incorporated into the always new housing policies. In the other hand the modifications to the MRPS are made taking projections of population growth in relatively long periods of time as the main background (the last amendments made to the PRMS are based on population projections for the year 2020) without establishing intermediate stages of reviewing and evaluation of results. It wasn't considered, for example, the accelerated process of socio-spatial segregation that was developed in less than a decade during the 80s, whose negative consequences were only considered as such once this pattern of socio-spatial differentiation was irreversible. It is still believed that the future projected from the diagnostics will be the same future obtained as a result of the intervention.

#### **4 METHODOLOGY**

A first stage of work consists in the definition of the conceptual framework that will act as a tool for analysis and interpretation of subsequent stages. This includes the theoretical delimitation of concepts such as coordination, inclusion / exclusion, socio-spatial differentiation, functional differentiation and the distinction of risk / danger.

A second stage of work considers the analysis of the instruments that constitute the urban regulation and housing policies implemented in the city of Santiago during the twentieth century, as well as official statistics, evaluation and diagnostic studies that show how there the problems associated with the socio-spatial differentiation of the city have been addressed.

Thirdly, as a way of complementing the information analyzed in the second stage, qualitative interviews of several key stakeholders will be made, considering those who have participated in the design and implementation of urban development policies as well as those which have not been considered directly in these kinds of processes. That is, in-depth qualitative interviews, which will be designed based on a semi-

structured schedule of questions. The analysis of these interviews will be made using the strategy of qualitative content analysis.

## **Bibliography**

Bergoeing Raphael, Piguillem F. 2005. "Patrones de Desarrollo Urbano: ¿Es Santiago Anómalo?" In: [http://www.webmanager.cl/prontus\\_cea/cea\\_2005/site/asocfile/ASOCFIL\\_E120050609154306.pdf](http://www.webmanager.cl/prontus_cea/cea_2005/site/asocfile/ASOCFIL_E120050609154306.pdf) (Junio 2009)

Büscher, Christian. 2009. "Risk Research and Megacities. Research approaches concerning Risk and Danger in the project Risk Habitat Megacity". ITAS: discussion paper - first draft

Galetovic Alexander, Jordán P. 2006. "Santiago: ¿Dónde estamos?, ¿Hacia dónde vamos?" Revista Estudios Públicos CEP: N° 101. 2006. pp 87-146.

Jobert, Bruno. 2004. "Estado, sociedad y políticas públicas" Santiago: LOM.

Lechner Norbert. 2007. "Tres formas de coordinación social" En Lechner, N. "Obras escogidas". Santiago: LOM.

Luhmann, Niklas, 1998 "Sociología del riesgo" México: Universidad Iberoamericana, Triana.  
2004 "La política como sistema" México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Messner, Dirk. 1999. "La transformación del estado y la política en el proceso de modernización" Revista Nueva Sociedad 163. Septiembre / Octubre 1999. pp 71-91.

MINVU. 2004. "Un siglo de políticas en vivienda y barrio" Santiago: Peguen.

Sabatini, Francisco. 2003. "La segregación social del espacio en las ciudades de América Latina" Serie Azul 35, Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo. En [http://www5.iadb.org/sds/SOC/publication/publication\\_630\\_4338\\_s.htm](http://www5.iadb.org/sds/SOC/publication/publication_630_4338_s.htm) (Junio 2009)

SERVIU Región Metropolitana. 2008. "Actualización Plan Regulador Metropolitano de Santiago" Memoria explicativa. In [http://www.minvu.cl/opensite\\_20080421111026.aspx](http://www.minvu.cl/opensite_20080421111026.aspx) (Febrero 2009).

Scharpf, Fritz y Matthias Mohr. 1994. "Efficient Self-Coordination in Policy Networks. A Simulation Study" Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung. Discussion Paper 94/1. Abril 1994. In [http://www.mpi-fg-koeln.mpg.de/pu/mpifg\\_dp/dp94-1.pdf](http://www.mpi-fg-koeln.mpg.de/pu/mpifg_dp/dp94-1.pdf) (Febrero 2009)