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1. Introduction

1.1. Welcome from the President
by Andrés Rodríguez-Pose

Two years have flown past and it is now time to pass on the baton to a new RSAI president. From January 1, 2017, Professor Jacques Poot, of the University of Waikato in New Zealand, will steer the RSAI affairs and I will continue to serve as past-president, but, more importantly, to play an active role as an ordinary member of the regional science community.

Two years are too short a period to radically change an organisation. One first has to learn how it works, understand the intricacies inherent to it, and help build the necessary alliances to make change happen. It was, in any case, never my intention to radically change the RSAI. If the RSAI has been around for more than six decades, it is because it has great strengths. Most of all, the power of the RSAI is based on its capacity to bring together a large community of top researchers from a variety of disciplinary fields. Regional scientists who are willing to give their time and effort to improving our understanding of how economic, social, and political phenomena evolve in space and affect the life and well-being of individuals across the world. By freely volunteering their time to get together, network, and prepare new initiatives, they continually contribute to create a widespread sense of community, gathering scholars from different fields and national origins and allowing the Association to constantly and successfully renew itself over time. Another great RSAI strength is what some would consider a weakness. The RSAI is an organisation of organisations, bringing together numerous subnational, national, and linguistic associations, grouped into super-regions, under the umbrella of regional science. This non-hierarchical, collaborative framework may lead to some confusion and the occasional spat, but is also at the heart of nurturing a worldwide community that extends beyond national and continental boundaries, giving rise to a buzzing web of relationships and connections.

The presence of great strengths did, however, not mean that there were no issues that had to be dealt with. In these two years, garnering the support of the RSAI Council, the super-regions, and the sections has allowed for change to take place within the organisation. Several areas have been at the centre of the action. First, there was for some time a consensus growing around the idea that the RSAI needed to become more proactive in supporting the development of regional science across the world. This has been one of the main thrusts of my mandate, which has included the creation of three new initiatives: ‘Nurturing new talent’, ‘Building bridges’, and ‘Thinking big’. The aim of these initiatives is, respectively, to facilitate the training of young researchers in international workshops, to encourage the participation of researchers from less developed countries in regional science conferences, and to facilitate the bidding for ambitious research projects by young scholars. ‘Nurturing new talent’ and ‘Building bridges’ have already been in place for two years and proved a success. ‘Thinking big’ has been launched this year. The calls are out and I would encourage you to take a look and apply, if applicable.

Another area where progress has been made is in the relationship with the super-regions. The relationship between the RSAI and the super-regions that make regional science – ERSA, NARSC, and PRSCO – was in the past not always as smooth as it should have been. Hence, much of my informal and formal efforts over the last two years have been devoted to building bridges with the super-regions. One important step in this direction has been the approval by the RSAI Council of the by-law that ensures that the presidents, or equivalent, of the super-regions will always have a voice and a vote at the RSAI table. Similarly, the RSAI will be represented at the super-region’s council meetings, guaranteeing that the channels of communication remain always open and strong.

Moreover, the expansion of the regional science community has continued apace. In particular, the creation of a new Latin American and Caribbean super-region is a clear evidence of how far regional science has come in this part of the world over the last decade. The emergence of a multitude of dynamic and able groups of researchers across Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as the numerous annual meetings held by the regional science sections in the region are living proof that research in regional science keeps on expanding in parts of the world where before it was conducted in relative isolation and without the support of international networks. Talks are also taking place in
other areas of the world in order to warrant that the regional
science community keeps on growing. Testimony of this is the
revamping in 2017 of the Indian Regional Science Association,
with the prospect of new and exciting RSAI endorsed activities
that will take place in India in the near future.
There is, however, considerable work still to be done. The
regional science community is as large and diverse as it has ever
been. Since becoming a member of the Association, I have seen
its conferences grow in numbers and diversity. There are certainly
more young people and women at the conferences than once
upon a time. The ethnic diversity is also becoming greater.
Nevertheless, there is no room for complacency. The number of
women, young, and/or ethnically diverse scholars is still limited.
There also seems to be a glass ceiling in the representation of
these groups in the governing bodies of regional science, in
general, and RSAI, in particular. There is a strong need to
increase the awareness about this sort of discrimination (see the
relevant piece in this newsletter) and to do something about it.
And the effort to raise the profile and representation of these
groups should not come from the groups themselves but, as
stated recently by women regional scientists, from the dominant
group – that is, white, middle-aged, academic men. It is this
dominant group that needs to raise awareness of these problems
and champion change in order to make sure that the regional
science community remains a vibrant and dynamic house for all.
These two years have been fantastic and much more rewarding
than I originally envisaged. Actively engaging with regional
scientists in meetings and conferences across the world has
been highly gratifying and inspirational. My respect for all of those
who volunteer work and devote considerable amount of their time
to regional science has nothing but grown. It would be impossible
to mention everyone who has inspired me during my time as
president, as I am certain to forget numerous people. But I cannot
but underscore the enormous support received by our executive
director, Tomaz Dentinho, and by Elisabete Martins at the RSAI
office. They are the ones who really make the Association tick, by
spending endless hours finding solutions to problems and dealing
with website, publishing, finance, and all other issues that emerge
on a daily basis. I hope to have been a good successor to the
work conducted previously by Jean-Claude Thill and my other
predecessors. I leave more humble, wiser, and in awe of much of
the work I have witnessed and with the certainty that, under the
forthcoming steering of Jacques Poot, the RSAI will be in great
hands.
Andrés Rodríguez-Pose, President RSAI (A.Rodriguez-
Pose@lse.ac.uk)

1.2. Welcome to the 2016 NARSC
Congress

Neil Reid, University of Toledo
Executive Director NARSC

John Leatherman, Kansas State University
NARSC 2016 Local Organizer
Executive Director MCRSA

Haifeng Qian, University of Iowa
NASRC 2016 Program Chair

Katherine Nesse, Seattle Pacific University
NARSC 2016 Local Organizer

On behalf of the North American Regional Science Council and
the Mid-Continent Regional Science Association it gives us great
pleasure to welcome you to Minneapolis, Minnesota for the 63rd
Annual North American Meetings of the Regional Science
Association International. With more than 650 regional scientists
from across the world in attendance these meetings provide an
excellent opportunity to learn about cutting edge research being
undertaken by your colleagues. The meetings are also about
networking and so we hope that you enjoy not only catching up
with old friends but also making new professional acquaintances.
Hopefully, these conversations during a coffee break, over a drink
at the bar, or over dinner will stimulate new ideas for professional
collaborations.
While here please take the opportunity to explore the city of
Minneapolis. The city is, of course, home to the Mall of America,
one of the world’s largest shopping malls. It is only 15 minutes
down town from downtown Minneapolis and with 520 stores, 50 restaurants,
an indoor theme park it is great place to do some holiday
shopping. If shopping is not one of your favorite activities there
are plenty of other things to do and places to visit including The
Walker Museum of Art (one of America’s largest modern art
museums), The Guthrie Theater (the area’s largest theater
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company), and The Minnesota Orchestra. The city also has a vibrant dining and bar scene with something for every taste and budget. Please visit www.minneapolis.org for a comprehensive list of things to do in Minneapolis. Most of the city’s attractions are easily accessible by Metro Transit, which provides both Light Rail Transit and public bus service within the Minneapolis metropolitan area.

In addition to the above attractions NARSC invites you to tour Minneapolis by Bike. The tour will start at 3:00pm on Saturday, November 12. The 1.5 hour “City Loop” tour will cover the downtown area and will focus on the development of the city, industry and recent changes. The tour cost is $39.50 (includes bicycle with helmet with speakers). To register please go to the NARSC website and click on the News and Announcement icon to access the tour registration link.

Please enjoy the conference and your visit to Minneapolis. We look forward to seeing you.

1.3. Welcome from the Editors
by Andrea Caragliu (andrea.caragliu@polimi.it) and Graham Clarke (G.P.Clarke@leeds.ac.uk)

Dear all,

We are happy to host so many interesting contributions in this issue of the Newsletter. RSAI activities thrive as usual, and while this Newsletter will reach you in Minneapolis, MN for the 63rd NARSC Congress, we hope you will find some time to read it. The major topic we cover in this Newsletter is a debate on current issues in land rent policy. Martim Smolka (Lincoln Institute), Paul Cheshire (London School of Economics) and Roberto Camagni (Politecnico di Milano) guide us through the intricacies associated with land rent policy. They deal with how this peculiar (and important topic for regional scientists) type of rent emerges, how and why new construction should be regulated (or not), and how the profits of the rentier can be taxed so that the value generated in transforming the environment truly becomes public.

We then fly to Paris to meet the research group dealing with proximity at University Paris Saclay, Agroparistech. André Torre tells us all about how the group was formed early in the 1990s and the way their contribution to proximity economics provided an interesting niche for them to study.

Further, we have the honour to have Jacques Poot describe his career achievements in the usual ‘Meet the Fellows’ column. Jacques is President Elect of the RSAI and we believe this is a nice introduction to him for the few of you who do not know him personally.

Lastly, this issue hosts two interesting letters to the editors. In the first, eminent women regional scientists discuss the extent of the gender bias in our discipline while proposing some possible solutions; in the second, Vijay Pandey tells us about the perspectives of Regional Science in India.

We both wish you all a good read, and fruitful sessions in Minneapolis and elsewhere this year.

2. News from the RSAI Council

2.1 Major events
Report on the Ph.D workshop in Regional Science – “Nurturing new talent”
by Daniela Constantin, Director of PROMAR (daniela.constantin@maa.ase.ro)

On May 19-20, 2016 the PhD Workshop in Regional Science entitled “Nurturing New Talent” took place at the Bucharest University of Economic Studies (BUES), Romania. It was supported by the Regional Science Association International and organised by the Romanian Regional Science Association (RRSA) in collaboration with the Faculty of Administration and Public Management (FAPM) of BUES.

The workshop started with the Opening Ceremony in the Aula Magna of the BUES. After the “Gaudeamus Igitur” hymn,
speeches were delivered by the local organisers – Prof.Dr. Nicolae Istudor, Rector of the Bucharest University of Economic Studies (represented by Prof. Dr. Dorel Mihai Paraschiv – Vice-Rector) and Prof.Dr. Elvira Nica, Dean of the Faculty of Administration and Public Management, by Prof.Dr. Daniela L. Constantin, President of the Romanian Regional Science Association as well as by Prof.Dr. Andrés Rodriguez-Pose, President of the Regional Science Association International.

Two Plenary Sessions hosted four outstanding keynote speeches delivered by Prof.Dr. Andrés Rodriguez-Pose, London School of Economics, RSAI President, Prof.Dr. Tomaz Dentinho, University of Azores, RSAI Executive Director and Mrs. Aura Raducu, Former Romanian Minister of European Funds – on May 19 and by Prof.Dr. André Torre – INRA and University Paris-Saclay, ERSA Vice-President and member of the RSAI Council – on May 20.

16 PhD students from Bucharest as well as from other Romanian cities with important academic and research communities (e.g. Timisoara, Iasi, Suceava) presented the preliminary results from their ongoing PhD research in five paper presentation sessions, offering a relevant image of the productive explorations in regional science undertaken by the Romanian young scientists. The keynote speakers as well as Romanian professors acting as PhD advisors, together with scientific researchers – most of them also RRSA members - from Bucharest, Timisoara, Cluj-Napoca, Pitesti and other cities and FAMP professors served as excellent chairs and audience members, stimulating effervescent debates and offering valuable suggestions to the PhD students.

At the Closing Ceremony each PhD student received a certificate of participation signed by the Rector of the Bucharest University of Economic Studies, the RSAI President and the RRSA President. Also, all PhD students have been urged to apply for RRSA and RSAI membership and have been advised to submit their papers to the Romanian Journal of Regional Science and other regional science-related journals and to participate in the future regional science meetings organised in Romania and abroad.

To conclude, the workshop has been a complete success, the participation of all key actors being gratefully acknowledged. Special thanks go to the RSAI and the local organisers for their invaluable support!

Professor Manfred Fischer awarded the RSAI Founder’s Medal

The highest accolade of the RSAI, the Founder’s Medal, was awarded to Prof Manfred Fischer, of the Vienna University of Economics and Business at the ERSA Congress in Vienna in August 2016. The medal is awarded every four years to scholars who have made significant lifelong contributions to regional science. The committee, presided by Dr Emmanouil Tranos, recognised Professors Fischer’s capacity to push the scientific boundaries in the fields of mathematical and statistical modelling, methods and techniques in regional science, spatial econometrics and spatial analysis.

Professor Manfred Fischer joins a long list of awardees going back to 1978 that includes the likes of Walter Isard, Martin Beckmann, William Alonso, Jean Paelinck, David Boyce, Peter Nijkamp, Antoine Bailly, and Arthur Getis.
2.2 ANZRSAl network linking with other "southern cone" sections
by Robyn Eversole, University of Tasmania, Australia
(robyn.eversole@utas.edu.au)
The Sustainable Regions Applied Research Network (SRARN) is a new international research network dedicated to addressing practical development challenges in rural regions. In its first phase, SRARN will connect researchers and research groups in Australia, Chile, and Argentina around sustainable regional development issues of common interest. These researchers already work closely with stakeholders in their own regions; the new network aims to stimulate international collaboration and knowledge partnering to grow the impact of their work. SRARN is supported by the Australian Government through the Council on Australia Latin America Relations (COALAR) of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade; RSAI is a project partner. Those interested in further information about the Network, including how to join and upcoming events, should contact Robyn Eversole, President of the Australia and New Zealand Regional Science Association (ANZRSAl) and SRARN Coordinator (robyn.eversole@utas.edu.au).

3. Current issues in land rent policy

3.1 Value Capture: The Latin American Toolbox
by Martim O. Smolka, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Cambridge MA (msmolka@lincolninst.edu)
Conventional fiscal policies largely neglect the fact that the costs of providing urban infrastructure and services are public, but their benefits are private. The notion of value capture is to mobilize, for the benefit of the community at large, some or all of the windfall income that landowners gain from public investments and by changes in administrative norms and regulations that raise the value of their properties. Although precedents can be found as early as the 16th century, and there have been isolated or unsystematic experiences in many jurisdictions since then, discussions about the need for urban policies that would provide for value capture began in some countries in the 1970s. But it was only in the late 1990s that a significant number of nations enacted this type of legislation. Colombia took the lead with passage of Law 388 in 1997, soon followed by Brazil with its Statute of the Cities legislation in 2001. Since then, Uruguay approved value capture provisions in 2008 and Ecuador in 2010. Peru is now in the process of sending its law (SEDATU) to the congress, while Guatemala and Chile are currently conducting high-level national debates on how the legislation should be formulated.

Windfalls to Landowners from Urbanization
The need for capturing the value generated by urban land transformations stems from the fact that landowners in Latin America often reap huge increases in unearned income from a variety of public projects or the easing of zoning and other restrictions. A few examples in this sense:
• Consistently in the region as a whole, conversion of rural land to urban use typically raises parcel prices by more than 400 percent (Bouillon 2012).
• In São Paulo's high-end areas, the value that developers are willing to pay for the right to build at a floor area ratio (FAR) of two or three (rather than the basic FAR of one) is well over US$500 per square meter (Sandroni 2011).
• In Rio de Janeiro, the markup for developing new land at the low-income urban periphery is huge, with fully serviced land selling for US$145 per square meter compared with an investment of just $10–35 per square meter (Vetter et al. 2011).
• Even the expectation of new public investments can boost prices. In Cali, Colombia, announcement of a future low-income housing project lifted the per-square-meter price of land in the area by a factor of eight within a year and a half (Bonilla and Loaiza 2006).

Land-Based Financing Tools
Value capture turns land into a major potential revenue source for municipalities, improving their ability to meet public expenditures as well as manage urban growth and promote greater social integration. Depending on the legal frameworks within which they operate, local governments have an opportunity to tap this
fundamental resource using a variety of land-based financing tools (LBFTs).

**Betterment contributions:** These charges or fees are imposed on property owners to defray the cost of a public improvement or service from which they specifically benefit. In the United States, these charges are known as special assessments. Use of betterment contributions came back into common use in Latin America, with over $1.7 billion collected in the eight largest cities in 2007–2012. Bogotá alone supported a public works program from contributions worth about $1 billion (Borrero, Durán, Hernández, and Montaña 2011). In Medellin, betterment levies are paying for more than half of the road grid (García Bolivar 2012).

**Charges for building rights:** Building rights charges recover the land value increment resulting from development rights over and above an established baseline. Over time, the charges have evolved from the more ad hoc manner of exactions into one where the fees are calculated according to predefined criteria and apply to all properties in the city or in a well-defined zone based on the master plan. The instrument that regulates charges for additional building rights in Brazil (Outorga Onerosa do Direito de Construir, OODC) is based on the notion that the landowner’s right is limited to a basic floor area ratio and imposes a charge for the right to develop land at higher densities. It also applies to other types of changes yielding more profitable land use options, such as conversions from rural to urban uses or the rezoning of areas for renovation or commercial uses. In 2013, São Paulo distributed about US$130 million in OODC payments to finance projects that included bus terminals, transportation corridors, parks and green areas, slum regularization, historical preservation, and drainage.

**Auctioning Additional Building Rights**

Brazil’s Certificates of Additional Potential Construction Bonds (CEPACs) provide an ingenious solution for valuing additional building rights by basing the charges on the amount that developers are willing to pay in a competitive market. CEPACs are issued by the municipality, regulated by the Comissão de Valores Mobiliários (the equivalent of the Securities and Exchange Commission), and auctioned on the São Paulo Stock Exchange. The bonds are used in large-scale Urban Operations (UO) in rezoned areas that require improved infrastructure, with revenues resulting from the sales of building rights reverting to the UO area. In only two UOs (Faria Lima and Agua Espraiada), the CEPAC auction raised in excess of US$2.5 billion. These revenues were used to defray the costs of transit improvements as well as redevelopment of the Jardim Edith slum and construction of an iconic bridge that cost over $100 million.

**Exactions:** Exactions are cash or in-kind contributions and other types of charges for extraordinary building rights, with compensation negotiated directly with municipal authorities. Under the Law on Fair Access to Habitat enacted in 2012 in the Province of Buenos Aires, Argentina, the municipality of Trenque Lauquen amassed about 100 hectares of land to urbanize. In combination with the funds collected from 10 percent of the land value increment generated by urban development of more than 5,000 square meters, these exactions are enabling the municipality to address the majority of its annual affordable housing needs.

**Land banking and Land leasing:** Under land banking, the municipality acquires and holds large tracts of land in order to control their use and prevent speculation. Upon sale or lease of banked land, the municipality captures the land value increment resulting from public investments or market forces. In the 1980s and 1990s, the administration of Aguascalientes, Mexico, acquired land through expropriation and other negotiations to
provide an alternative to informal settlements while also imposing sanctions on pirate subdivisions (Jiménez Huerta 2013).

**Land readjustment:** This scheme requires contributions of land by local owners to an entity that then uses (sells) the contributions to finance the cost of infrastructure and services. These investments, in turn, increase the value of all properties in the area. Participants in land readjustment initiatives assume the risk that the increase in land values from urbanization will more than compensate for the reduction in their individual holdings. The Simesa project in Medellin, an area of about 30 hectares, was originally owned by a steel mill and other smaller factories. Using land readjustment, the area was transformed into a fully self-funded residential complex on 13 plots, with 37 percent of the land set aside for parks, green zones, and streets.

**Property taxation:** Any tax on land value is a form of value capture insofar as much of that value results from accumulated public actions and investments. It follows that the property tax captures some value increase since it applies to both buildings and land. To pay for a new 40-kilometer subway line in Buenos Aires that would double the existing capacity, Law 23.514 of 1987 created a special fund financed with a 5 percent increase in property taxes for all city residents, plus another 2.4 percent surcharge for residents living within 400 meters of the stations (Cuenya et al. 2003).

**Transfers of development rights:** Transfers of development rights (TDRs) are in-kind compensation by the municipality to owners for constraints on building rights (e.g., historic preservation or environmental conservation), or when owners surrender some of their land for a public project such as widening a road, creating a park, or rehabilitating a slum. These rights can be sold to third parties or used directly in developments in predefined areas. The city of Porto Alegre, Brazil, used such rights to compensate owners releasing part or all of their property to make room for a new avenue crossing the city.

References


3.2 Land markets: market failure, policy failure – which dominates, where?

by Paul Cheshire, London School of Economics (P.Cheshire@lse.ac.uk)

There are good reasons for regulating land markets. They suffer from endemic problems of ‘market failure’ in the classic sense used by economists. Occasionally there is monopoly, for example, in the process of site assembly especially for transport infrastructure. That is why we have ‘compulsory purchase’ or ‘eminent domain’. As elementary urban economics teaches us the value of any parcel of land depends on the uses of all near-by parcels: and often such uses generate externalities (impacts not reflected in prices paid by the owner who generates the effect). Above all in land use there are critical issues of public goods: goods from which no revenues can be derived. The most obvious would be parks, wilderness areas, habitats or historic buildings but perhaps the most important is to supply land for public, especially transport, infrastructure: not just for the now but for the foreseeable future to allow cities to grow. In
In rich countries we need to safeguard land for highways and high capacity public transit and for their expansion to accommodate growth. This issue is even more significant in developing countries. The failure to safeguard land for public use—often coupled with growth constraints in the central municipalities—is a major cause of informal development; once established this makes organising efficient urban expansion problematic.

The common form of land use regulation is ‘planning’ or ‘zoning’. There is, however, a chasm between regulation or planning to get land markets to deliver something closer to the social optimum and the restriction of the supply of space. Policy may increase the public good by preventing development in environmentally valuable areas or preserving scenic landscapes; certainly by stopping building on urban parks. But as has been shown with increasing persuasiveness over the last 20 years, policy in many countries—the UK, USA, Canada or New Zealand to name just a few—has gone far beyond that. It has rationed or constrained the supply of space for little or no social or environmental gain but at great cost.

The crisis of housing affordability in Britain, for example, with its epicentre in London, is largely the result of restricting the supply of space for now 60 years—since Greenbelts were established around most large cities with the sole purpose of preventing development (Cheshire et al., 2014). They sound environmentally cuddly—they are green after all. But they have no environmental rationale and almost certainly increase average commuting distances; most Greenbelt land is privately owned and the biggest single use is environmentally damaging intensive arable. More restrictive local planning also increases average commutes. We (Cheshire et al., 2016) recently found a one Std. Dev. increase in local restrictiveness increased the length of commute by 8.5%. Hilber and Vermeulen (2016) found that if, since 1979, the most restrictive local jurisdiction had been as flexible as the least restrictive, house prices in it would have been 35% lower. It is not just that in Britain we cannot build outwards (£18bn spent on Crossrail but no additional houses near any of those greenbelted, Home Counties communities suddenly transported to within an easy commute of the highest paying jobs in Europe); it is almost impossible to build up either. Some London Boroughs, like Islington, have blanket bans on any building over 7 stories almost anywhere; 75% of the surface of Westminster is a Conservation Area (as is much of other inner London Boroughs) and one of the eight protected sight lines of St Pauls extend 16kms to Richmond; another to an oak tree on Hampstead heath. No wonder London is such a low rise city. Some people may like it like that but it comes at great cost and the skyline of Manhattan or Hong Kong has its attractions.

The effects of restricting space is cumulative over time because new building is always a small fraction of the stock. It affects the costs of office space—in a 2008 paper Cheshire & Hilber showed that the ‘regulatory tax’ measure—the mark-up of the price of office space compared to its costs of construction—averaged over five years was up to 800% in London’s West End. The effects on housing are most dramatically revealed in how much the price of land increases if building permission can be got. In the northern fringes of London farmland is about £20k per hectare; but if you could build on it then the price would be maybe 750 times higher—£15m per hectare. The increase around Oxford, where houses cost more relative to incomes than anywhere else in England, would not be very much less.

The result is rapidly falling home ownership amongst the young and a substantial redistribution from the young to the old and from poor to rich. The latest English Housing Survey showed a continuing rise in age for first time buyers with the proportion of 25 to 34 year old owner occupiers falling from 59 to 36% over 10 years; and for the first time ever, more owner occupiers did not have mortgages than did. Our policies also generate a serious misallocation of both scarce land and housing. We build houses not where they are most socially valuable—near jobs—but where restrictions allow. Over the past decade more than twice as many houses have been built in Barnsley and Doncaster than in Oxford and Cambridge (Cheshire, 2014). The lack of competition from housing means we have a gross over-supply of golf courses (just within the GLA area there is an area of golf courses that would cover Kensington & Chelsea twice over) and grazing for horses. The problems of the British housing market (or those of New Zealand or the coastal areas of the USA) result from policy failure not market failure. What is needed is for land supply to respond to economic demand (but of course take account of environmental value) and for local communities to be provided with enough incentive from land value uplift for them to welcome development rather than resist it as if life itself were at stake.
3.3 Why a taxation on development rents?

by Roberto Camagni, Politecnico di Milano

Cities are large collective goods created through public and private investment decisions, providing advantages in terms of citizens’ well-being and efficiency of production activities. As a consequence, the economic value of their single parts – places or urban spaces – is not determined by individual action, but by collective action external to the individual actor: as all classical economists maintained, urban land values depend on the “overall development of society”.

Land and property values are the counterpart of real advantages that can be obtained from locating new economic or residential activities within the city: advantages of internal and external accessibility, availability of public goods and services, agglomeration of numerous complementary activities, enhanced by an efficacious and far-sighted urban planning and by the presence of a shared, collective project for the city. As a consequence, the private acquisition of the monetary counterpart of these advantages by land-owners in the form of rents was considered by classical economists – but also by many neoclassical economists at the beginning of last century – as a “non-earned income” that should be adequately taxed. Alfred Marshall, following Smith, went so far as to claim that a 100% taxation on land rents would have certainly produced huge political effects, but in economic terms “the vigour of industry and accumulation need not have been impaired” (Principles, Book VI, ch. 9, Sect. 351) - a sentence recalling georgism, that curiously was dropped by Marshall himself in late editions.

In present days, a taxation of land rent is not generally pursued by governments in its smooth and continuous manifestations but rather when it appears in sudden, one-shot and relevant ways as a consequence of changes in land uses, real estate developments or as a direct effect of new, specific public investments. Value ‘recapture’ and value ‘sharing’ on ‘betterments’ (UK) or ‘windfalls’ (US) are pursued with different intensities in time and space in advanced countries and increasingly in some developing countries like Colombia and India. In fact, the issue is highly politically sensitive, but increasingly felt as central in the contrast of private and public corruption. In some cases, like in Italy, rent on urban transformation was traditionally assured a condition of fiscal paradise by legislation and practice, with the effect of drawing savings and investments out of the manufacturing sector. In Europe, Anglo-Saxon countries are at the forefront in rent taxation: in the UK, according to Allan Evans, taxation on planning gains can nowadays reach 40%, being much higher in previous after-war periods; in Germany, in the most advanced and imitated ‘Munich way’, local taxation is as high as 30% of the total market value of the urban transformation. In France a lower but still relevant share is reached through private-public negotiation, but only on large development operations; this share might be estimated to be 15-18% of total market values (10-12% in Spain and 4-7% in Italy).

In the short term, the distribution between the private and the public spheres of surplus values generated by urban transformation certainly represents a zero-sum game, implying a difficult and tough bargaining process, where public authorities may easily succumb as a consequence of information...
asymmetries, lack of sufficient incentives for public officials, lack of the requisite skills in public administrations in many countries, fuzzy legislation on taxation levels and pervasive non-transparency. But in the long term, the game could turn into a positive-sum one, if the share of recaptured land rents is channeled towards urban infrastructure improvement and enhanced livability services: a virtuous cycle of continuous urban wellbeing, competitiveness and growth may be triggered, turning the game into a win-win one.

A further economic rationale for rent taxation resides in the fact that the private appropriation of surplus values by land-lords happens not just at the expense of public budgets – deeply involved in investments, services and urban maintenance – but also at the expense of private productive classes (on profits) as surpluses can only appear thanks to industrial innovations, general development and increasing citizens demand.

On the juridical side too, many justifications were produced in many countries in favour of a taxation of capital gains and real estate surplus values. The British legal system, established with the Town and Country Planning Act 1947, removed the right to land development from the bundle of ownership rights, stating that the entitlement to development should come from a permission granted by the state or the local authority. In more recent years, development permits are assigned through complex planning agreements implying the possibility for the administration to recover ‘planning gains’ in kind rather than only in cash, through the direct provision of extra benefits for the area by the private party – beyond the necessary physical precondition for the functionality of the estate developments.

In Spain the new Constitution, art. 47, prefers a more direct, transparent and generalized obligation to a case-by-case solution through public-private negotiation: “the community and the local public administration will participate in the surplus values generated by the planning action of public bodies.” Many Latin American Constitutions include a similar principle for equity and income distribution reasons: no citizen should accumulate wealth that does not result from his own effort – “no enriquecimiento sin justa causa”.

In other cases where recapture of surplus values has never been explicitly accepted, a different rationale is given for some form of taxation of real estate development: impact fees imposed on the developer (US) to recover the public costs for the provision of public goods and infrastructure directly linked to the development scheme (“recoupment”) or as a counterpart to the spatial and environmental impacts of the scheme itself – on traffic, on demand for local public services, on depletion of some commons. This justification comes close to a traditional claim of planning, namely the need to provide or reconstruct public goods – natural, semi-natural or built – endangered by physical expansion of settlements: a sustainability justification which adds to an equity justification.

All the previous justifications – of an economic, juridical or ethical nature – hold a superior relevance in times, as the present ones, characterized by difficulties in public finance, collapse of public investments particularly on cities and necessity of relaunching solidarity, sustainability and competitiveness in our cities.
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4. Centres of Regional Science:

Proximity team, University Paris Saclay, Agroparistech, INRA
by André Torre, Agroparistech (torre@agroparistech.fr)

Our history started in 1999, when André Torre came to Paris as an appointed full professor, and integrated the SAD-APT laboratory in Agroparistech (the main French School of engineers in environment and agronomy science) and INRA (the large public body devoted to studies about agriculture, agri-business and rural areas). Previously, he had spent some years at the University of Sophia Antipolis as an assistant professor, working on the creation and the diffusion of technology and high tech innovations at the local level, using input-output techniques and industrial economics methodologies, and then four years in Corsica working on local development. There existed a tradition of research about geography and territory in the Paris team, but André rapidly decided to start multidisciplinary research on Regional Science and to launch a new team devoted to the works on proximity relations as well as cooperative and non-cooperative behaviors at the local level.
Step by step, he was joined by young researchers and PhD students, and the team developed its own methodological framework. Now it has a stabilized but is still a growing configuration (two new women assistant professors are joining it this autumn), involving around 20 tenured researchers and about 15 doc and post-doc and a few associated researchers or professors. They are mainly economists and sociologists, with a few geographers and planners. The team is now led by Romain Melot (assistant Professor in Sociology) and Frederic Wallet (assistant Professor in Economics). It involves well known scholars in the field like Jean-Baptiste Traversac (assistant Professor in Economics), Maryline Filippi (Professor in Economics), Florence Pinton (Professor in Sociology) or Emmanuel Raynaud (Professor in Economics)…

The team hosts the two main French speaking Journals in the field of Regional Science, namely the Revue d’Economie Régionale et Urbaine, also named Journal of Regional and Urban Economics (mostly in Economics), and Géographie, Economie, Société (mainly in multidisciplinary fields), respectively directed by André Torre and Frederic Wallet. It includes 33 collaborative research projects that are spread over almost all of the French regions, under the direction of André Torre (Program Director) and Frederic Wallet (General Manager).

The group is located on two sites in the Greater Paris area, one in the Quartier Latin, in the heart of Paris, and the other in Ivry, south Paris. It became, two years ago, one of the major components of the department of Social Science of the big University of Paris Saclay. It is considered as one of the major contributors to research in regional science, land use assessment and environmental research in France, with a good and increasing international visibility.

The name of the team is directly related to its contribution to the development of the ideas in Regional Science, in terms of Proximity. The definitions of the proximity-based approach are based on a division according to two main dimensions – geographical and organised - which include more refined and detailed categories.

Geographical proximity is above all about distance. In its simplest definition, it is the number of meters or kilometres that separate two entities. But it is relative in three ways: the morphological characteristics of the spaces in which activities take place, the availability of transport infrastructure and the financial resources of the individuals who use these transport infrastructures.

Geographical proximity is neutral in essence. It is the human actions and perceptions that give it a more or less positive or negative dimension, as well as certain usefulness. It is the way in which actors use it that matters. Thus, the fact that two firms are located in proximity to each other may or may not be a source of interaction: these two entities may remain indifferent to each other or they may choose to interact. But this mobilisation can have different results depending on the actions undertaken. For example, it might be the diffusion of scientific or technological knowledge through spillover effects, but it might also lead to firms spying on other firms, or unduly reaping the benefits of an invention. Geographical proximity can be activated or mobilized by the actions of economic and social actors. More precisely, actors might seek to get closer to, or further away from, certain...
people or places, or they might feel satisfied or dissatisfied with the geographical proximity of certain people, places or technical objects. One then talks of sought for and unwanted geographical proximity.

Organized proximity refers to the different ways of being close to other actors, regardless of the degree of geographical proximity between individuals, the qualifier “organized” referring to the arranged nature of human activities. Organized proximity rests on two main logics, which do not necessarily contradict each other; the “logic of belonging” and the “logic of similarity”. The logic of belonging refers to the fact that two or several actors belong to the same relationship graph or even to the same social network whether their relation is direct or intermediated. The logic of similarity corresponds to a mental adherence to common categories; it manifests itself in small cognitive distances between some individuals. They can be people who are connected to one another through common projects, or share the same cultural, religious (etc.) values or symbols. Social norms, common languages partake of this organized proximity.

Temporary geographical proximity (TGP) constitutes one form of geographical proximity that enables actors to temporarily interact face-to-face with one another. The development of communication technologies and ICT facilitates long-distance exchanges; be they for economic reasons between producers, or for day-to-day relations between friends or relatives. Consequently co-location no longer constitutes an absolute necessity. A large part of the information and knowledge that are necessary for production or innovation activities can be transferred from a distance, through the telephone or Internet mediated exchanges for example. However, sometimes face-to-face interactions are necessary and beneficial. TGP corresponds to the possibility of satisfying needs for face-to-face contact between actors, by travelling to different locations. This travelling generates opportunities for moments of geographical proximity, which vary in duration, but which are always limited in time.

The group has also worked in an extensive way on the relations between territorial governance and territorial development processes. The notion of territorial governance is related to the processes of decentralisation and the setting of new forms of public action and involvement in decision making, passing from a hierarchic organisation, founded on the public institutions, to a network type organisation that combines public-private partnerships and involves a highly varied group of players and multiple territorial levels. It corresponds to the participation of local stakeholders with heterogeneous preferences in the territorial development decision process, and refers to concrete objectives in terms of local development, like favouring the setting up of territorial development projects, contributing to the design of wide consultation schemes, facilitating the coordination of heterogeneous groups of players, limiting the spatial exit of people with certain profiles, avoiding sterile confrontations, and deciding about future development pathways. It corresponds to the rupture of the government approach to public affairs by hermetic administrative and political devices, and the upsurge of questions of local democracy in the management procedures of people and organisations.

Our research on the land use and proximity conflicts shows that they are a form of expression of opposition to decisions that leave part of the local population unsatisfied. Some local innovations provoke resistance which can give rise to conflicts. Major changes, which involve reconfiguration of the use of space (introduction of transport or waste treatment infrastructures, new local urbanism plans, territorial or environmental zones) generate conflicts whose spatial and social extent can become very considerable. During the phases of conflict, social and interest groups tend to reconstitute themselves and may even undergo technical or legal changes. Once a conflict ends, it leaves behind new local agreements, new modes of governance, new configurations of discussion forums as well as new technical procedures (changes in direction, various adjustments, changes in urban planning documents, etc.), all arrived at during the negotiations. Harbingers of territorial innovation, conflicts are thus both the result as well as the cause of territorial changes.

Thus, territorial governance is not limited to an idyllic vision of economic and social relations, i.e. to forms of cooperation and common constructions. It is also about interaction between forces promoting cooperation and other forces promoting conflict. The processes of territorial development and their progress are made up of phases of negotiation, collaboration or appeasement, and of
much rougher periods when certain groups or categories of players clash, sometimes violently, in defining the steps to be followed and the options to be adopted. The team is also interested in new forms of activity that structure the rural and peri-urban areas, and their relationship to the city; for example alternative food systems or more broadly, territorial innovation. These ideas have been developed in several projects, like the European TASTE project (Towards A SmarT rural Europe), involving various European teams, where the possibility of a smart development in rural areas has been tested.

The research group has joined the international scientific community, participating in the organization of many activities. The ERSA Conference in Paris, in 2007, on Local Governance and Sustainable Development, the ERSA Workshop ‘Do Rural Regions count?’ in Paris in 2012, or the international Workshop on Proximity and Regional Development in Paris in 2011 are three examples over time. André Torre, Jean Baptiste Traversac, Frederic Wallet and Maryline Filippi have organized various special sessions on Proximity relations, territorial governance, or rural development in different ERSA or RSAI Conferences. André Torre has been Vice-President of ERSA since 2014 and a member of the RSAI board. He was appointed President of the French speaking section from 2008 to 2011.

The scientific strength of the group is also reflected by the various books or special issues. André Torre and Frederic Wallet have recently published two books: one edited book on Proximity relations, involving contributions by major scholars in Regional science like Roberta Capello, Roberto Camagni, Bob Stimson, Peter Nijkamp, Andres Rodriguez Pose, Antoine Bailly, Ron Boschma, Harald Bathelt..., and one textbook on Regional Development in Rural Areas, making a broad assessment on this topic. André Torre and Jean Baptiste Traversac also edited the very first book on Territorial Governance, involving many recognized scholars in the field.

5. Meet the Fellows: Jacques Poot

How does one become a regional scientist? In my case my high school mathematics teacher in Uithoorn, the Netherlands, recommended that I should study something challenging like econometrics. Not having a strong preference for an alternative discipline, I followed his advice and enrolled in September 1972 in the Interfaculty of Econometrics and Actuarial Sciences at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (also referred to as VU University, or Free University Amsterdam). It was a small cohort, as they took in only the 30 best qualified applicants per year. It was called an Interfaculty because students were required to take core courses from the Faculty of Economics and from the Faculty of Science, as well as specialised courses in the Interfaculty itself. Thus, as an undergraduate student I had to struggle with topics like topology, measure theory and abstract algebra. The mathematical models used in undergraduate macroeconomics and microeconomics looked rather simple by comparison.

I started my Masters in Econometrics at VU in January 1975 and had to choose between mathematical economics, econometrics and operations research. A strong interest in public policy led me to mathematical economics, where the work of Nobel Prize winner Jan Tinbergen – who I met when he was visiting VU – still strongly influenced the curriculum. My Masters supervisor Arnold Merkies had previously worked at the Dutch Central Planning Bureau (now called CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis) and offered me a research assistant position in 1976 to update and complete a study he had started at CPB on forecasting the long-run economic growth rate in the Netherlands under assumed scenarios of population growth and post-compulsory education enrolments. This introduced me not only to the economic growth theories at the time (and the inadequacy of the exogenous technological change assumption) but also to population projection methodologies and the use of Markov chains to model transitions. A seminar by Henri Theil, at the University of Chicago at the time, on modelling social mobility further inspired me to go in that direction. The Masters thesis was written in Dutch and sadly not subsequently published, but triggered a job as research assistant of the VU professors of economic growth and macroeconomic policy, Steven Huisman and Bernard Compaen respectively. With them I contributed to a Dutch macroeconomics textbook.

By late 1978 I decided to do a PhD abroad and a pamphlet on
the VU noticeboard advertising a new PhD programme at Victoria University of Wellington (VUW) in New Zealand led me to apply. While at the opposite side of the world, New Zealand was not an odd choice for me as several of my relatives migrated there in the 1950s and I had visited them and hence knew the country. Additionally, my parents decided to retire there in the same year. VUW offered me a job as junior lecturer, which was financially more attractive than a scholarship offer I received in Australia. I also met my wife-to-be soon after arriving in Wellington, so that settled the location question. I decided on a PhD thesis on interregional population mobility, with labour economist Peter Brosnan as chief supervisor. Initially I started applying Markov chain models and could have gone in the direction of Andrei Rogers' work, but became particularly intrigued by Bill Alonso's general theory of movements. Formal econometric modelling of this model remained challenging for decades. I did design an estimation method and a New Zealand application, which was published in the Scottish Journal of Political Economy (a journal that had a tradition of publishing about labour markets and migration) in 1986.

My introduction to the regional science network was through taking regional, urban and transportation economics as elective courses during my Masters at VU. That is how I met Peter Nijkamp and the late Piet Rietveld. In early 1980 I received a letter “out of the blue” from Peter Nijkamp, jointly with Wal van Lierop, inviting me to participate in a summer institute in Soesterberg, The Netherlands. There I presented my first regional science paper on analysing intra-urban residential mobility with log-linear models. The discussant was Peter Batey. Roughly at that time I also joined the Australian and New Zealand section of RSAI, which subsequently awarded me with the 1985 best PhD dissertation medal. Like many others in regional science, I continued to be active in other networks as well, in my case the New Zealand Demographic Society (now Population Association of NZ) and the NZ Association of Economists.

Following completion of my doctorate in early 1984, my family and I went on sabbatical back to VU in Amsterdam and to the Australian National University in Canberra. In Amsterdam, I started my first project with Peter Nijkamp on dynamics of generalised spatial interaction models, subsequently published in 1987 Regional Science and Urban Economics. My first presentation of this paper was at the 1985 PRSCO conference on Molokai, Hawaii, with Walter Isard as the discussant. Walter liked the paper – which was a pure theory one – and told me not to be concerned when some New Zealand colleagues had criticized the paper for having little practical use.

In the second half of the 1980s, I got my first large grant from the NZ government. The aim was to do a scenario-based impact assessment of immigration by means of simulations with a computable general equilibrium (CGE) model. For this, I worked with VUW's Bryan Philpott, who had developed several CGE models for New Zealand, and his PhD student Ganesh Nana. At that time Australia and New Zealand were well ahead of North America and Europe in doing integrated impact assessment of international migration. Many of the issues that became subsequently core topics of immigration economics (such as the role of international trade, fiscal impacts, housing, technological change and population diversity) were already introduced in our 1988 book International Migration and the New Zealand Economy.

At the same time I continued working with Peter Nijkamp, and also with Jan Rouwendal, on endogenous economic growth in a spatial setting, leading to several articles in Annals of Regional Science and also one in Australian Economic Papers.

In 1994 I was offered an opportunity to spend a few years in Japan at the University of Tsukuba, on the invitation of former RSAI President and 1996 World Congress organiser Hirotada Kohno. During this time in Japan I also worked closely with the more recent RSAI President Yoshiro Higano. While my teaching in Japan introduced me to the challenges of environmental economics and policy, my research remained focussed on the economics of migration and endogenous growth. Upon returning to New Zealand in 1997 (VUW had graciously kept my position open), my VUW colleague Philip Morrison and I organised the December 1997 PRSCO conference in Wellington which attracted 250 participants from throughout the world.

After Peter Nijkamp won the 1996 Spinoza Prize, he used the funds to set up MASTER-point at VU University, a research centre for meta-analysis in spatial, transportation and environmental research and invited me to join MASTER-point as a visiting professor. Raymond Florax was appointed as director. Meta-analysis, the quantitative research synthesis of a body of
empirical research findings, had become very popular in other disciplines such as psychology, medicine and education, but had received relatively little attention in economics. This association with MASTER-point during the late 1990s and early 2000s turned out to be a very productive period and led to highly cited publications. One topic was the labour market impacts of immigration, to which Simonetta Longhi, who was doing her PhD at VU at the time, made a major contribution.

In 2004 I took up, upon the invitation of New Zealand’s demographer par excellence, Ian Pool, a personal chair in population economics at the University of Waikato and the Directorship of the Population Studies Centre. We were very fortunate to secure during the following decade some large grants for research on population ageing, immigrant integration and regional population distribution in New Zealand that allowed participation of around 6-10 researchers. After a three year-stint as Director, I was happy to pass on that administrative role to my colleague Richard Bedford, who subsequently transformed PSC into the National Institute of Demographic and Economic Analysis (NIDEA), where I am at present.

As co-Principal Investigator of the 2009-2013 Migrant Diversity and Regional Disparity in Europe (MIDI-REDIE) project and having several other professional roles and projects in Europe as well, I became during the last decade one of the world’s longest distance commuters – spending several months in Europe each year, as well as continuing the New Zealand projects. Given that a lot of my work had been concerned with economic policy analysis, I was very honoured to win the New Zealand Institute of Economic Research (NZIER) Award in 2013, referred to by the NZ public as “Economist of the Year”.

In recent years I have been doing further meta-analyses, including with Henri de Groot and Martijn Smit on agglomeration externalities (with the latest paper recently published in Journal of Economic Surveys) and with former VU PhD student Ceren Ozgen (now at the University of Birmingham) on productivity effects of net migration (in Papers in Regional Science). Work with Ceren also included several projects on trying to find causal evidence of diversity impacts on innovation. It is clearly impossible to mention all research collaborators around the globe since the turn of the millennium, but I should acknowledge many interesting projects with former Waikato PhD students Bill Cochrane, Matt Roskruge, Valente Matlaba, Steven Bond-Smith and Lynda Sanderson (I should explicitly mention the paper with Lynda and Phil McCann on relationship capital published in Journal of Economic Geography, of which I am particularly fond), with former VU PhD students Masood Gheasi and Guney Celbis; and with former Purdue PhD student Julia Beckhusen. Several of the New Zealand projects are jointly with Senior Fellows Dave Maré and Arthur Grimes at Motu Economic and Public Policy Research, New Zealand’s leading economic think-tank.

The European work on the economics of cultural diversity triggered a 2014-2020 mixed methods project in New Zealand, entitled Capturing the Diversity Dividend of Aotearoa New Zealand (CaDDANZ, pronounced cadence). Research on diversity impacts, immigrant integration and social capital development is likely to remain the main focus of my research in years to come, but new projects on the challenges of New Zealand’s largest city, Auckland, and on the future of smaller urban areas are on the horizon. This, combined with having accepted the Presidency of RSAI over the next two years, implies there is no shortage of interesting and challenging things to do in the years to come.

6. Letters to the editor

6.1 Women in Regional Science

by Simona Iammarino (s.iammarino@lse.ac.uk), Brigitte Waldorf (bwaldorf@purdue.edu), Alessandra Faggian (faggian.1@osu.edu), Elisabetta Marinelli (Elisabetta.Marinelli@ec.europa.eu), Bianca Biagi (bbiagi@uniss.it), Margherita Gerolimetto (margherita.gerolimetto@unive.it), Rachel Franklin (Rachel_Franklin@brown.edu)

Gender – and more general Equality and Diversity (E&D) issues – recently resurfaced in an open debate across different social science disciplines. This stemmed from the observation of the strongly biased composition of academic community bodies of various types (e.g. key-note speakers, conference panels, editorial boards, summer school, policy research groups, etc.). A strong gender (and race) bias has been observed by groups of female academics spanning across regional science, economic geography, innovation studies, international business, and
economics. It has been suggested that the gender bias has increased since the latest financial crisis, which has exacerbated competition in labour markets.

In the Regional Science scientific community of the 1980s similar discussions were carried out and efforts were made to make the discipline more inclusive, for example by recruiting women into roles of responsibility within the community.

It is acknowledged that, since then, the gender ratio has changed substantially. Evidence of such change was acknowledged, e.g. Regional Science Newsletter, October 2009: http://www.regionalscience.org/images/PDF/October_2009_newsletter.pdf (see, in particular, the article by Brigitte Waldorf “Women in Regional Science: A success story”).

It is realized, however, that the default choice in Regional Science, as in other disciplinary fields, is still highly ‘white male-dominated’. It is believed that this is not a success story for the community as a whole, and it will be a serious mistake to dismiss it as sorted while heading into the 2020’s.

In the latest decades a lot of debate has been around the lack of representation of women in science, with a presumption that gender imbalance is a phenomenon affecting mainly STEM. However, this is also true in social sciences and related policy debates, although possibly in different ways from STEM (e.g. not so much lack of participation of women in social science, but lack of representation in the more “visible” areas of the academic and policy debate).

The perception is one of women’s “tolerance”, more than real inclusion. In fact, women are even very much appreciated as their presence makes it harder to point fingers against “old-boys-networks”. Women are also often sought because they are more willing to accept time-consuming tasks, like organizing conference. But, in general, they rarely are involved in decision making processes: e.g. selection of key-note speakers, gender-ratio in the number of person-years as editors.

The problem is complex and has a ‘cumulative causation’ nature. It has been noted, for instance, that women participation in policy ‘impact’ of research is negligible across domains (e.g. S&TI policies, industrial policies, regional policies). Impact is now in several academic systems (e.g. UK) one of the area of ‘metrics’ used to assess academic performance. More generally, it is also recognised that other metrics such as citations or teaching evaluations strongly penalise women, affecting their overall career progression and public profile. See for e.g. (among hundreds of others):

https://www.hastac.org/blogs/superadmin/2015/01/26/gender-bias-academie-annotated-bibliography-important-recent-studies
http://www.slate.com/articles/life/inside_higher_ed/2016/01/student_evaluations_show_bias_against_female_instructors.html

Women are easily dismissed as “endless complaining”: this distorted attitude makes female social scientists feel often like censoring their own writing and apologize for speaking up. This does not encourage serious evaluation and representation of the problem, particularly in social sciences.

Also, and most importantly, many academic women in senior positions are already the first to be called upon for service work within their own academic institutions. Many academic women at advanced stages of career have and are increasingly called in decision making roles on the basis of gender ‘quotas’. It is not an imposition but women often have no choice, internal regulations on E&D fix quotas for female in management within universities. There is then a problem with overload, as women are still much fewer at present among the high levels of career because of the long-term glass ceiling, so this ends up by creating an impossible triad: more internal admin, more external engagement in the community, same skewed balance of tasks in professional and private life (particularly for women with young children).

There is a clear mismatch between the demand for women colleagues and the stock of women colleagues (especially at the senior level of career). This has led to an informal perception of ‘she is there because she is a woman’, in most cases very explicitly communicated. The latter is a severe form of discrimination; women are acknowledged on the basis of their gender, rather than for their capabilities and qualities.

A few decades of awareness is plenty of time to move women completely through the pipeline from students to settled academics. Looking around and not seeing those women, should be regarded as a failure and an urgent and pressing need to adjust the approach.

Blatant discriminatory behaviour is enduring on this topic. Behavioural change (including support to women self-confidence
6.2 A brief report on the perspective of Regional Sciences among the young researchers in India

by Vijay Pandey, University of Delhi (vijay.dse15@gmail.com)

Over the past three decades the process of globalization has brought forward major changes in the regional and economic landscape. Since the 1980s, the unprecedented expansion in volumes of international trade and capital mobility across countries has dramatically altered the pre-existing equilibrium based on the strong role of nation states in regulating, orienting and/or restricting such flows. Therefore, globalization has gradually frayed nation-state level regional and economic institutions as they were known in the post world war-II period. At the same time, globalization has contributed to the progressive evolution of the regional science paradigm shift of mass production towards more flexible and successful production systems as a way to respond to the increasing competitive pressure of international markets. Improvements in communication technologies and the fall in transportation costs reduce the importance of physical distance in the location of productive activities. Consequently, regional development can virtually occur everywhere without any role being played by local spatial factors. Convergence in incomes across regions and countries would thus be the ultimate result of globalization.

In general, regional science (basically the result of globalization) highlights that development potential and competitive advantage are strongly localized elements. Therefore, what regional science strategies should aim at is basically to adopt balanced policies which build upon local strengths and try to alleviate local weaknesses as the only way to root economic activity in territories in a sustainable manner (Pike et al., 2006).

Indian perspectives: inventory and prospects

The growing awareness about the relevance of regional science in shaping regional and local development path is reinforced by the increasing demand for power decentralization from national to regional governments in the last decades. Decision-making at the local level could be extremely positive for regional development by encouraging collective action and tailoring strategies to local
needs, although some drawbacks also exist in terms of equity and efficiency.

Regional science has become the priority area in government policies especially after 1991 (new era of globalization). After China's model of growth, the Indian Government feels the inclusive and sustainable development of the remote and unprivileged regions to be the growth engine for the country's regional and economic development. Since 2007 various schemes and projects have been started in different sectors of the economy and the focus has shifted towards research and development in the field of regional science. Now, India's big challenge is to speed the momentum of regional science as a major discipline across the universities and to create interest among young researchers.

Regional Science has still not defined its occupational scope in India. People in India cannot understand the real concept of regional science yet. This has created an ambiguity in the mindsets of many. But if we consider the government's missions and policies, we are increasing the importance of decision making which is good news for regional planners. The trend should increase and the authorities should realize the importance of a planner or the importance of the view that planner has. There is still a long way to go. But India is slowly realizing it. If we decide to get more into planning, I suggest it is a good time to get involved. Though initially we will find a few ups and downs, it will be worth the effort.

At the same time, regional science has tremendous scope for regional planning graduates/degrees but the focus should be aimed at providing students with a sound education in regional science and planning. As a career, planning offers a real opportunity to play a key role in shaping places and localities across the globe.

In my view the future of regional science is quite bright and favorable in India especially among young researchers and scholars, but this needs to be enhanced through teaching, research, training and extensions in this innovative field, which would definitely give a new path and directions to regional science and of course to regional planners in India.
## Contents

1. Introduction 01

   1.1 Welcome from the President 01
   1.2 Welcome to the 2016 NARSC Congress 02
   1.3 Welcome from the Editors 03

2. News from the RSAI Council 03

   2.1 Major events 03
   2.2 ANZRSAI network linking with other "southern cone" sections 05

3. Current issues in land rent policy 05

   3.1 Value Capture: The Latin American Toolbox 05
   3.2 Land markets: market failure, policy failure – which dominates, where? 07
   3.3 Why a taxation on development rents? 09

4. Centres of Regional Science: Proximity team, University Paris Saclay, Agroparistech, INRA 10

5. Meet the Fellows: Jacques Poot 13

6. Letters to the editor 15

   6.1 Women in Regional Science 15
   6.2 A brief report on the perspective of Regional Sciences among the young researchers in India 17