

ISOCARP



The Creation of the First ISOCARP Group in Romania

From May 27th 2011

Hesper Industrial Hall (unconventional space)

communication language: English / Romanian

BUCHAREST Str. Dr. Constantin Istrati nr. 1

The International Society of City and Regional Planners (ISOCARP) is a global association of experienced professional planners. It was founded in 1965 in a bid to bring together recognised and highly-qualified planners in an international network. The ISOCARP network brings together individual and institutional members from more than 80 countries worldwide. As a non-governmental organisation, ISOCARP is recognised by the UN, UNHCR and the Council of Europe. The Society also has a formal consultative status with UNESCO.

Dr. Ing. Pietro Elisei (Italy / Romania)

Dr. Ing. Dirk Engelke (Germany)

Dipl. Ing. Manfred Schrenk (Austria)

Dr. arch. Gabriel Pascariu

Arh. Mihaela Vrabet

Arch. Irina Iamandescu

Arch. Ștefan Ghenciulescu

Dr. Arch. Giuseppe Cina (Italy)

Urb. Alexandru Matei



An international meeting thought for creating the first Romanian delegation at ISOCARP.

Event Coordinator and promoter: Pietro Elisei (a special thanks to Irina Iamandescu, Gabriel Pascariu, Mircea Pricop and Alexandru Matei for their fundamental help in co-organising the event)

Programme - Annex No. 1

List of invited planners - Annex No. 2

List of participants - Annex No. 3

Invited speakers - Annex No. 4

Panel speakers at round table - Annex No.



Picture taken by prof. lect. drd Liviu Ianăși

REPORT OF THE EVENT

At 9.30 of May the 27th started the meeting having the aim of creating the first Romanian ISOCARP group, from this group could be defined the Romanian delegation at ISOCARP.

Pietro Elisei (moderator) gave the welcome to the guests and briefly explained the reasons and the objectives of the meeting. He reported the welcome speech of the ISOCARP Secretary General (Alex Mac Gregor) and the greetings of the ISOCARP President (Ismael Fernandez Mejia) , than he invited the Director of the HESPER (Mircea Pricop), that kindly put at disposal the rooms for the conference, to hold a welcome speech.

Mircea Pricop presented to the guests the History of the HESPER and elucidated its huge value in terms of industrial archaeology. He illustrated the current productive activities of the HESPER, than he invited the present town planners to find solutions for re-launching the HESPER heritage, the old building of the end of the XIX century and those of the beginning of the XX.

He closed his speech in wishing to the participants to have a successful meeting and to count on HESPER spaces in order to organize further events that aim at promoting good town planning in Romania.

Pietro Elisei invited Dirk Engelke to explain to the participants the activity of ISOCARP and the added value of being a member.

Title of presentation: *The professional network of ISOCARP: History, objectives and added values for new members.*

Dirk Engelke presented a short description of The International Society of City and Regional Planners (ISOCARP). He began in explaining the role of the urban and regional planning in the present and in its future challenges. He underlined that in a world with cities growing very rapidly, town planning activities will be more and more important. In this challenging context of an urbanizing world, in his opinion, we need to put the following questions:

1. What is the frameset of this urbanization? What are its trends?
2. How is the spatial impact?
3. Who can provide solutions?

Starting from these questions the ISOCARP is trying to propose a set of solutions.

He presented some major characteristics of the network: ISOCARP is Global, it is Trans-disciplinary and it is “an action taking” society. Dirk Engelke explained that the response and opportunities given by ISOCARP are:

- Professional publications – reviews
- An annual world congress related to different global issues
- Advisory work by Urban Planning Advisory Teams – UPATs
- and workshops for Young planners.
- Finally, ISOCARP offers some Awards for best practices.

After the presentation of Dirk Engelke, the floor has been taken by Manfred Schrenk.

Title of presentation: *Promotion of innovative technics and technologies for spatial planning within the ISOCARP network: Consolidated experiences, current projects and future proposals.*

Manfred Schrenk illustrated the role of technologies for spatial planning in the present and some trends for the future; he linked faced topics with ISOCARP network activities.

In the last 50 years technology and its products have increased their presence in many aspects of our life. New and innovative technologies try to identify and propose tools in ICT that can improve our daily work in town planning, and propose solutions for new challenges to be faced by contemporary cities. In relation with this continuous research (technologies/urbanism/policy design), ISOCARP supports the realization of an international conference on this field. The name of this event is REAL CORP. This conference has already 11 years tradition and focus on global perspectives. This year (2011), the REAL CORP took place in Essen, Germany, between 18-20May, it debated the subject: "Change for Stability, the Lifecycles of Cities and Regions". One of the main observations that resulted after this deliberation was that all the important "actors" related to planning must focus more on implementation and not only on projects: transforming planning practices into operational practices. Manfred Schrenk warned that: "We make plans but we don't rely get results".

In the last part of his presentation he explained how ISOCARP is an important "platform for partners in (international) projects" and showed the example of PLAN4ALL (EU promoted project, www.plan4all.eu). This European project it is currently under implementation and tries to harmonise geographical planning data across Europe (Inspire directive). He concluded underlining that ISOCARP it is not only a network of professionals but a network of friends as well.

Pietro Elisei consecutively introduced Gabriel Pascariu and remarked how his help has been essential in order to finalize the realization of this first ISOCARP meeting in Romania.

Title of presentation: *Urbanism (planning) education and organizations in Romania: an overview of the current situation.*

Gabriel Pascariu showed a synthesis of the evolution (especially focusing on the last 30 years) of urban studies in Romania, both referring to the educational evolution in universities and mutations in professionals. He explained how the beginning of Romanian town planning is associated with the activities performed at the Polytechnic of Bucharest ('30), than in an second phase it was more associated with the School and Faculty of Architecture and just from 1997 the field of urbanism has its own dedicated Faculty. From 2005 the Faculty of Urbanism, as part of the "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urbanism, moved to the Bologna System and got a new structure with 3 cycles of study: Bachelor's Degree, Master's Degree and Doctoral Degree.

At the same time town planning course in Romania can be found ,in different proportions, in other Faculties like: Geography, Engineering and Architecture.

In the second part of his presentation, Gabriel Pascariu briefly presented the evolution of Romanian Associations of Town Planners: 1) Association of Professional Urban Planners in Romanian - APUR, 2) Association of Urban Planner in Cluj-Napoca - AUC, and some other minor nongovernmental organizations.

He then illustrated the numerous changes in attributions and denominations of the Romanian Ministry responsible for territorial governance issues , from 1990 till present.

At the end of the presentation, he explained when and how was born the RUR (Registrul Urbanistilor din Romania, that is Registry of Romanian Planners) and its role, underlying that just few specialists accredited by this institution are proper town planners, while the majority of members are architects.

Prof. **Alexandru Sandu** added more information and explained the relation intervened between APUR and RUR, he explained the reasons why RUR took over some APUR tasks. He underlined and provided information about the current affiliation of RUR and CEI/ECTP.

THE OPEN DISCUSSION

The open discussion is launched. A first question from the participants:

Participant: How can you become a member?

Dirk Engelke: Individual application and CV can be provided via web. The application and the CV will be analyzed the National ISOCARP Delegation. ISOCARP – focus is mainly on individual membership.

The many individual memberships create delegations.

Speaking of delegations and associations came into debate the question of APUR. Many participants explained the different reasons of the current APUR state of the art, from the discussion emerged the need of re-discussing and likely re-launching the APUR activities.

Mihaela Vrabete brought into discussion the topic of the relationship between young and senior planners, she emphasized how important is to define a place/association for such a confrontation.

She highlighted even the question of having an association/corporation that is going to defend the rights of planners in the Romanian working environment: to have entities connecting town planners with job opportunities at urban scale.

Pietro Elisei underlined that ISOCARP is working and collaborating with many other national and international associations (e.g. AESOP), and that to create this first Romanian group in the ISOCARP is the occasion for many Romanian town planners to jump into the international arena and express there all those possibilities that currently are difficult to exploit in Romanian cities.

Giuseppe Cinà said that it is an enormous opportunity to enter such form of international association as there “you are free to play your game”, fact that is not so simple in the national arena. If Romanian town planners are unsatisfied of the game’s rule in the national context have in an international arena .

After the coffee break initiated the part more content oriented, Pietro Elisei is the first speaker of this second part.

Title of presentation: *Europeization of Romanian urban and territorial policies: inertias and transformations.*

Pietro Elisei’s presentation focused on the necessity to proceed towards the reform of those governance mechanisms ruling the allocation of structural funds. He started in pointing out the questions of continuing to have non-elected regions (ADRs,, functional regions) and he insisted on the necessity of having real elected regions for the next programming period, proper elected administrations where to accurately devolve the management of structural funds in order to start a necessary decentralization in town and regional planning questions. He invited to pay attention, for the 2014-2020, at avoiding the mistakes already done, especially in the axis 1, of investing EU public money in the cities without asking for proper strategic planning.

PUG, PUZ, PUD (the pool of Romanian ruling plans), in his opinion, are not to be considered strategic tools for town planning (stop to PUZing the cities!), they are just normative instruments, he enhanced the need for new urban policies and innovative tools for managing the old and emerging Romanian urban questions. He recalled a basic requirement in town planning of having instruments/policies that permit to launch negotiations (into a precise frame of rules) and create PPPs (Public Private Partnerships). He concluded his intervention with a provocation demonstrating how in the current programming period it was implemented a sort of SUDOKU Town Planning: just compile the bureaucratic forms in the right way to access the financing; it is not important if the chosen/promoted project is triggering sustainable and coherent development at urban and territorial scale.

Pietro Elisei concluded his presentation and introduced Mihaela Vrabete.

Title of presentation: *Strategic planning and local development in Romania.*

Mihaela Vrabete underlined in her intervention some unsuccessful attempts of changing/moving the Romanian planning system bringing as example the recent history of urban and regional planning and evidences several expectations for the future. She started in stressing the importance of Strategic Planning in Romania especially related with situation of small financial power, and then pointed the most important elements that can change in better this domain: education, professional organizations, new mentalities and new attitudes. In the second part of the presentation she completed the history of urban and regional planning in Romania, previously introduced by Gabriel Pascariu, emphasizing the aspects related to strategic planning. Mihaela Vrabete explained that nowadays, in a market economy, it is almost impossible to think urban and regional planning without having a proper strategy. She evidenced how Romanian professionals have a very wide experience in analyzing territorial and urban situations, but they face strong and resilient problems with proposals and implementation. She considered that some positive changes have been made since the integration of Romania in the European Union (2007), but they are still too slow: there is a need of some assistance and founding programs for planning, some new organizations for planners and some openness from the administrative institutions. At the same time, although some changes in law were made, Romania still does not have a legal framework to create strategies.

Finally, Mihaela Vrabete expressed her disappointment that the young planners are generally well prepared, but they are discouraged and have big problems in finding proper jobs as town planners.

Pietro Elisei introduced Irina Iamandescu and invited the participants to pay attention to the need of creating policies for exploiting industrial heritage in Bucharest and in Romania.

Irina Iamandescu presentation concentrated on difficulties and opportunities linked to industrial archeology in Bucharest. She began by showing the evolution of the industrial areas in Bucharest in relation with the railway infrastructure development. According to her viewpoint, the industrial sites and buildings present a huge value in terms of re-use when opportunely refurbished and re-functionalized. She presented seven negative situations and two positive approaches on industrial areas requalification in Bucharest.

The sites presented were:

- Solaris Oil Factory
- Assan Mill
- Luther brewery
- Bragadiru brewery
- Filaret electrical plant
- Matches factory
- Hesper S.A. / former Wolff factories
- Vama antrepozite
- Metropolis center / Tipografia 13 decembrie

The last two industrial areas were presented like the less destructive approaches made in Bucharest till now. She detailed history, values and opportunities connected to HESPER (the meeting place).

Irina Iamandescu ended the session by informing about the existence of the Romanian Association for Industrial Archaeology.

Pietro Elisei explained the important role played by young planners within the ISOCARP network and introduced Alexandru Matei, which helped a lot in gathering for this event the most promising young town planner in Romania.

Alexandru Matei began his presentation by explaining that he was encouraged to speak on behalf of the Romanian young planners and this is for him a great honor.

The presentation started with a reflection on the role of INTERNET as a work and communication instrument. He argued how the best proof of internet's importance is the "Arab Spring". He then continued by underlying a particular phenomenon called: "Being closer, yet being far away" which has an enormous influence on our society. Alexandru

Matei presented after that the many characteristics, trends and expectations from future of Romanian young planners. They consider that the new generations of planners from Romania are:

- well trained
- interested to continue study
- open to new ideas
- flexible
- and willing to compete.

Unfortunately the unfavorable political, economic and social context creates the tendency of emigration. At the same time, young planners consider that (on a long term perspective) the particular phenomenon of internet and a good relation with an international professional group might change the situation.

Alexandru Matei then pointed the main expectations of young planners from networks like ISOCARP:

- international experience
- international network relations
- participation in international projects.
- offering in exchange good knowledge on specific local characteristics.

The speech was ended with the proposal to discuss on the possibility to initiate a series of online seminars and to enforce the dialogue between Romanian planners, professional networks and ISOCARP.

THE LUNCH BREAK

The lunch break has been held in one of the old buildings of the HESPER Factory. During the lunch a short concert of classic music with famous opera arias has been performed. Ms Adriana Alexandru (mezzosoprano at National Opera of Bucharest) have sung some opera arias accompanied by two young musicians of the Bucharest Conservatory. Purposes of this concert was “to gladden the spirit” of all participants and, at the same time, to demonstrate the big potential that these industrial spaces, initially thought and used for fine mechanics and weapons production, have in order to be re-used as places for leisure, artistic performances and other “creative economy” possible applications. The acoustic of the place proved to be amazing.

The second part of the meeting started with the presentation of the new version (in English and in Romanian, the first one was in Italian) of the Giuseppe Cinà’s book: Bucharest, from Village to Metropolis. Book Published by CAPITEL. The Book’s content has been introduced by Stefan Ghenciulescu, editor of the architecture review ZEPPELIN.

Stefan Ghenciulescu highlighted in his introduction the deep analysis of the city (Bucharest) contained in the Cinà’a book, than he illustrated how the mechanisms of the “production of the city” have been clearly explained and addressed. Stefan Ghenciulescu remarked how Cinà has been contextualizing architectural and town planning into the social and political mutations of the Romanian society.

Cinà commented his books defining it as an urban biography; he recalled the Italian examples of the touring club guides: I had in mind an urban biography where to highlight special topics that could open new perspectives. He then faced the question of the identity in Bucharest; this is a very special city as it conjugates the utopia of the socialist city with that of the liberal one. He wondered about the predominant identity: is it that of modernism or that of the socialist city? He concluded by noticing that, it was clear that ten years ago Bucharest had an identity in progress, in construction, mutation...but nowadays he did not see this progress. He, finally, invited the present young planners to write the final chapter of his book.

ROUND TABLE

Gabriel Pascariu moderated the final discussion.

ROUNDTABLE: *Meeting the challenge of designing liveable cities: What about the Romanian contribution? How can ISOCARP, with its decennial experience in town and regional planning, actively effectively and efficiently interact with administrations, academy and practitioners in Romania?*

Mihaela Vrabete asked to be the first to speak because must leave the conference. She left with a very clear and well-articulated proposal. She proposed 1) to test this ISOCARP Group on a three years long period. She proposed 2) to have a second meeting to be hosted by Halcrow Romania (*Company* delivering planning, design and management services for developing infrastructure and buildings worldwide) at the end of the year, 3) to organize the activity of the young planners (she suggested them to make groups and work on project ideas to propose), finally, 4) she focused on the question of fund raising: what activity could be initiated in order to face this issue and to look even for financial sustainability of this idea.

Gabriel Pascariu introduced again the topic of discussion for the final round table. He remembered that this will be even the topic (liveable cities) of the annual ISOCARP conference (October 2010). Gabriel Pascariu than presented the panel discussants for the round table (prof. Alexandru Sandu, Prof Catalin Sarbu, Prof. Liviu Ianasi and Gruia Badescu, young planner).

Gabriel Pascariu put the following questions to the panel discussants:

What are the main problems and perspectives of cities in Romania?

Is there a Romanian urban development model?

Before to launch the discussion Gabriel Pascariu asked to Dirk Engelke to explain the reason of this title for the 2011 ISOCARP conference.

Dirk Engelke precised that it is at least four years that the ISOCARP is facing the topic of livability connected to that of sustainability (from the Dalian Conference in China through Porto and Nairobi): in the next conference in Wuhan there will likely be the closure of the circle about this discussion. He emphasized how this topic from one side has been demanded by the academicians, while in the other it answers to a precise market demand coming from big industries (e.g. Siemens, Philips). He remembered that the discussion around liveable cities should not just to focus around products for an urbanizing world, but it is necessary to define which the conditions are in determining better living conditions for the citizens, that are not to be seen just as consumers.

Finally, he referred to interesting meeting had with representative of the European Commission and pointed out how for the next programming period the mainstreaming of structural funds for investment in cities is going to change. Another important change is even change, according to Engelke, is even happening in terms of change of paradigms and keywords of the EC: we do not more speak about Europe of regions, but we speak of Europe of cities, better of Europe of city-regions.

Prof. **Alexandru Sandu** started his intervention stressing that the subjects brought into discussion in the afternoon are very important but time is not enough to deepen such relevant urban questions.

He put from first considerations the topic of liveable city at the center of his intervention and specifically focused on the relationship between living the city (a locui) and livability in the city (locuibilitate). The former element of this relation (a locui) is to be considered as a process, the latter a quality of the space. Second subject introduced in his intervention was on the state of the art of Romanian cities: these are in a really bad situation (situatie ingrata). This situation is making him, as president of the RUR (Registrul Urbanistilor Romani), very depressed and wonder on what are the measure to take in order to stop the decline of Romanian cities.

He said that this is not a problem of solutions, but it is a problem of knowledge. The knowledge related to town planning is very weak in the Romanian cities, at every level from politics to professionals. Successively, he introduced the theme

of the territorial cohesion, Prof. Sandu affirmed that before of speaking of positive territorial cohesion, we should face questions of negative territorial cohesion and made the example of gipsy neighborhoods and communities. Finally, he came to conclusions introducing the lack of proper urban policies at in Romania: there is a lack of urban policies, there is no Romanian city having a proper urban policy or strategy for a development showing perspective. The many Romanian metropolitan areas do not properly exist, in major cities there is no dialogue/communication between the political power, the public opinion/citizens and the media. Moreover, the question of social housing is not seriously taken into consideration. The Romanian cities do not have a proper continuity in the urban actions, there is no guarantee of continuity settled down in the knowledge of urban experts working in and for the cities, the situation mutates rapidly along with each political change.

Gabriel Pascariu invited to intervene Catalin Sarbu.

Catalin Sarbu initiated his speech with the consideration that many of the themes faced by Prof. Sandu are definitively very important topics in the contemporary Romanian city. He, than, put into the discussion the multidimensional aspect of the liveable city (Oras Locuibile). He stressed how the liveable city includes many aspects, among these: physical, economic, cultural, social, environmental and emotional. He agrees on the fact that the solutions and directions proposed by town planners should derive from a clear definition of a sphere of urban policies: policies address solutions.

The variables that characterize the cities, the human settlements are in continuous mutation: to look at the space with options and objectives that are going continuously to reformulate themselves.

He then stated that the concept of liveable city is in continuous mutation, the act of living requires an objective setting having an internal capability of progressively re-modulate itself. Very important, in his opinion, is the relation between the city and surrounding territory, we should think and design them not separately. Small or big cities construct their potential of livability in relation with their territories. This relation is not just to express in those infrastructural terms (roads, railways) that constitute an urban system/metropolitan area, but even in terms of people movements/fluxes, ideas exchange, economic interchange and its evolving frame.

He stressed that the evolution of Romanian cities in the last 15 years has been very rapid and definitively very ideological: there has been a mechanical interpretation of very rigid/inflexible policies, these evidently results in current social structures and spatial expressions/outputs.

He evidenced how we have a surplus of dwellings/housing settlements in Romania, the question is not the offer of a place where to live but it is how you live in it: the issues is in the quality of the living spaces. He concluded that we have to look for a new interpretation of the relationship between urban and rural, the quality of life and living should be conjugate both in small and medium cities and in the great urban agglomerations.

Gabriel Pascariu invited Liviu Ianasi to take the floor for his consideration.

Liviu Ianasi characterized the fundamental points defining the transition of the Romanian planning system: when speaking about the Romanian cities in transition he mentioned 1) problems before of 1989, 2) problems coming with the transition and 3) problems deriving from not considering the previous two categories. To this set of problems we have to add now, from 2000 onwards, all those connected to globalisations effects and climate change, and finally nowadays we have to face the issues of the economic crises as well: so that the situation of our city is disastrous.

It is important in Romania to highlight the demographic question, we do not have a proper study in Romania about the last migratory fluxes (internal and external), all Romanian cities having more than 200.000 inhabitants probably in the period 1992-2002 have lost 10% of their population.

Moreover, it is to consider that the use of EU money in the Romanian cities it has been an answer to the EU bureaucracy pushing to spend money, but real problems have not yet been addressed. Local administration too often look for short term profits/business and not always choice transparent practices: there is an high level of corruption; additionally, they do not believing town planning and in town planners added value. We have now money, but we miss a national urban

policy, we do not have governance hierarchies: we have the best administration in avoiding good town planning and the worst in promoting it. He stressed, furthermore, that a decentralisation, without the state control, could lead to more wild development. There is no vertical cooperation and even between mayors and city councils there are communication problems. The decadence of the public space is very serious; “just consider that you cannot individuate a public square in Bucharest.” Finally, the question of integration, he said: there is a total absence of integration! Development and planning, public and private, national interest and local interest, usually diverge in Romania. One of the recent architecture biennials in Venice had this title: more ethics less aesthetics, we would need both of them in Romania.

Finally, **Gabriel Pascariu** introduced the last panel discussant, the young planner Gruia Badescu.

Gruia Badescu stressed the need of bridging the current Romanian viewpoints in town planning with those coming from abroad. He then introduced in the discussion the topic of property; he said that in Romania the relationship among property, new liberal policies and market rules has not been properly faced. He successively moved to the issue of shrinking cities, he started from the studies on this topic implemented in Germany and connected them with the Romanian cities: these are even experiencing a deep loss of population, for many different reasons, as well. He also agreed on the fact that there is a need to pay attention to the rural dimension, because it is very significant in Romania. He concluded in considering that even if many problems connected to design and use of urban space remains, there have been some positive signs of urban regeneration in Romanian cities (e.g. Cluj Napoca, Timisoara): the open question is to assess the grade of transferability linked to good practices/urban regeneration schemes implemented abroad.

Gabriel Pascariu invited the participants to spend no more than 30 minutes on comments/short interventions/questions and 15 minutes for conclusions and follow ups of this ISOCARP group *in spe*.

Manfred Schrenk launched the metaphor of the doctor (town planner) and the patient (the city). It put in evidence the resistance/resilience of cities: it is amazing how cities can stand enormous migrations and serious problems (he did some examples of growing cities in developing countries). Anyway, he stated, there is still a big trust/believe in moving to the city, in living in the city, even if we talk of informal urban settlements. He invited the young planners in considering the limit of town planning: planners are not the only responsible professionals for the state of the cities. Town planners are part of the game, it is not up to them to save the city; town planners are generalists and then respond to the many urban issues, but we are not a religious group rescuing the cities in the world, being town planners is a normal job that require indeed a big passion: just not over-estimate or under-estimate its role. He concluded with a remark on Bucharest: many things seem to me quite inexplicable, but many other (he did the example of the parks) seem that are really working...so not all is lost, something positive is happening in the city and someone is taking care of it.

Alexandru Matei asked to intervene, he said that he listened at a presentation about Vilnius and he noticed how the set of problems could perfectly mirror Bucharest. He concluded that with a common effort it is maybe possible to propose solutions...

Giuseppe Cinà made him to notice that we, as town planners, have the same rhetoric, but every city is different and present different urban issues to face...

Liviu Ianasi emphasized that Vilnius periphery is worse than Ferentari and he said that completely agree with Giuseppe Cinà: common words but different problems. Finally, he replied to Manfred Schrenk: planners will be at the frontline in the occasion of next political elections.

Irina Iamandescu entered the discussion introducing the topic of the National Strategy for using the EU funds. He underlined as we (in Romania) are paying back the mistakes that we did in designing this plan. We are not capable to set

the real needed priorities and EU money does not flow where necessary. She insisted that we have to create a group (as town planners) that must be involved in the negotiations for the next programming period.

Young planner **Iulan Canov**: This new ISOCARP group should be more aggressive in comparison with the current NGOs advocating urban questions in Romania...There are many ONGs and associations active in Bucharest, but they are not following the right methodologies to be listened and to be effective.

Dirk Engelke intervened in the discussion emphasizing how big national strategies are not usually solving problems on the ground, big change like the Ruhr/Emscher Park, he brought this case as an example, started with simple projects. He recommended concentrating the action on the next small steps: start from the small steps to achieve frames for big thinking.

Gabriel Pascariu commented: this could be a great change in Romanian mentality, we usually jump the first steps.

Florin Muresanu wanted to come back to the metaphor of the doctor and the patient, and he pointed out that in the Romanian context there are not just doctors but unfortunately many shamans.

Manfred Schrenk answered that the final decision is responsibility of the political class and they are free to be consulted by many professionals, at the end of the day, it is important the quality of content we provide to politicians, the quality of our advices as town planners.

Gabriel Pascariu concluded with the remark that we had a good debate and fertile ideas. Very passionate and emotional sometimes. The Romanian contributions to liveable city could be related to conceptual approach, to include the relation city – territory or making a connection between cohesion and liveability. It appeared, in his opinion, that the Romanian planners complain more that acting, that there is some passive acceptance of the situation, that in general professional action when it came is more reactive than preventive. However, he noticed how Romanian interventions focused more on issues like: lack of policies, bad management, migration and demographic decline, disparities between urban and rural and so on.

A topic to be definitively discussed is the relationship between competitive and liveable cities. Bucharest is the most competitive city in Romania but not among the first liveable ones!

Gabriel Pascariu, lastly, asked to Pietro Elisei to conclude or to find an answer to: what to do next?

Pietro Elisei recalled the Dirk Engelke example about the Ruhr, he commented it as “the very good urban philosophy promoted through the *perspektivischer inkrementalismus*”, and simply affirmed that the first step for this group is to keep in touch. We have to elaborate a report of this conference and start to elaborate ideas, we need now to take time to “digest” all this information that we produced in this meeting. We got very articulated and concrete proposals (e.g. Mihaela Vrabete offered the possibility to organize a second meeting at Halcrow), we should take this point into consideration. He then addressed the young planners to provide new ideas and proposals and asked, on the other side, to the senior planners to take initiatives...He said I do not know what is the first next step, but I see many small and simple next steps that could be initiated in the near future...within this group!

Dirk Engelke said it is not now the time of giving responsibilities and setting tasks

Pietro Elisei replaced that we need to look around, and even understanding what could be the first occasion for this group...we should look for a first opportunity

Manfred Schrenk proposed a sort of homework that could be to set perspectives, for example in the use of EU funds, how to go into EU projects, how, and who is the most adequate to respond in the Romanian planners arena.

Pietro Elisei definitively concluded with these final remarks: Let us right now to assess our opinion at Romanian scale about this meeting and about the realms where to be operational and effective, let us to take time! A good point where to experiment this group is the preparation of the next 2014-2020 programming period, here it would be the case to propose us in order to be mediators for new tools and priorities, we can learn from the mistakes did, and even those that we did, in the first round of the EU funds addressed to the cities (the obliged antithesis of the AXIS 1). He stressed that it is to understand this new trend of current discussion in the EU that aims at linking the EU policies directly with cities/city regions, and seriously start to consider that we cannot continue to maintain a centralistic system for managing territorial governance questions in Romania, town planning is first of all a local question, a task of/for local communities. We have to trust even the local administration (a sort of new alliance with the cities for the next programming period): there is the need to move decisional power towards the cities, to start forms of decentralization.

Pietro Elisei concluded with the statement that it exists now an ISOCARP group in Romania, and we will see in the next days/weeks if it will be capable to survive and achieve results...he, lastly, invited all participants to have a glass of Romanian Spumante.

ANNEXES

Programme:

9:15	Mircea Pricop	<i>General Manager HESPER Industrial Area</i> Welcome Speech: a short introduction to HESPER.
9:25	Dr. Ing. Pietro Elisei (Italy / Romania)	<i>ISOCARP, senior member</i> Welcome Speech: a short introduction to ISOCARP. Official Speech from the Secretary General of ISOCARP Alex Macgregor (Scotland) – read.
09:30	Dr. Ing. Dirk Engelke (Germany)	<i>ISOCARP, Vice-President</i> The professional network of ISOCARP: History, objectives and added values for new members.
10:00	Dipl. Ing. Manfred Schrenk (Austria)	<i>ISOCARP, Vice President and Treasurer</i> Promotion of innovative technics and technologies for spatial planning within the ISOCARP network: Consolidated experiences, current projects and future proposals.
10:30	Dr. arch. Gabriel Pascariu	<i>„Ion Mincu” University of Architecture and Urbanism, Bucharest – scientific secretary of the Faculty of Urbanism</i> Urbanism (planning) education and organizations in Romania: an overview of the current situation.
10:50	Dr. Ing. Pietro Elisei (Italy / Romania)- moderator	OPEN DISCUSSION: Setting up the first Romanian ISOCARP group: networks, associations, professionals alternatives and perspectives.
11:15		Coffee break
11:30	Dr. Ing. Pietro. Elisei (Italy / Romania)	<i>ISOCARP, senior member</i> Europeization of Romanian urban and territorial policies: inertias and transformations.
11:40	Arch. Mihaela Vrabet	Halcrow – Director of development planning and design department. Strategic planning and local development in Romania.
12:10	Arch. Irina Iamandescu	<i>„Ion Mincu” University of Architecture and Urbanism, Bucharest – History and Theory Department.</i> Industrial archeology as a driver for urban renewal in Bucharest.
12:40	Urb. Alexandru Matei	The Romanian young planners: Present situation and trends.
13:00	Ștefan Ghenciu (with the participation of Giuseppe Cinà)	book presentation - Dr. Arch. Giuseppe Cinà (2010) Bucharest: from village to metropolis: urban identity and new trends - București: de la sat la metropolă: identitate urbană și noi tendințe. Editura Capitel, BUCHAREST.
13:20		Lunch

14:45	Dr. arch. Gabriel Pascariu – moderator	ROUNDTABLE Meeting the challenge of designing liveable cities: What about the Romanian contribution? How can ISOCARP, with its decennial experience in town and regional planning, actively effectively and efficiently interact with administrations, academy and practitioners in Romania?
16:30		Farewell and final Cocktail.

Annex No. 2

List of invited planners:

Alexandra Ioniță	urb.	Youngplanner	București / Râmnicu Vâlcea
Alexandra Vișinescu	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Alexandrina Retegan	arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Alexandru Bălășescu	antropolog		București
Alexandru Matei	urb.	Youngplanner	București / Brașov
Alexandru Sandru	prof. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Alina Anastasiu	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Alina Dragoescu	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Anca Ginavar	prof. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Andrei Luncan	prof. lect. arh.	S eniorplanner	Oradea
Bădescu Gruia	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Bogdan Bogoescu	arh.		București
Bogdan Suditu	dr. geogr.	S eniorplanner	București
Carmen Tănase	arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Cătălin Sârbu	prof. conf. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Cerasella Craciun	prof. conf. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Claudiu Runceanu	prep. drd. urb.	S eniorplanner	București
Constantin Enache	prof. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Coralia Mărginean	arh.	S eniorplanner	Sibiu
Cosmin Olteanu	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Cristina Cordoș	arh.	S eniorplanner	Cluj-Napoca
Cristina Zlota	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Damo Holt	dr. econ.	S eniorplanner	Netherlands
Dirk Engelke	dr. ing.	S eniorplanner	Germany
Dora Morcov	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Edmund Futo	arh.	S eniorplanner	Baia Mare
Eugen Pănescu	arh.	S eniorplanner	Cluj-Napoca
Florin Ciobanu	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Florin Gaman	prof. conf. dr. ing.	S eniorplanner	București
Florin Machedon	prof. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Florin Mureșanu	dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Gabriel Pascariu	prof. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
George Duță	urb.	Youngplanner	București / Argeș
Gheorghe Patrascu	arh-sef București	S eniorplanner	București

Giuseppe Cinà	prof. dr. arh.	Seniorplanner	Italy
Irina Cioangher	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Irina Iamandescu	prof. dr. arh.	Seniorplanner	București
Irina Popescu Criveanu	prof. arh.	Seniorplanner	București
Iulian Canov	urb.	Youngplanner	București / Tulcea
Joep de Roo	econ.	Seniorplanner	Romania / Netherlands
Livia Morega	urb. peis.	Youngplanner	București
Liviu Bailesteanu	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Liviu Ianași	prof. lect. drd.	Seniorplanner	București
Liviu Veluda	prep. urb.	Youngplanner	București
Manfred Schrenk	ing.	Seniorplanner	Austria
Meta Vandrunen	arh.	Seniorplanner	Romania / Netherlands
Mihaela Vrabete	arh.	Seniorplanner	București
Mihai Alexandru	prep. arh.	Youngplanner	București
Mircea Pricop	ing.		București
Mircea Toma	jurnalist		București
Mirela Chirac	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Monica Mureșanu	arh.	Seniorplanner	București
Monica Rădulescu	prof. conf. dr. arh.	Seniorplanner	București
Oana Luca	prof. conf. dr. ing.	Seniorplanner	București
Olivia Oprescu	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Ramona Ungureanu	urb.	Youngplanner	București / Pitetți
Simona Braniste	sociolog		
Simona Munteanu	dr. arh.	Seniorplanner	Ploiești
Smaranda Todoran	arh.	Seniorplanner	Cluj-Napoca
Șerban Dragoș Ion Țigănaș	arh.	Seniorplanner	Cluj-Napoca
Șerban Popescu Criveanu	arh.	Seniorplanner	București
Șerban Sturdza	arh.	Seniorplanner	București
Ștefan Ghenciulescu	arh.	Seniorplanner	București
Teofil Gherca	urb.	Seniorplanner	București
Tiberiu Florescu	prof. conf. dr. arh.	Seniorplanner	București

Annex No. 3

List of participants:

Alexandra Ioniță	urb.	Youngplanner	București / Râmnicu Vâlcea
Alexandra Vișinescu	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Alexandru Matei	urb.	Youngplanner	București / Brașov
Alexandru Sandu	prof. dr. arh.	Seniorplanner	București
Alina Drăgoescu	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Cătălin Sârbu	prof. conf. dr. arh.	Seniorplanner	București
Cerasella Craciun	prof. conf. dr. arh.	Seniorplanner	București
Cristina Zlota	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Dirk Engelke	dr. ing.	Seniorplanner	Germany
Dora Alexa-Morcov	urb.	Youngplanner	București
Eugen Pănescu	arh.	Seniorplanner	Cluj-Napoca

Florin Mureșanu	dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Gabriel Pascariu	prof. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
George Duță	urb.	Y oungplanner	București / Argeș
Giuseppe Cinà	prof. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	Italy
Gruia Bădescu	urb.	Y oungplanner	București
Irina Iamandescu	prof. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Iulian Canov	urb.	Y oungplanner	București / Tulcea
Joep de Roo	econ.	S eniorplanner	Romania / Netherlands
Liviu Ianăși	prof. lect. drd.	S eniorplanner	București
Manfred Schrenk	ing.	S eniorplanner	Austria
Mihaela Vrabete	arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Mircea Pricop	ing.		București
Monica Mureșanu	arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Monica Rădulescu	prof. conf. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Nicolae Lascu	prof. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Pietro Elisei	dr. ing.	S eniorplanner	Italy / Romania
Ramona Ungureanu	urb.	Y oungplanner	București / Pitești
Simona Munteanu	dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	Ploiești
Ștefan Ghenciulescu	arh.	S eniorplanner	București

Annex No. 4

Invited speakers:

Alexandru Matei	Urb.	The Coordinator Romanian young planners
Dirk Engelke	Dr. Ing.	ISOCARP, Vice-President „Ion Mincu” University of Architecture and Urbanism, Bucharest – scientific
Gabriel Pascariu	Dr. Arch.	secretary of the Faculty of Urbanism „Ion Mincu” University of Architecture and Urbanism, Bucharest – History and
Irina Iamandescu	Arch.	Theory Department.
Manfred Schrenk	Dipl. Ing.	ISOCARP, Vice President and Treasurer
Mihaela Vrabete	Arch.	Halcrow – Director of development planning and design department.
Mircea Pricop		General Manager HESPER Industrial Area
Pietro Elisei	Dr. Ing.	ISOCARP, senior member
Ștefan Ghenciulescu	Arch.	Architect, journalist and researcher in the field of architecture and urban planning.

Annex No. 5

Panel speakers at round table:

Alexandru Sandu	prof. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Cătălin Sârbu	prof. conf. dr. arh.	S eniorplanner	București
Gruia Bădescu	urb.	Y oungplanner	București
Liviu Ianăși	prof. lect. drd.	S eniorplanner	București

The Creation of the First ISOCARP Group in Romania

May 27th 2011 9am

Hesper Industrial Hall (unconventional space)

communication language: English / Romanian

BUCHAREST Str. Dr. Constantin Istrati nr. 1

The International Society of City and Regional Planners (ISOCARP) is a global association of experienced professional planners. It was founded in 1965 in a bid to bring together recognised and highly-qualified planners in an international network. The ISOCARP network brings together individual and institutional members from more than 80 countries worldwide. As a non-governmental organisation ISOCARP is recognized by the UN, UNHCS and the Council of Europe. The Society also has a formal consultative status with UNESCO.

Dr. Ing. Pietro Elisei (Italy / Romania)

Dr. Ing. Dirk Engelke (Germany)

Dipl. Ing. Manfred Schrenk (Austria)

Dr. arch. Gabriel Pascariu

Arh. Mihaela Vrabete

Arch. Irina Iamandescu

Arch. Ștefan Ghenciulescu

Dr. Arch. Giuseppe Cinà (Italy)

Urb. Alexandru Matei

