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Conclusion 247
Peer review is a method used in many fields. It happens as a matter of course when institutions seek external guidance about their own expertise from outside experts or consultants. In academia, peer review is the predominant process by which research is judged. Material is sent to relevant outside experts and is judged in relation to its contribution to the best current understandings in the field. It is a formalization of the basis by which the modern natural and social sciences have modified, built on and revolutionized knowledge. In this way, notwithstanding the hubris of modern epistemology, peer review can be positively revolutionary.

Peer review in the broad sense works best when it is complemented by peer exchange – that is by bringing field-related experts together in person to discuss basic developments in their field. The form of peer exchange that we all know best is the conference. In conjunction with circles of circulating written texts, actively discussed and debated, there is nothing more important for the development of knowledge than meaningful face-to-face exchange linked to extended dialogue. However, while peer exchange can be rich, it can also be empty. Conferences can be exciting and productive exchanges of knowledge. But often they can be empty rehearsals for banal information delivery. They can quickly descend into careersensitive jostling or acts of going through the motion.

Similarly, peer review has enormous strengths, but it also has damning problems. It can be elitist. It can be a harsh process with final decisions made one way or another based on a small number of reviewers. It is often conducted confidentially for the wrong reasons. Bad non-transparency and political closure is regularly legitimised as giving objectivity to the process or upholding commercial integrity. Peer review can lead to new knowledge being jealously regarded while old fields of knowledge are zealously guarded. It can tend towards treating knowledge development as a competitive process akin to the capitalist market. Cultural capital accrues to those who are best at getting past the reviewers. It can end with its knowledge...
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gatekeepers becoming powerful while locally applied ideas are dismissed. Through peer review, formal knowledge tends to be empowered at the expense of informal and implicit knowledge. Modern knowledge tends to be privileged over traditional or customary forms of understanding the world. It short, peer review can be deeply flawed. In practice it often does not meet the test of normative reflexivity discussed earlier (Chapter 5). However, for all of these limitations, when conducted well, peer review is the best method we have for assessing complex analytical or technical knowledge. This potential explains why peer review remains important in contemporary intellectual life.

Building on the strengths of peer review

Peer reviews are held regularly in a number of municipalities so that projects can be improved and suggestions can be made. For example, in the Philippines there is a programme known as kaakbay – which translates as ‘arm in arm’. As part of this programme, cities regularly hold peer-to-peer coaching meetings; however, these are more training sessions than forums for problem-solving processes. In India, the National Institute of Urban Affairs has been conducting peer review forums called Peer Experience and Reflective Learning (PEARL; 2014). A series of workshops have been held since 2007. These have been marginally successful, but because of lack the intensity the National Institute is seeking to reform how they are run. In the European Union some cities or member states themselves often carry out reviews on specific topics: for example on issues such as responding to homelessness or reforming health care. The European Commission sees peer reviews as a key instrument of its Social Open Method of Coordination (2014). They are promoted as enabling open discussion in the different European member states and facilitating mutual learning. However, the reports tend to be carefully written set pieces showcasing existing national activities and policies rather than deeply exploratory and problem oriented.

Peer review is therefore not a new method for cities, nor is it unproblematic. However, with refinement it can work well. The test of practical usefulness (also discussed in Chapter 5) comes in here very strongly. In many cases, peer review is too expensive and too demanding. Important individuals are paid large sums of money, afforded business-class airfares and asked to attend multiple meetings. Consultants are enlisted at considerable expense to interview relevant participants and review processes, only to find that the final report tells you little more than what you and your colleagues imparted to the consultants in the first place. In effect, the consultancy legitimizes the decision that you already want to make. In a context of competitive judgement, multiple meetings, workshops lasting five or more days, extensive interviews with resource persons and comparative benchmarking are necessary but demanding. In any case, cities have such different starting points of framework conditions that establishing benchmarks is a very difficult process.

The peer review process developed here is a response to these strengths and weaknesses. The Circles of Sustainability peer-review process takes the robustness of
peer reviewing and carefully qualifies its weaknesses. In this process developed by a Metropolis-Cities Programme team led by the City of Berlin the focus is on a major project in a city. Ideally this project should be in early development or at a critical juncture in its operation. This qualifies one of the common weaknesses of peer exchange events – empty rehearsals of information in gatherings where there is little immediately at stake beyond the cultural capital of the people in the room. This peer-review process is intended to have consequences.

With the Circles peer-review process, recommendations and ideas for the project under review are developed based on the peers’ own experience. These are offered as reciprocal ‘gifts’ to the host city. The process builds on a very practical basis: the feedback given by the experts derives from their everyday working lives and from their long years of practical experience. Which of their recommendations will later be implemented and adapted to the city’s needs depends on the host city. This means that the peers in this process are not scrutinizers. They are not critics on whose judgement good and bad news depends. Rather, they are something like critical friends involved in a circle of knowledge exchange. Peers know from experience how difficult it can sometimes be to avoid tripwires and hurdles when putting a project into practice. This knowledge is treated as reciprocal. In the process they also learn themselves by comparing their experience to the experience of others. By being ‘given’ a privileged insiders’ warts-and-all introduction to a city’s plans and project development, they learn in ways that are quite unique. Akin in some ways to Médecins sans Frontières, this process involves ‘peers crossing borders’.

Phases in the peer-review process

The peer-review process follows the same seven-stage method as previously outlined (Chapter 6), but as with all our methods it is not a pathway to be followed mechanically. In the following description, the high-level definitions of the stages remain as previously expressed, but each is elaborated with specific recommendations for practice based on extensive field experience.

The simplified process presented here begins with written preliminary documentation of the project prepared by the host city and distributed to the peers before they come to see the project. The process then includes a concentrated period – optimally, two or three days – during which the peers are immersed in the on-the-ground reality of the project and then have time to work through what they have seen with local experts and practitioners in an extended round of discussion. A report on outcomes and recommendations is produced in the aftermath.

Commit to responding creatively to a complex or seemingly intractable problem.

Because the peer-review process asks cities to open their work to a critical group of outsiders, taking on this process takes commitment – commitment of time and resources, commitment to openness and creatively and commitment to rethinking
current plans rather than just showcasing best practices. Once a project or programme of activity has been identified that is suitable for a peer review, the host city spends considerable time preparing a written overview of that project to present to the peers. This has the virtue of giving project managers time to reflect: it is not the usual cut-and-paste process, taking stuff off the website that has been used to document success. Key figures involved in the project need to commit to the documentary preparation and to two or three days of hosting the peers.

Projects in a very early stage of implementation are most suitable for being reviewed. Such projects tend to be open to adjustment, reorientation and even reversals. They have not proceeded so far as to make reorientation or basic change counterproductive. Ideally, enough has been developed on the ground to see the future and to assess how locals are responding to the project. Alternatively, projects that face seemingly intractable forces or barriers are potentially given new efficacy by the process, as are projects that are a critical junctures, or projects that have become too complex to see possible gains.

Engage local and global partners in the process of responding to the provisionally identified main issue.

A peer review at city level is a structured method aimed at extending mutual learning about a particular project or programme. Peers are invited on this basis. The process involves both review and exchange – possibly ongoing interchange. The success of the process turns substantially on appropriate peers being identified and then accepting the invitation in the collaborative spirit that it is extended. The invited team of around four to seven experts should include a range of people with skills oriented around two emphases: working with parallel projects and thinking broadly about the social whole. This means firstly engaging colleagues from other municipalities, technical experts, who know directly about the chosen general issue and its working intricacies. Secondly, and just as importantly, it means involving individuals with generalizing cross-domain knowledge that goes beyond the immediate project. One of these people, preferably a person with experience in peer reviewing should be named as the workshop facilitator. For example in the peer-review process conducted in Johannesburg in 2013, the subject was a Bus-Rapid-Transit system called Rea Vaya. Three comparable peers, all involved in developing and running bus services came to Johannesburg from Ahmedabad, Lagos and Mexico City. Additionally, there were three generalizing peers with more generic knowledge about urban sustainability, planning and liveability who came from Berlin and Melbourne – one of whom served as the facilitator for the two-day workshop.

As a general rule, most comparable peers come from cities that are facing comparable problems, working in a similar environment. Each peer is familiar with the project topic and contributes his or her own viewpoint and experience. The host city thus has an opportunity to see its urban project or practice through the eyes of
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others in a way that can enhance the activities locally. The peers, on the other hand, are presented with a chance to reflect on their own practices as they give advice to the host city project and bring to bear examples from their own cities.

Assess the nature of the problem, and analyse the current situation in relation to the general issue in contention across all social domains.

The assessment stage is conducted from two main perspectives: internal and external. The internal assessment begins with an initial report written by local practitioners and experts of the host city. This report is crucial for giving the external peers insight into the machinations of the project. It also allows them to think about the comparable examples from their own cities and about how lessons might be transferred. The report should give answers to the following questions:

- What is the project about? This means giving a short overview of the structure of the project or programme under review. It becomes a summary of the whole initial report.
- How does the project relate to the whole of the city?
- What are the main objectives of the project or programme? What is it trying to achieve?
- What are the main critical issues that it is confronting: ecologically, politically and culturally?
- What are the corresponding planned and/or already implemented concrete actions to respond to those critical issues?
- What are the concrete objectives of these actions?
- What tools and instruments are used to meet these objectives?
- Which actors and stakeholders are included?
- What are the expected and already existing results?
- What pitfalls and problems, barriers and drivers were experienced during the process of implementing the project?
- What are and what were concrete solutions to overcome these barriers? How did people make use of the drivers?
- What questions still exist? What answers are expected from the peer review?

If a city has the capacity, it is a distinct advantage to also develop an urban profile of the whole city before the peer-review meeting (see Chapter 7). This enables the project to be seen figuratively and dramatically in the context of the strengths and weaknesses of the city.

The external perspective on the assessment, begins with the peers reading the initial report and then continues into the first period of the peer-review workshop (usually the first day of two) when the peers are afforded a detailed and comprehensive introduction to the project, including through presentations, site visits and the possibility of talking to people on the ground: workers, customers, users, locals – people who are affected by the project or programme. In the evening it is an advantage for
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the outside peers and those centrally involved in the project to socialize and share food together. During this first day in the city, working relationship are being initiated:

• An atmosphere of collegiality is being created that enables trust and open, problem-oriented discussions
• A milieu of knowledge exchange is developing, where peers get the chance to deepen their understanding of the project through formal presentations, informal discussion and site visits

**Define** the terms of the problem, and identify the most important critical issues that will provide the focus of action in relation to the general issue.

The definition stage is done mutually with the internal and external experts working together in discussion. It has two main phases. The first is to interrogate the critical issues that are affecting the project and refine what the city hopes to do about them (as critical objectives). This can be done in the first couple of hours of the second day (if two days is the chosen length of the workshop). Refining the critical issues and objectives that affect the project and then testing the relationship between those critical objectives is often more revealing that is usually expected. In fact, while assessing the compatibility of critical objectives and resolving possible tensions between them is fundamental to the success of any project, it is usually handled tacitly rather than as a focused event. Such tensions always exist in some way, but they often they go unrecognized. In this phase it is worthwhile to test the range of critical issues and objectives against the four domains of the circle.

This stage in the peer-review process serves in particular to highlight patterns of strengths, consequence and tensions between different objectives. For example to take the usual elephant in the room, economic growth is often assumed as one of the objectives of urban development projects, but it is normally associated with increased use of non-renewable resources, which is incompatible with environmental sustainability, another common objective. Although this seems obvious when made explicit it is usually left unacknowledged. Explicitly recognizing the most salient of these tensions enhances the possibility that the city will be fully aware of countervailing forces and contradictory objectives, and thus policymakers, practitioners, and engaged locals can find ways to negotiate between these tensions or mitigate possible problems.

For example in the peer-review process conducted in Johannesburg in 2013 in relation to its Bus-Rapid-Transit system, Rea Vaya, twenty main issues were identified. They are represented in summary form in Table 9.1 with each critical objective mapped against every other critical objective. The key points in tension are shown with a ‘−’ sign, while the objectives that are mutually reinforcing are designated with a ‘+’ and those which are neutral in relation to each other are marked with ‘o’.
### Table 9.1: Objectives Compatibility Matrix

| Critical Objectives                                                                 | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  | 20   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Managing dispersal of urban settlement                                              |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Finding space for bus rapid transit corridors                                       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Decreasing pollution, carbon emissions                                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Decreasing costs – overall service                                                  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Decreasing costs – maintenance                                                      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Increasing financial sustainability                                                 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Increasing patronage numbers                                                        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Decreasing social inequity                                                          |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Decreasing turnover of staff                                                         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Increasing infrastructure quality                                                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Achieving integrated planning                                                       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Decreasing conflict with minibus drivers                                            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Facilitating good negotiation with bus companies                                    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Facilitating good negotiation with bus drivers                                     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Decreasing corruption                                                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Enhancing training                                                                  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Overcoming mini-bus culture – drivers                                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Overcoming mini-bus culture – passengers                                            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Redirecting car-driving culture                                                     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Responding to cash-oriented culture                                                 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

Key:
- Not relevant (doubling up)
- Neutral
- Compatible (positive) +
- In Tension
Analysis of these critical-issue relationships can be extensive and worked through in detail in a full process report. However, here we have only the space to make some of the more stark points that are revealed by the mapping. In positive terms, the three most important issues concerning the Rea Vaya are decreasing inequality, maintaining infrastructure quality and improving integrated planning. These are closely followed by the importance of responding to urban sprawl and planning for space around urban corridors for transport-oriented development. This was not self-evident in the questions that the Rea Vaya project managers presented as the key issues in their preliminary report. Given the self-assessed strengths in the political area including organization and governance as shown in the urban profile process figure (see Figure 9.1 in this chapter’s case study) building on that strength with a bold vision to respond to those five objectives in a manifold way becomes paramount. The most complicated issues are decreasing the cost of the overall service and decreasing carbon emissions. Again this requires considerable teasing out and further analysis, but it can be readily seen from Table 9.1 that there are nine points where objectives in obvious tension. These provide focus points for follow-up work after the workshop if the city so chooses.

The second phase in the definition stage is for the peers to present possible answers to questions formulated by the host city and raised during the process of refining the critical objectives. This is done based on their own project experience. Usually this review takes the second half of the second day. The workshop closes with a summary and votes of thanks.

Implement measures to respond to the problem, and authorize the various aspects of the plan and its subprojects within project parameters.

This stage and the next are for the host city to decide based on their own judgement and the oral and written advice provided by the peer-review process

Measure and monitor activities, and assess progress towards achieving the normative goal and objectives of the project.

Communicate progress and strategies in relation to the project through public documentation, publication and through engagement with stakeholders.

A key aspect of the communication stage is the writing and public dissemination of a final report on the recommendations. Ideally, a written report on the whole exercise should more broadly contextualize the recommendations and discuss the complexities of the project and its setting. However, what is really important for a peer review is that the host city informs the peers about which of their recommendations and suggestions are going to be implemented in the project. It would, of course, be positive for ideas to continue to be exchanged and further activities to be planned for after the review workshop, but in the busy working lives of such practitioners this is not always possible. Nevertheless, in a short period of the
process, through intensive, open, trustful exchange of professional opinion, peer review can be the initial catalyst for fruitful cooperation among all those who were involved in the exercise – between the host and the peer cities and between individuals.

Conducted with reflexive care the peer-review process should have positive outcomes. First, it offers an enriching learning experience by opening up opportunities to work both generally across the critical issues that pertain to a project and to delve deeply into the praxis-relevant experience of others in dealing with relevant problems confronted in the day-to-day work of a project. For example, it can extend a rounded understanding of the local steering regulations and organizational frameworks acquired through working through legal and administrative challenges in comparable contexts. Second, it provides a forum for intensive exchange between individual practitioners who examine and explore each other’s practices and at the same time are called on to reflect on the situation in their own municipalities. This collegial relationship is ideally carried forward as the project progresses. Third, it enables those people whose project is currently being reviewed to be able to react more freely to questioning and recommendations given by their peers than would be the case with directions from a consultant or from a government representative, both of whom are more remote from everyday realities of the project. Fourth, it opens up new perspectives upon local debates. The fact that peers as external players can take a relatively neutral point of view in relation to local politics and local practices increases both the possibilities for creative learning and the credibility of the evaluation process. And fifth, it validates local work by experts with regard to the local practices, while providing support in important areas of global protocol and process, for example in the form of suggesting new instruments or techniques.

Overall, the peer-review process can provide a simplified structure and cooperative ongoing relations for sound evaluation of a project that leads to a more integrated and holistic vision of what is possible. It is often simple expert assurances or realignments that make the difference. Often it is the emboldening of a vision that needs to be stronger. Technically brilliant city projects do not necessarily make for great cities.
CASE STUDY: JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA

Johannesburg began its massive development under oppressive apartheid. In 1975, Ponte City, a cylindrical skyscraper of fifty-four storeys, was built in the white’s-only area of Hillbrow, making it the highest residential tower in Africa. In the same year, the Western Bypass section of the N1 was completed as a route around the city centre to access Witwatersrand. Construction began in that year on the M1 De Villiers Graaff freeway connecting the south including Soweto to the city centre and extending to Sandton, the wealthy northern commercial centre of Johannesburg. All of these infrastructure developments became carriers of the post-apartheid spatial heritage of the city. In the south the poor continue to live in concrete shacks and have limited work, and in the north, the wealthy work in modern commercial buildings and go home to green leafy suburbs. Service jobs connected the two zones. These jobs are available to those in the south who can bear the heavy peak travelling times between the south and the north.

Johannesburg is now a much more positively inclusive and liveable city than under apartheid (see Figure 9.1), but there is much to be done. Today, long after the end of formal separate development, the prior configuration of stark spatial separation continues to confront the city. There are no walls dividing people, but the effect is no less confronting. The south-west freeway has just been massively upgraded, linking working-class Soweto and the downtown area of Johannesburg. But between them is a nether zone of continuing mining operations, slag heaps and undermined wastelands. These are bad lands where building will require considerable engineering care.

Urban development in Johannesburg now stretches along two axes. One projection focuses on the north and continues the spatial divide between the concrete shacks and commercial high-rises. Recently, a Hong Kong–based company, Shanghai Zendai Property Ltd, announced its intention to build an alternative financial centre to the Sandton business district (Crowley 2013). It will be ‘on par with cities like New York and Hong Kong in the Far East’, said Dai Zhikang, chairman of the company. What is intended is a gateway for Chinese firms investing in sub-Saharan Africa. This kind of development confirms the development of a dual city. The second axis pushes to the south-west into a vast zone of badly serviced suburbs for the poor.

This is the dual reality of the city. It is a metropolis with one of the highest levels of inequality in the world. Currently Johannesburg has 4.4 million inhabitants and a population growth rate of 3.4 per cent. A high proportion of those people are poor, with approximately 30 per cent unemployment and 67.4 per cent of households with an income of less than R3,200 per month. Consequently, and in line with national and provincial planning paradigms,
the city launched a ‘Growth and Development Strategy’ with a long-term vision to make ‘Johannesburg as a world-class African city of the future – a vibrant, economically inclusive and multi-cultural African city; a city that provides real quality of life, for all its citizens’ by 2040.

This led to the Department of Transport redefining its development goals:

- Building a leading, responsive and activist transportation sector in the city which works in partnership with stakeholders and residents
- Planning, policies and coordination for integrated and sustainable transport
- Promoting public transport, walking and cycling as modes of choice
- Building co-responsibility and a value-based culture to enable behavioural change towards transport issues
• Providing high-quality, safe, accessible, affordable and environmentally friendly public transport services
• Building, maintaining and managing the road infrastructure and systems to ensure safety, accessibility and mobility for all road users including pedestrians
• Transforming the construction, maintenance and management of storm water to respond to climate change and water scarcity and ensure the safety of residents and infrastructure
• Building, maintaining and managing public transport and non-motorized transport infrastructure to support walking, cycling and the use of public transport

The modal split between different modes of transport assessed in 2002 showed that, for non-car use, 47 per cent of the 35 million daily trips were made by public transport, whereas 72 per cent of them are made with privately operated vans. The vans had the advantage of flexibility, but they were often controlled by gangs, were polluting and were unsafe.

A fast bus system (a Bus-Rapid-Transit or BRT system) called the Rea Vaya was initiated in 2006, and three years later in August 2009 the first dedicated trunk route was operationalized from Soweto to the inner city of Johannesburg. Today this Phase 1A service carries 43,000 passengers per day and travels 6.5 million kilometres per annum on the trunk line, as well as linking to feeder routes and complementary slower buses. The decision on the selection of the route was influenced by the fact that it is a high-demand corridor linking Soweto to Sandton and thus the poor south with the rich north. Moreover, it linked the Soccer City and Ellis Park Stadiums to the ‘accommodation hub’ in Sandton during the FIFA World Cup in 2010.

Linking this back to the sustainability profile of Johannesburg (Figure 9.1), what the profile suggests is that there are critical issues that are less than satisfactory in Johannesburg pertaining to the areas of built form and transport; embodiment and sustenance, particularly relating to physical health of urban residents; emissions and waste; materials and energy, both connected to car and van dependency; and wealth and distribution. There is only space here to give the broadest response and explanation (leaving out much interpretive work that lies beneath the surface of this figure). However, in short, what the analysis tells us is that the Rea Vaya project could possibly have a central strategic position in relation to these critical issues.

More than a bus infrastructure project, the Rea Vaya needs to be considered in response to some fundamental ecological issues, and the basic economic issue of wealth distribution in the city supported by a skewed built form. If the Rea Vaya can change the spatial separation between the poorer
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South-west and the wealthier north, if the Rea Vaya can contribute to reducing carbon emissions and particulate emission and decrease dependency on heavy fossil-fuel use by cars, and if the Rea Vaya can be part of changing how people move around the city – then it could potentially make a substantial difference to improving the ecological and economic sustainability of the city. The heartening part of the analysis indicates that in the political domain there is the will, capacity and potential community engagement to develop the Rea Vaya in a way that could make a substantial difference.

Concretely the city has set up a strategy to identify and map the whole network of public transport, freight, walking and cycling corridors and nodes, and to identify the most appropriate mode, routes and services that will be contracted or licensed to operate in each corridor. Over time it will construct and develop already-identified public transport corridors and focus on the Rea Vaya system.

However, what the peer-review process conducted in 2013 suggested was that the vision needed to be even bigger. For all of its technical ecological innovations, it needed to give the bus service political edge and cultural identity. Patronage and cultural identification with the Rea Vaya continues to be limited. People in the south see it as just a fancy bus service. They are suspicious of the credit card system used to pay for the bus. The review confirmed that the integrated transport hubs and bus stations need to be associated with fully realized transport-oriented development. That is, it needed to develop a public vision projecting use of the stations as places around which to build carefully designed housing estates that will bring poor and well-off citizens into a living association. In 2013, in association with this kind of thinking, the main transit corridors for the Rea Vaya BRT were thus given the additional name of ‘Corridors of Freedom’ – with a vision to integrate disadvantaged people by providing affordable access to mobility.

Notes

1 The co-authors of this chapter are Han-Uve Schwedler, Michael Abraham and Barbara Berninger with Paul James.

2 The Johannesburg peer-review process was carried out within the context of the Berlin Metropolis Initiative ‘Integrated Urban Governance—Successful Policy Transfer’ in cooperation with the city of Johannesburg. The mayors of both cities, Mr Parks Tau from Johannesburg and Mr Michael Müller from Berlin, agreed at the Metropolis Board of Directors Meeting in Guangzhou in 2012 to organize this workshop conjointly in order to review the Johannesburg Bus-Rapid-Transit system and hold it concurrently with the Metropolis Annual Meeting in Johannesburg in 2013.
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