POLITECNICO DI TORINO
Repository ISTITUZIONALE

Global urban development frameworks landing in Latin America: Insights from Ecuador and Bolivia

Original
Global urban development frameworks landing in Latin America: Insights from Ecuador and Bolivia / Blanc, F., Cotella, G.. - In: DEVELOPMENT POLICY REVIEW. - ISSN 1467-7679. - 00:e12632(2022), pp. 1-18. [10.1111/dpr.12632]

Availability:
This version is available at: 11583/2960645 since: 2022-08-31T17:02:20Z

Publisher:
Wiley - Blackwell publishing

Published
DOI:10.1111/dpr.12632

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

13 October 2026

Check for updates

Received: 26 August 2021 | Accepted: 28 March 2022

DOI: 10.1111/dpr.12632

ARTICLE

WILEY

Global urban development frameworks landing in Latin America: Insights from Ecuador and Bolivia

Francesca Blanc[1] | **Giancarlo Cotella**[2]

[1]Interuniversity Department of Regional and Urban Studies and Planning (DIST), Politecnico di Torino, Italy

[2]Interuniversity Department of Regional and Urban Studies and Planning (DIST), Politecnico di Torino, Italy

Correspondence
Francesca Blanc, Interuniversity Department of Regional and Urban Studies and Planning (DIST), Politecnico di Torino, Viale Mattioli 39, 10125 Torino, Italy.
Email: francesca.blanc@polito.it

Summary

Motivation: The global urban development frameworks defined by the United Nations are circulating worldwide and a race towards their domestic adoption has arisen since the approval of the New Urban Agenda and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Their institutionalization at the domestic level is favoured by the rather aseptic "urban paradigm shift" that these documents present. However, the process according to which this happens is subject to path-dependent logics and varies from one context to another.

Purpose: Stemming from the policy mobilities literature, the article explores the role that "pasteurized" urban narratives play in the domestic institutionalization of the global urban development frameworks. At the same time, it analyses how domestic institutional configurations have influenced their differential implementation in two Latin American countries.

Methods and approach: The article details the cases of the Ecuadorian National Urban Agenda and the Bolivian National Urban Policy, employing a mixed methodology that includes participant observation, consultancy activities, desk-research, and semi-structured interviews.

Findings: The analysis findings show that, on the one hand, the "comfortable landscape" offered by the "pasteurized concepts" that comprise the global urban development

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2022 The Authors. *Development Policy Review* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of ODI.

frameworks served as a "coalition magnet" favouring the building of consensus among stakeholders with rather different positions. On the other hand, however, this may result in a "fast-track institutionalization" that prevents the concrete engagement of local governments in the process, in turn undermining the relevance of the results achieved.

Policy implications: Whereas further comparative research on the institutionalization of global urban development frameworks in Latin America and beyond is certainly needed, to further understand the hidden pitfalls of their domestic adoption, the evidence presented may contribute to inform the action of policy-makers and practitioners dealing with their implementation at all levels.

KEYWORDS
institutionalization, Latin America, path dependence, policy mobilities, urban development

1 | INTRODUCTION

Cities are increasingly regarded as "the core of the planet's future" (Parnell et al., 2018, p. 1) and "the everyday reality of the twenty-first-century urban is, out of necessity, the focus on the cities of the global south" (Ibid., p. 7). In order to address the future of cities, on the occasion of the Habitat III conference that took place in Quito in 2016, the United Nations approved the New Urban Agenda, drawing on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN, 2015), aiming at the promotion of a worldwide "urban paradigm shift" (UN, 2017). National Urban Policies (NUPs) "emerged from Habitat III as the instrument with which to give meaning to the recognition that national governments can enhance the success of all cities" (Cartwright et al., 2018, p. 26) and a widespread race towards their adoption has since then been triggered, involving in particular lower-middle and upper-middle-income countries (LMICs and UMICs), irrespective of their political leanings.

The implementation of global urban development frameworks at the domestic level has been mostly described as a top-down activity (Barnett & Parnell, 2016; Caprotti et al., 2017; Kaika, 2017; Novovic, 2021), favoured by the "pasteurized" narratives (Peck & Theodore, 2015) that they bring forward—e.g. the "right to the city" discourse (Kuymulu, 2013; Turok & Scheba, 2018)—albeit leading to rather questionable results (Cartwright et al., 2018). In this article, we argue that, whereas pasteurized urban narratives function as a "coalition magnet" (Silvestre & Jajamovich, 2021) that favours the consolidation of an "overlapping consensus" (Barnett & Parnell, 2016) over the domestic institutionalization of global urban development frameworks, the actual course that this process follows in a given country is shaped by path-dependent logics, in turn leading to differential outcomes.

To support our argument, we examine and compare the development and institutionalization of two national urban development documents, namely the Ecuadorian National Urban Agenda (Ministerio de Desarrollo Urbano y Vivienda, 2020) and the Bolivian National Urban Policy (Ministerio de Obras Públicas, Servicios y Vivienda, 2020) that are similar to many domestic implementations of the global urban development frameworks defined by the United Nations (i.e. the New Urban Agenda and the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development, in particular SDG 11). In doing so, we engage with the policy mobilities literature focusing on the worldwide circulation of urban policies and best urban practices (Jajamovich, 2013; Jajamovich & Delgadillo, 2020; McCann, 2011; Montero, 2020; Stone et al., 2020;

Wood, 2015) and on its framing as a "global-local assembling process" (Temenos & McCann, 2013) frequently subject to "pasteurization" (Peck & Theodore, 2015). In greater detail, we draw on and combine the outcomes of two recent studies focusing on the Latin American context, one considering the role of mobile policies as a tool for coalition building (Silvestre & Jajamovich, 2021) and the other warning about the perils of the "fast-track institutionalization" in policy circulation (Whitney & López-García, 2020). When doing so, we devote particular attention to the "silenced" institutional configurations (Montero & Baiocchi, 2021) that influence the domestic path-dependent landing of global urban development frameworks (Forestier & Kim, 2020; Horn & Grugel, 2018).

Ecuador and Bolivia constitute two interesting and underexplored case studies among Latin American LMICs and UMICs. They are both in the Andean region and for more than a decade have been undergoing important reforms, which started with the approval of new political constitutions around the *Buen Vivir/Vivir Bien* paradigm,[1] in 2008 and 2009 respectively (República del Ecuador, 2008; Asamblea Constituyente de Bolivia, 2009), and have since then led to the decentralization of the territorial administration system, in line with a process that had already started in the 20th century. As the article will argue, the Ecuadorian National Urban Agenda (*Agenda Hábitat Sostenible Ecuador 2036*) and the Bolivian National Urban Policy (*Política Nacional de Desarrollo Integral de Ciudades*) tap into these ongoing processes of governance and institutionalization, hence offering relevant case studies in relation to our main focus.

Following this introduction, in Section 2 we detail the theoretical framework upon which our work is based, and in Section 3 the methodology we employed. Then we reveal in Sections 4 and 5 the processes behind the development of the Ecuadorian National Urban Agenda and of the Bolivian National Urban Policy. In Section 6 we discuss the findings of our research, by addressing two critical aspects emerging from the case studies: (1) the frequent "pasteurization" (Peck & Theodore, 2015) of the concepts and the resulting "comfortable landscape of the SDGs'" —as framed by a senior development researcher— stemming from the global urban development frameworks act as a "coalition magnet" (Silvestre & Jajamovich, 2021) towards the construction of consensus among stakeholders with very different positions (Barnett & Parnell, 2016); (2) at the same time, when the process follows a "fast-track institutionalization" (Whitney & López-García, 2020), it prevents the concrete engagement of local governments, in so doing potentially undermining the relevance of the result achieved. Finally, a concluding Section 7 rounds off the article, arguing for the need for further comparative research on the domestic implementation of global urban development frameworks to reveal the potential pitfalls that may be hidden in the process.

2 | CIRCULATING GLOBAL URBAN DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS

The New Urban Agenda (UN, 2017) and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN, 2015) opened the path to various critical academic contributions, which have focused on their seemingly neutral contents as well as on their questionable implementation at the domestic level (Caprotti et al., 2017; Cartwright et al., 2018; Novovic, 2021). On the one hand, Kaika (2017) drew critical attention to the fact that the concepts of "resilience, safety, inclusiveness and sustainability" are undeniably allocated "from those in power to those in need," in so doing following a rather top-down approach (Kaika, 2017, p. 98). On the other hand, other authors have highlighted how the implementation of the SDGs is often subjected to a "cherry-picking" process, finalized to the selective legitimization of existing domestic interests and priorities (Forestier & Kim, 2020) and to the actual fit with "domestic governance structures" and ongoing decentralization patterns (Berisha et al., 2022; Horn & Grugel, 2018). According to Barnett and Parnell, the Urban SDG (SDG 11) is itself "a product of a fluid alliance of interests and organizations that generated a coherent pro-urban discourse through which to assert the importance of cities in future development policy agendas" (Barnett & Parnell, 2016, p. 89). The "impulse towards inclusivity" for complying with many different positionalities

[1]The Ecuadorian *Buen Vivir* and the Bolivian *Vivir Bien* concepts (both translated as "Good Living" in English) take direct inspiration from the worldview of the indigenous communities in various Latin American countries. Whereas the potential of this paradigm to produce a change of the ongoing development dynamics is subject to debate (Radcliffe, 2012; Walsh, 2010), Ecuador and Bolivia are to date the only two countries that have included this paradigm into their constitutions, hence constituting interesting cases to explore the implications and limits of its operationalization.

has resulted in what Barnett and Parnell (2016) call "overlapping consensus," hiding what are conflicting positions. Similarly, Dagnino (2010) has warned about the "perverse confluence" between neoliberal and democratic participatory projects in Latin America, merged under the meaning of "citizenship," which has been nuanced and applied by governments with very different political leanings.

The NUPs "emerged from Habitat III as the instrument with which to give meaning to the recognition that national governments can enhance the success of all cities" (Cartwright et al., 2018, p. 26), and quickly led to a race around the world towards the formulation of such documents, in particular in relation to LMICs and UMICs. More in detail, according to the National Urban Policy Database developed by the United Nations (2021), as many as 160 countries of the 194 included in the world database are engaged in the process at the time of writing. In Latin America and the Caribbean, of a total of 33 countries, eight are already implementing their NUPs (Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Uruguay, and Venezuela); seven countries are formulating them (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Paraguay, and Peru); three are developing feasibility studies (El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti) and one is going through the diagnosis stage (Panama). When it comes to other LMICs and UMICs, the numbers are even higher: across sub-Saharan Africa, for instance, 85% of these countries embraced NUPs, with more than a 60% that are already implementing or monitoring and evaluating them.

Whereas, at first glance, the development of NUPs may resemble "donor-funded tick-box compliance" (Cartwright et al., 2018, p. 12), the domestic institutionalization of global urban development frameworks that occurs through the latter follows peculiar path-dependent logics that are worth investigating. To shed light on the matter, we substantiate critical instances of the implementation of global urban development frameworks with concepts stemming from the literature on policy mobilities, and in particular from a number of recent works focusing on the Latin American context (Jajamovich, 2013; Jajamovich & Delgadillo, 2020; Montero, 2020; Montero & Baiocchi, 2021; Stone et al., 2020; Whitney & López-García, 2020; Wood, 2015). In line with Montero's work (2020), we argue that the international organizations and the multilateral donors involved in the "global circuits of knowledge" (McCann, 2011; McCann & Ward, 2012, 2013) are crucial in selecting what narrative, concepts, and practices will travel, favouring at the same time their "pasteurization" (Peck & Theodore, 2015). Then we adopt the concept of policies as "coalition magnet," highlighted by Silvestre and Jajamovich (2021) to describe the application of the "Barcelona model"[2] to a number of Argentinian and Brazilian cities, and explore how the pasteurized urban narratives that compose global urban development frameworks manage to quickly and easily merge different positions towards an "overlapping consensus" (Barnett & Parnell, 2016).

Finally, we dig into the "silenced" institutional conditions (Montero & Baiocchi, 2021) that have influenced their differential institutionalization, to explore the implication of path dependence (Pierson, 2000; Sorensen, 2020), understood as "self-reinforcing pathways of institutional development" (Sorensen, 2018, p. 618) due to policy choices made long ago that influence present possibilities and limitations (Sorensen, 2018), as already undertaken by other scholars in the analysis of the SDGs' domestic implementation (Horn & Grugel, 2018; Tosun & Leininger, 2017). In doing so, we borrow the concept of a "fast-track" (as opposed to incremental) institutionalization, as framed by Whitney and López-García (2020) in relation to the adoption (and possible failures) of best urban practices by local Mexican urban agencies, to highlight the risks that such a process encompasses.

3 | METHODOLOGY

This article is the result of the combination of: (1) the participant observation developed in 2018 when one of the authors worked as a consultant for the UN-Habitat office in La Paz, Bolivia; (2) the consultancy activities developed

[2]The "Barcelona model" refers to the urban transformation introduced by the City Government since the 1992 Olympic Games, and particularly related to the urban waterfront renovation. It has become a global model for urban transformation. Buenos Aires (Argentina) and Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) are two cities that have looked to the "Barcelona model" for their own urban renovation strategies.

in Ecuador since 2011 as part of the UNESCO Chair on Intermediary Cities; (3) a thorough document review of the global urban development frameworks promoted by the United Nations and the Bolivian and Ecuadorian relevant policy documents; and (4) a total of 30 semi-structured interviews with relevant stakeholders who have been involved in the formulation of the Bolivian National Urban Policy and the Ecuadorian National Urban Agenda.

The authors have been involved in the Ecuadorian and the Bolivian urban debates, particularly in the formulation of some of their urban development policy documents. Since 2011, the first author has been involved with the UNESCO Chair on Intermediary Cities on the development of seminars and peer-to-peer learning activities, promoting the circulation of "best urban practices" among Ecuadorian intermediary cities and the implementation of the national spatial planning law approved in 2016. Furthermore, in 2018 the same author was involved in consultancy activities related to the preliminary diagnostic phase of the Bolivian National Urban Policy.

On the one hand, this insider perspective facilitated access to information and the engagement of the interviewees. On the other hand, the overlap between the role and activity of the researchers and the object of research has raised a number of ethical and methodological challenges (Lapdat, 2017; Whitney, 2022), in particular in relation to the use of working materials and the possible bias deriving from the role played in the process. To overcome these challenges, the article draws only on documents and materials that were made publicly available. The possible bias deriving from the insider role played by the first author have been addressed through repeated feedback from former colleagues and interviews, as well as through the interaction with the second author. Furthermore, the information deriving from the interviews and the participant observation were triangulated with the results of the analysis of relevant legislative and policy documents from the selected countries.

The semi-structured interviews were conducted from the end of 2019 to mid-2021 by telephone or through digital communication platforms, and concerned relevant stakeholders from national and local governments, international organizations, universities, and representatives of citizens' organizations who were involved in the formulation of the Ecuadorian National Urban Agenda and the Bolivian National Urban Policy. The interviews concerned the role played by the different stakeholders, the rationale and contents of the documents and their compliance with the global urban development frameworks, the process behind their approval and the following implementation phase. All interviewees were informed from the beginning as to the reasons for undertaking the interviews, and all quotes deriving from the latter have been explicitly authorized.

4 | THE ECUADORIAN NATIONAL URBAN AGENDA

From the right to the city to the "leaving no one behind" discourse

> "One of the main problems in the country at the moment is the urban chaos and disorder. This is the reason why we propose an urban revolution." (SENPLADES, 2013)[3]

The "urban revolution" in Ecuador started in the second half of the 2000s, with the election of Correa's government in 2007 and the undertaking of the so-called "citizens' revolution," a national development strategy aiming at reforming existing institutions and ameliorating infrastructures and the implementation of public welfare (Ayllón Pino, 2014). In 2008 the country approved a new political Constitution based on the *Buen Vivir* paradigm and acknowledging the right to the city, among other human rights. In 2016, the "urban revolution" led to the enactment of the country's first spatial planning law—the so-called LOOTUGS (*Ley orgánica de ordenamiento territorial, uso y gestión de suelo*) (Blanc, 2022; República del Ecuador, 2016) and, in the same year, the country hosted the Habitat III Conference on Sustainable Urban Development that paved the way for the approval of the United Nations' New

[3]Original Spanish version: 'Uno de los problemas principales del país en este momento es el caos y el desorden urbanístico. Esa es la razón por la cual proponemos una revolución urbana.' (SENPLADES, 2013)

Urban Agenda (UN, 2017). These subsequent steps contributed to the progressive intertwining of the fulfilment of the right to the city promoted by both the Constitution (Art. 31) and the LOOTUGS (Art. 1) to the United Nations' "leaving no one behind" discourse, as had already happened in other countries (Turok & Scheba, 2018).[4]

The resulting discourse inspired the development of the Ecuadorian National Urban Agenda (*Agenda Hábitat Sostenible del Ecuador 2036*),[5] which was launched in 2020 by the Ministry of Urban Development and Housing (*Ministerio de Desarrollo Urbano y Vivienda*, MIDUVI) and the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit* (GIZ) GmbH. German co-operation aid funded the National Urban Agenda formulation within a broader programme called *Ciudades Intermedias Sostenibles* (Sustainable Intermediate Cities) (Llop et al., 2019; GIZ,n.d.). Its main goal has been to strengthen the enabling conditions for more sustainable urban development in Ecuador, in line with the narratives brought forward by the New Urban Agenda, the SDGs, and the Paris Agreement.

Within the precarious political scenario that characterized the post-Correa period, the action of the German co-operation aid agency and its legitimacy made it possible to bring very different positions to some convergence on the contents of the document. In this sense, in the hands of GIZ, the National Urban Agenda has functioned as a "coalition magnet" (Silvestre & Jajamovich, 2021) towards "a wider acceptance of the SDGs," as a senior Ecuadorian academic put it in conversation in October 2020.

4.1 | A process of incremental institutionalization

As argued by Horn and Grugel (2018, p. 74), in Ecuador there "is particularly strong engagement with SDG 10.2 (breaking inequalities) and SDG 11 (inclusive cities), both of which were already identified as priority areas in earlier national planning rounds," referring to the national development plans, where urban development played a key role. Furthermore, as argued by the same authors, the "domestic governance structure" and its recent decentralization have contributed to influencing the domestic institutionalization of global urban development frameworks, and this is evident in relation to the Ecuadorian National Urban Agenda (Horn & Grugel, 2018, p. 74). In this sense, the *Agenda Hábitat Sostenible del Ecuador 2036* contributed to legitimizing a path that had been already embarked upon. In so doing, it constitutes the most recent step towards the recognition of the role that local governments should play in urban development issues, as acknowledged by the legal and institutional changes introduced since the 2000s (Blanc, 2022; Vivanco Cruz & Cordero, 2019).

Local governments have been involved in the formulation of the National Urban Agenda since the beginning of the process, through the urban labs organized by GIZ in several intermediate cities of the country. As explained by a senior GIZ officer, "the urban labs are virtual spaces for working together, not spaces to come and visit." Their aim has been to reflect upon and support local urban development policies, in so doing feeding back to the National Urban Agenda with practical examples. Among many others, Loja's urban lab focused on improving the management of existing urban public spaces, resulting in a legitimization of the cross-cutting green spaces management system already introduced by the LOOTUGS' local spatial planning tools. A senior officer working for GIZ affirmed in April 2021 that "even if there was no second phase of the programme, it [the urban lab experience] would still continue." A senior officer working for the local government argued that this result was possible because the urban lab progressively carved itself a position among the city's institutions and now "it works independently," a process that GIZ and, more generally, the overall National Urban Agenda process contributed to consolidating. Alongside local governments, several actors from the academic world and more than 70 citizens' organizations were involved in the formulation of the National Urban Agenda, through a process that since its inception set out to be open and inclu-

[4]A similar fate has befallen the *Buen Vivir* paradigm, which has been framed as a "discursive tool and co-opted term" (Walsh, 2010, p. 20) based on postcolonial conditions of development (Radcliffe, 2012) and progressively emptied of significance (Blanc, 2022).

[5]See, for instance, the preface to the *Agenda Hábitat Sostenible del Ecuador 2036*: "Having hosted this event [Habitat III] supposes for Ecuador an immense commitment to advance towards the fulfilment of the objectives agreed in the New Urban Agenda in order to achieve cities and human settlements where all people can enjoy equal rights and opportunities, and where 'no one is left behind' (Ministerio de Desarrollo Urbano y Vivienda, 2020, p. 9).

sive. This inclusiveness helped to enhance the visibility and the social recognition and acceptance of the process, in so doing facilitating the incremental institutionalization of the National Urban Agenda in the country and at the same time limiting the emergence of conflicting positions.

The next stage of the National Urban Agenda process is once again linked to the GIZ Sustainable Intermediate Cities programme (2021–2024), and focuses on the matchmaking among financiers, banks, and municipalities regarding the existing global climate funds. The State Bank (*Banco del Estado*) has so far been the main funder of local governments. However, the process proved rather too complex for intermediate cities to manage, given their limited economic and technical capacities. The business of international climate change funds is so huge that small and medium-sized cities need to organize their participation jointly, which is why GIZ has been recently working on the organization of an "urban investment platform for climate change," as the GIZ programme leader put it. As part of this stage, three Ecuadorian cities (Cuenca, Loja, and Portoviejo)—each having hosted an urban lab during the previous stage—are developing their local Urban Agenda. This pilot activity will pave the way for other intermediate cities to follow suit and to develop their own local Urban Agenda to facilitate applications to receive national and international climate funds.

5 | BOLIVIA'S NATIONAL URBAN POLICY

The "comfortable landscape of the SDGs"

> Bolivia has been waking up into a new world. The country realizes that it has become urban. The 2012 census had already shown that 67% of the population was officially urban (an increase of 30% compared to the 2001 census, while the total population had only increased by 20%); however, mentalities remained fixated on the 60% indigenous population of the previous census, and by assimilation, on a rural world. (Mazurek, 2020, p. 133)

Urban development issues have been historically neglected in Bolivia (Prado Salmón, 2008, 2017) and, when the Habitat III conference took place in 2016, the country had just acknowledged its urban nature. When Evo Morales' government was invited to participate in the Habitat III conference, the national government rushed through an ad hoc document called "Building Urban Communities for Good Living in the 21st Century" (*Construyendo Comunidades Urbanas para Vivir Bien en el Siglo XXI*) (Ministerio de Obras Públicas, Servicios y Vivienda, 2016). As a senior academic explained, however, the narrative put forward by the document was put together quickly, and as such resembled more a list of issues to be tackled than a coherent vision for the future:

> The national government built the discourse on the urban communities, which was a demonstrative declaration, where the words "*Vivir Bien*", "commons," and "well-being" were merged with the cultural narrative and that of mother earth and the environment. It was approved in a hurry and resulted in a declaration of pending tasks.

Driven by its own momentum, in 2018 the same government launched the Bolivian National Urban Policy (*Política Nacional de Desarrollo Integral de Ciudades*) and, after the troubled 2019 general elections, the interim Añez's government brought the process forward until its completion. The process was funded by Swedish co-operation aid and UN-Habitat provided the technical assistance for its development, as was quite common practice with LMICs and UMICs. One of the former Swedish co-operation officers explained further that, "the original idea was to use it [the process] as an example of co-operation 2.0, by employing the urban issue to achieve different development goals."

The Bolivian National Urban Policy is a clear example of domestic translation of global urban development frameworks. It draws on the UN-Habitat's guiding framework published in 2015 (UN-Habitat, 2015), which defines

the different stages for setting up NUPs worldwide. At the same time, it also counts on the technical support of UN-Habitat to smooth the process. As highlighted by a senior lead officer working for UN-Habitat, their role was "to deliver [the National Urban Policy framework] on a silver platter and make it digestible" for national governments. However, a senior consultant working for the same agency warned that their "headquarters have a huge problem: they make golden eggs that are supposed to be perfect, but they are not applicable everywhere." Seemingly, from the perspective of UN-Habitat, having a National Urban Policy approved is more relevant than the process leading to its construction and institutionalization, as the final goal is having as many different NUPs as possible for comparison at the global level. However, as a senior scholar pointed out, to achieve a high level of global comparability "obviously, it's great, but it cannot be the main purpose," as the latter should derive from the actual results that the adopted policies produce on the ground.

When looking at the document, the tension between the pro-rural and pro-indigenous discourse developed by the government (Mazurek, 2020) and compliance with the UN-Habitat NUP framework centred on cities and the urban environment is clearly visible (UN-Habitat, 2015). A previous National Development Plan (*Agenda Patriótica 2025*) (Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia, 2012) had focused on the economic and industrial development of the country, framed under the *Vivir Bien* paradigm and disregarding to a large extent urban development issues. This narrative also permeates the National Urban Policy, with the latter, as was also acknowledged by an interviewee from the Swedish co-operation aid, mainly being seen as a means to legitimizing predetermined national development priorities within a specific governance framework (Horn & Grugel, 2018).

Despite the many critics of the decision to formulate a National Urban Policy for the country, during the early stages of its development the "comfortable landscape of the SDGs" (to use the words of a senior development researcher) that so appealed to the global urban development frameworks also served as a powerful "coalition magnet" (Silvestre & Jajamovich, 2021) that managed to anaesthetize the opposing positions and to catalyse the required "overlapping consensus" (Barnett & Parnell, 2016). The interviewees spoke with one voice when describing the role played by UN-Habitat in allowing stakeholders belonging to very different political groups "to stick together." In a controversial political context, the involvement of an international organization, despite its supposedly neutral discourse, has legitimized the process and shielded it from possible crossfire.

5.1 | A "fast-track institutionalization" process

The process of institutionalization of the Bolivian National Urban Policy has been very different from the one of the Ecuadorian National Urban Agenda. First, no real discursive shift has occurred in the country. The ad hoc introduction of the "urban communities for good living" in the occasion of the Habitat III conference has not been accompanied by the emergence of a debate on urban development issues nor by the introduction of any local action specifically devoted to urban development (Cabrera, 2011). At the same time, and perhaps among the elements that prevented the emergence of any local urban development discourse, the country still lacks a national spatial planning law, and is still characterized by a high degree of interference of the national government in the management of urban development issues—as is witnessed, for instance, by the need to require the central government's authorization to shift local land uses from rural to urban (Blanc et al., 2022).

In consequence, the Bolivian National Urban Policy did not engage to any relevant extent with local governments and civil society, as many interviewees underlined. Despite the efforts of the UN-Habitat local team,[6] "the role of facilitator [played by UN-Habitat] has been frequently mixed with the one of consultant," in the judgment of a senior development researcher, and the spaces for dialogue that were launched at the very beginning of the process did

[6]UN-Habitat representatives have been travelling to many Bolivian local governments to share the National Urban Policy draft and several workshops have been set up to this end; 300 working sessions have been developed, almost 7,000 people have been involved throughout country for structuring the diagnostic, according to a senior consultant working for UN-Habitat and at least 50% of the citizens' organizations involved in urban issues in Bolivia have been included in these "consultations."

not result in any real engagement of the parties involved.[7] In the words of a member of a citizens' organization, the Bolivian National Urban Policy "could be acknowledged as UN-Habitat business, rather than a national government outcome." The absence of engagement on the part of local government and civil society has increased the already existing perception of this being a "package" to be sold, as pointed out by a representative of a citizens' organization, based on "concepts for export" (REHABITAR, 2021).

Among these concepts, the implementation of the City Prosperity Index (CPI) as an integral part of the Bolivian National Urban Policy is particularly interesting.[8] The CPI is premised on the rigid collection of data for building a "composite index made of six dimensions." However, most of these data were not available in the country, and the initial reluctance of the Bolivian government to adopt a rigid framework led to what a senior consultant working for UN-Habitat referred to as the "Bolivianization of the CPI," i.e. the development of an alternative index based on the available statistical data. The results are controversial. On the one hand, this domestic implementation of the CPI represents an interesting example of proactive contextualization of the global urban development frameworks. On the other hand, however, the latter has not been acknowledged by the UN-Habitat headquarters because it does not follow the established rules and does not allow for any worldwide comparison.

Currently the National Urban Policy is being implemented in several local governments through the definition of their local urban agendas. Even if the New Urban Agenda and the 2030 Agenda are non-binding tools, "aligning to the SDGs is crucial for reaching international funds," as highlighted by a senior development researcher interviewed. At the same time, several national and international sponsors are interested in funding the local implementation of the National Urban Policy.

6 | ANALYTICAL COMPARISON AND DISCUSSION

The New Urban Agenda, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and the SDGs defined by the latter, form an undeniably useful reference for many countries in the world, influencing how they address urbanization processes through national policies and agendas. When looking at National Urban Policies and Agendas from the perspective of the international development agencies, their main value lies in the fact that they allow the monitoring and global comparison of urbanization processes worldwide. On the other hand, when looked at from the "demand side," their institutionalization and implementation within specific contexts reveal a complex, inherently path-dependent process that can lead to very different outcomes.

The detailed analysis of the two case studies in this article highlighted both similarities and differences, making it possible to formulate a number of considerations in relation to the dynamics behind this peculiar type of policy mobilities. In Ecuador the progressive "pasteurization" of the right to the city discourse and its leaning towards the "leaving no one behind" paradigm brought forward by the global urban development frameworks has contributed, under the co-ordination of German co-operation aid, to favour the convergence of very different political positions on the country's National Urban Agenda. Similarly, in Bolivia the "comfortable landscape of the SDGs" has allowed for growing consensus among very different stakeholders. In this case, however, there was a rapid development from the outset of a narrative about the country's "urban communities," one that was in partial conflict with the dominant rural narrative promoted until then by the national government.

Whereas in both cases the global urban development frameworks, given their rather neutral nature, acted as a "coalition magnet" (Silvestre & Jajamovich, 2021), their introduction in the two countries is producing rather differ-

[7]As one interviewee from academia put it, "we were thrilled about our involvement in the formulation of the first National Urban Policy and we managed the setting-up of many public events by academia to debate around the urban issue in Bolivia. Unfortunately, our contributions were not merged in the final document."

[8]The CPI is a monitoring framework firmly grounded on established principles and sound statistical practices that enables the tracking of progress and ensures accountability for the implementation of the 2030 development agenda. It is proposed as a global framework for indicators and targets to monitor progress in relation to SDG11. According to the UN-Habitat webpage, 46 countries worldwide have been engaged in the CPI definition, altogether covering over 400 cities (UN-Habitat, n.d.).

ential outcomes, following path-dependent processes that were enabled and shaped by those peculiar institutional patterns that are frequently "silenced" in processes of policy mobilities (Montero & Baiocchi, 2021). In Ecuador the process of institutionalization has proceeded incrementally, and the National Urban Agenda has contributed to legitimizing and consolidating a set of institutional reforms and urban development processes that were already taking place in the country, with progressive decentralization and the national spatial governance and planning reform (through the LOOTUGS) (Blanc, 2022). The setting up of several urban labs and the involvement of the local governments—alongside academia and civil society—since the very beginning of the process have contributed to legitimizing the Ecuadorian National Urban Agenda and to smoothing its implementation vis-à-vis all the actors involved. Conversely, the development of the Bolivian National Urban Policy has followed a "fast-track institutionalization" (Whitney & López-García, 2020), which should ideally have contributed to the development of an urban development discourse in the national context. However, the lack of consensus as to what kind of urban development was suitable for the country, and the lack of engagement with local stakeholders, led to a general perception of the contents of the National Urban Policy as "golden eggs" that were produced elsewhere and then sold as a ready-made package at the domestic level.

In light of these findings, we can argue that the international organizations involved in both case studies have given recognition to the process within unstable political contexts and played the role of mediators by enabling the urban debate and fostering the dialogue among conflicting stakeholders, eventually leading to the formulation of an "overlapping consensus" (Barnett & Parnell, 2016). Also, in the Bolivian context, where rural and the indigenous interests are prevailing in the current political discourse and the government demonstrated a certain reticence about adopting global urban development frameworks focusing on urban areas, eventually the supposed neutrality of the discourses that underpin them have favoured their introduction (Peck & Theodore, 2015). However, the path-dependent logic that contributed to shaping their domestic institutionalization has led to very different results, highlighting the risks of a "fast-track institutionalization" rather than a more incremental, inclusive approach. In turn, these differences in the processes of institutionalization, which depend on contextual conditions that are often silenced in the policy mobilities debate (Montero & Baiocchi, 2021), can make the difference between success or failure, and consequently threaten the domestic implementation of the global urban development frameworks themselves, among which the implementation of the SDGs stands out.

7 | CONCLUDING REMARKS AND FUTURE RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES

The article has analysed and compared the development of the Ecuadorian National Urban Agenda and of the Bolivian National Urban Policy, within the framework of policy mobilities literature and, more particularly, combining several concepts that have been recently developed in the Latin American context.

Looking at the underexplored Bolivian and Ecuadorian case studies has allowed us to shed light on the nuances that characterize the process of worldwide circulation and domestic institutionalization of global urban development frameworks. These are considered as a particular type of policy mobilities, pivoted around the action of their "pasteurized" urban narratives as a "coalition magnet" and simultaneously shaped by the path-dependent influence of "silenced" institutional configurations. In both cases, the "comfortable landscape of the SDGs" has smoothed the process and favoured the domestic penetration of narratives that substantiate these global frameworks, even if the two institutional configurations are dissimilar, hence leading to different outcomes. It could be argued that, whereas the global circulation and domestic implementation of the global urban development frameworks is certainly useful to allow global comparison (as well as the monitoring of the processes of urbanization worldwide and the implementation of the global urban development frameworks and the SDGs), the "silencing" of specific institutional configurations may undermine the results of these processes.

The development and implementation of the National Urban Agendas and Policies is still a work-in-progress in many countries. Their institutionalization is an issue that needs to be addressed and this article shows that the policy

mobilities literature provides several interesting entry points for engagement. Further comparative research on the domestic implementation of the global urban development frameworks in Latin America and beyond is required to identify and unfold the pitfalls that may be hidden in the process—such as "fast-track institutionalization." The evidence collected through such analysis could inform the action of both domestic policy and decision-makers and of practitioners and consultants working with international organizations involved in the development and implementation of global urban development frameworks.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the peer reviewers for their useful comments, the Policy Mobilities Writing Group (PMWG) for their feedback on an earlier draft version of the article, and discussion panel T01P03, led by Osmany Porto de Oliveira and Cecilia Osorio Gonnet, at the Fifth International Conference on Public Policy held in Barcelona in July 2021. Open Access Funding provided by Politecnico di Torino within the CRUI-CARE Agreement.

FUNDING

The research upon which this article is based was funded by Politecnico di Torino, in the framework of the Joint Projects with Top Universities "Comparative analysis of territorial governance and spatial planning systems in Europe and beyond. Exploring changes in the actual practice."

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

ORCID

Francesca Blanc https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8190-2943
Giancarlo Cotella https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8445-412X

REFERENCES

Asamblea Constituyente de Bolivia. (2009). *Nueva Constitución Política del Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia* [New Political Constitution of the Plurinational State of Bolivia]. Gaceta Oficial del Estado. https://www.oas.org/dil/esp/innesotaon_bolivia.pdf

Ayllón Pino, B. (2014). Revolución ciudadana, buen vivir y cooperación en Ecuador (2007-2013) [Citizens' revolution, good living and co-operation in Ecuador (2007-2013)]. *Relaciones Internacionales*, *23*(46), 177–199. https://revistas.unlp.edu.ar/RRII-IRI/article/view/779

Barnett, C., & Parnell, S. (2016). Ideas, implementation and indicators: Epistemologies of the post-2015 urban agenda. *Environment and Urbanization*, *28*(1), 87–98 https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247815621473.

Berisha, E., Caprioli, C., & Cotella, G. (2022). Unpacking SDG target 11.a: What is it about and how to measure its progress. *City and Environment Interactions*, *14*, 100080 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cacint.2022.100080.

Blanc, F. (2022). Unpacking the Ecuadorian spatial planning law: Policy mobilities in Latin America between transnational agency and path-dependent logics. *Planning Practice & Research*. *Advance online publication*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459.2022.2034283

Blanc, F., Cabrera, J. E., Cotella, G., García, A., & Sandoval, J. C. (2022). Does planning keep its promises? Latin American spatial governance and planning as an ex-post regularisation activity. *Planning Practice & Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459.2022.2042921

Cabrera, J. E. (2011). La construcción del territorio plurinacional. Bolivia de 1960 a 2010 [The construction of the plurinational territory. Bolivia from 1960 to 2010]. *Territorios*, *24*, 13–58. https://revistas.urosario.edu.co/index.php/territorios/article/view/1593

Caprotti, F., Cowley, R., Datta, A., Broto, V. C., Gao, E., Georgeson, L., Herrick, C., Odendaal, N., & Joss, S. (2017). The New Urban Agenda: Key opportunities and challenges for policy and practice. *Urban Research and Practice*, *10*(3), 367–378 https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2016.1275618.

Cartwright, A., Palmer, I., Taylor, A., Pieterse, E., Parnell, S., & Colenbrander, S. (2018). *Developing prosperous and inclusive cities in Africa – national urban policies to the rescue?* (Coalition for Urban Transitions Working Paper). African Centre

for Cities & Coalition for Urban Transitions. https://newclimateeconomy.report/workingpapers/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2018/09/CUT18_Africa_NatUrbanPolicy_final.pdf

Dagnino, E. (2010). Citizenship: A perverse confluence. *Development in Practice*, *17*(4–5), 549–556 https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520701469534.

Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia. (2012). *Agenda Patriótica 2025*: *13 pilares para constituir la Bolivia digna y soberana* [Patriotic Agenda 2025: 13 pillars for a dignified and sovereign Bolivia]. Ministerio de Planificación del Desarrollo. https://siteal.iiep.unesco.org/bdnp/3612/agenda-patriotica-2025

Forestier, O., & Kim, R. E. (2020). Cherry-picking the Sustainable Development Goals: Goal prioritization by national governments and implications for global governance. *Sustainable Development*, *28*(5), 1269–1278 https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2082.

GIZ. (n.d.). *Making medium-sized cities more sustainable and climate-friendly*. https://www.giz.de/en/worldwide/62786.html

Horn, P., & Grugel, J. (2018). The SDGs in middle-income countries: Setting or serving domestic development agendas? Evidence from Ecuador. *World Development*, *109*, 73–84 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.04.005.

Jajamovich, G. (2013). Miradas sobre intercambios internacionales y circulación internacional de ideas y modelos urbanos [Perspectives on international exchanges and the international circulation of urban ideas and models]. *Andamios*, *10*(22), 91–111. https://doi.org/10.29092/uacm.v10i22.268

Jajamovich, G., & Delgadillo, V. (2020). La circulación de conocimientos, saberes y políticas urbanas en América Latina. Introducción [The circulation of knowledge, know-how and urban policies in Latin America]. *Iberoamericana*, *10*(74), 7–11. https://doi.org/10.18441/ibam.20.2020.74.7-11

Kaika, M. (2017). *"Don't call me resilient again!"*: The New Urban Agenda as immunology … or … what happens when communities refuse to be vaccinated with "smart cities" and indicators. *Environment and Urbanization*, *29*(1), 89–102 https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247816684763.

Kuymulu, M. B. (2013). The vortex of rights: "Right to the City" at a crossroads. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *37*(3), 923–940. https://doi-org.ezproxy.biblio.polito.it/10.1111/1468-2427.12008

Lapdat, J. C. (2017). Ethics in autoethnography and collaborative autoethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *23*(8), 589–603 https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417704462.

Llop, J. M., Iglesias, B. M., Vargas, R., & Blanc, F. (2019). Las ciudades intermedias: concepto y dimensiones [Intermediary cities: Concept and dimensions]. *Ciudades*, *22*, 23–43. https://doi.org/10.24197/ciudades.22.2019.23-43

Mazurek, H. (2020). Bolivia en busca de su política urbana [Bolivia in search of its urban policy]. *Temas sociales*, *47*, 132–162. http://www.scielo.org.bo/scielo.php?pid=S0040-29152020000200006&script=sci_arttext

McCann, E. (2011). Urban policy mobilities and global circuits of knowledge: Toward a research agenda. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, *101*(1), 107–130 https://doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2010.520219.

McCann, E., & Ward, K. (2012). Policy assemblages, mobilities and mutations: Toward a multidisciplinary conversation. *Political Studies Review*, *10*, 325–332 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-9302.2012.00276.x.

McCann, E., & Ward, K. (2013). A multi-disciplinary approach to policy transfer research: geographies, assemblages, mobilities and mutations. *Policy Studies*, *34*(1), 2–18 https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2012.748563.

Ministerio de Desarrollo Urbano y Vivienda. (2020). *Agenda Hábitat Sostenible del Ecuador 2036* [Ecuador's Sustainable Habitat Agenda 2036]. https://www.bivica.org/file/view/id/5721

Ministerio de Obras Públicas, Servicios y Vivienda. (2016, April). *Construyendo comunidades urbanas para vivir bien en el siglo XXI* [Building urban communities for good living in the 21st century]. https://www.cedib.org/biblioteca/construyendo-comunidades-urbanas-para-vivir-bien-en-el-siglo-xxi-informe-pais-bolivia-en-la-conferencia-mundial-habitat-iii-documento-borrador-abril-2106/

Ministerio de Obras Públicas, Servicios y Vivienda. (2020). *Política de Ciudades* [Cities Policy]. https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2020/10/cities_policy_onu-habitat_bolivia_10082020.pdf

Montero, S. (2020). Leveraging Bogotá: Sustainable development, global philanthropy and the rise of urban solutionism. *Urban Studies*, *57*(11), 2263–2281 https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098018798555.

Montero, S., & Baiocchi, G. (2021). A posteriori comparisons, repeated instances and urban policy mobilities: What 'best practices' leave behind. *Urban Studies*, *59*(8), 1536–1555 https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980211041460.

Novovic, G. (2021). Can Agenda 2030 bring about "localization"? Policy limitations of Agenda 2030 in the broader global governance system. *Development Policy Review*, *40*(4), e12587 https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12587.

Parnell, S., Elmqvist, T., McPhearson, T., Nagendra, H., & Sörlin, S. (2018). Situating knowledge and action for an urban planet. In T. Elmqvist, X. Bai, N. Frantzeskaki, C. Griffith, D. Maddox, T. McPhearson, S. Parnell, P. Romero-Lankao, D. Simon, & M. Watkins (Eds.), *Urban planet: Knowledge towards sustainable cities* (pp. 1–16). https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316647554.002

Peck, J., & Theodore, N. (2015). *Fast policy: Experimental statecraft at the thresholds of neo-liberalism*. University of Minnesota Press.

Pierson, P. (2000). Increasing returns, path dependence, and the study of politics. *American Political Science Review*, *94*(2), 251–267 https://doi.org/10.2307/2586011.

Prado Salmón, F. (2008). Diálogo: el descuidado tema urbano en la Bolivia de hoy [Dialogue: The neglected urban issue in Bolivia today]. *Tìnkazos, Revista Boliviana de Ciencias Sociales*, *11*(25), 9–32. https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=426141567001

Prado Salmón, F. (2017). *50 años de planificación urbana en Santa Cruz: la transformación de un pueblo en metrópolis* [50 years of urban planning in Santa Cruz: The transformation of a town into a metrópolis]. Editorial El País.

Radcliffe, S. A. (2012). Development for a postneoliberal era? *Sumak kawsay*, living well and the limits to decolonisation in Ecuador. *Geoforum*, *43*(2), 240–249 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.09.003.

ReHABITAR. (2021). A propósito de la "Política de ciudades". Una mirada crítica [On the "Cities Policy". A critical look]. *Locus*, *1*(19), 121–125. https://www.iiach.fach.umss.edu.bo/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/REVISTA-LOCUS-C1.pdf

República del Ecuador. (2016). *Ley Orgánica de Ordenamiento Territorial, Uso y Gestión del Suelo* [Organic Law on Land Use Planning and Land-Use Management]. Asamblea Nacional. https://leap.unep.org/countries/ec/national-legislation/ley-organica-de-ordenamiento-territorial-uso-y-gestion-de-suelo

Secretaría Nacional de Planificación y Desarollo (SENPLADES) (2013) Programa de Gobierno 2013-2017, p. 225. https://www.planificacion.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2014/04/urbana.pdf

Silvestre, G., & Jajamovich, G. (2021). The role of mobile policies in coalition building: The Barcelona model as coalition magnet in Buenos Aires and Rio de Janeiro (1989–1996). *Urban Studies*, *58*(1), 2310–2328 https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098020939808.

Sorensen, A. (2018). Multiscalar governance and institutional change: Critical junctures in European spatial planning. *Planning Perspectives*, *33*(4), 615–632 https://doi.org/10.1080/02665433.2018.1512894.

Sorensen, A. (2020). Urbanization and developmental pathways: critical junctures of urban transition. In D. Labbé & A. Sorensen (Eds.), *International handbook on megacities and megacity–regions* (pp. 47–64). Edward Elgar https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788972703.00009.

Stone, D., Porto de Oliveira, O., & Pal, L. A. (2020). Transnational policy transfer: The circulation of ideas, power and development models. *Policy and Society*, *39*(1), 1–18 https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2019.1619325.

Temenos, C., & McCann, E. (2013). Geographies of policy mobilities. *Geography Compass*, *7*(5), 344–357 https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12063.

Tosun, J., & Leininger, J. (2017). Governing the interlinkages between the Sustainable Development Goals: Approaches to attain policy integration. *Global Challenges*, *1*(9), 1–12 https://doi.org/10.1002/gch2.201700036.

Turok, I., & Scheba, A. (2019). 'Right to the city' and the New Urban Agenda: Learning from the right to housing. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, *7*(4), 494–510 https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2018.1499549.

UN-Habitat. (2015). *National urban policy: A guiding framework*. https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/download-manager-files/NUP%20Guiding%20Framework.pdf

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* (A/RES/70/1). https://stg-wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/11125/unepswiosm1inf7sdg.pdf?sequence=1

United Nations. (2017). *New Urban Agenda* (A/RES/71/256*). https://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/NUA-English.pdf

United Nations. (2021, May 15). *Urban Policy Platform*. Retrieved from https://urbanpolicyplatform.org/national-urban-policy-database/#table

United Nations-Habitat. (n.d.). *City prosperity initiative*. https://unhabitat.org/programme/city-prosperity-initiative

Vivanco Cruz, L., & Cordero, F. (2019). Descentralización de la planificación del ordenamiento territorial en Ecuador [Decentralization of land-use planning in Ecuador]. *Ecuador Debate*, *108*, 73–100. http://hdl.handle.net/10469/16293

Walsh, C. (2010). Development as *Buen Vivir*: Institutional arrangements and (de)colonial entanglements. *Development*, *53*(1), 15–21 https://doi.org/10.1057/dev.2009.93.

Whitney, R. A. (2022). Trendy urbanists, innovation laboratories and best practices: In pursuit of 'progressive' urban planning in Mexico City. *Town Planning Review*, *93*(1), 15–35 https://doi.org/10.3828/tpr.2021.12.

Whitney, R. A., & López-García, D. (2020, October 26–27). *The perils of fast-track institutionalization: The collision between global urban politics and local governance in Mexico City's best practice agencies* [Paper presentation]. *Policy transfer, diffusion and translation in territorial governance and spatial planning in the Global South*, Delft University of Technology, Delft, Netherlands.

Wood, A. (2015). The politics of policy circulation: Unpacking the relationship between South African and South American cities in the adoption of bus rapid transit. *Antipode*, *47*(4), 1062–1079 https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12135.

How to cite this article: Blanc, F., & Cotella, G. (2022). Global urban development frameworks landing in Latin America: Insights from Ecuador and Bolivia. *Development Policy Review*, *00*, e12632. https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12632