

Article

Urban Water Management Paradigms in Chinese Cities

Meine Pieter van Dijk ^{1,2,*}  and Mingshun Zhang ²

¹ International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) of Erasmus University Rotterdam, 3062 PA Rotterdam, The Netherlands

² Beijing University of Civil Engineering and Architecture (BUCEA), Beijing 100091, China; zhangmingshun@bucea.edu.cn

* Correspondence: mpvandijk@iss.nl

Received: 23 March 2019; Accepted: 17 May 2019; Published: 28 May 2019



Abstract: Three paradigms used in China to deal with urban water issues are compared. The analysis focuses on their definition and objectives, the role of different stakeholders, the issues they deal with and the possible solutions suggested. The use of these paradigms in Chinese cities is compared on different dimensions to conclude when and where they can be used for which purpose. The paradigms differ substantially in their scope (from the narrow focus of the sponge city paradigm to the broad goals of eco-city paradigms) and in terms of the governance mechanisms used to coordinate between different actors. The resilient and sponge paradigms mainly use government structures to achieve their objectives, while the idea is to also involve the private sector (certainly in case of the sponge city paradigm). This has not happened most of the times because project money had to be spent in time. In the eco-cities approach the citizens want to be involved through newly created governance structures. In resilient cities potential victims may be involved. Resilient and eco-city initiatives emphasize the involvement of stakeholders, while in the sponge cities approach the initiative is often taken by local government. Finally, in terms of expected solutions, the paradigms want to avoid disaster, create an eco-city or improve water management. Only in the case of eco-cities there is more space for different water management practices and using alternative technologies. Water-related technologies are available, generating energy from wastewater or underground water and diminishing the dependence on fossil fuels.

Keywords: resilient cities; eco-cities; sponge cities; water management; paradigms; China

1. Introduction

Chinese cities suffer from rapid growth, pollution, congestion, water shortages or surpluses and climate change challenges cities even more [1]. Cities can also expect heat waves [2], and besides more or less rain, more volatility [3]. In this study a framework will be used to compare three recent paradigms to deal with urban water and environmental issues in China and the background for these paradigms will be given to better understand their logic. Paradigms are new combinations of solutions recommended for identified water-related urban issues. The paradigms discussed suggest different activities (see Table 1) to be undertaken by stakeholders, implying the use of different urban water governance structures. Different approaches to achieve environmental sustainability in Chinese cities will be reviewed to find out to what extent these three paradigms have contributed to the development of livable, inclusive and competitive cities. Which policies have contributed to the success of these paradigms? What lessons can be learned from successful eco-cities (cities focusing on the environment), sponge cities (cities managing the quantity and quality of water) or resilient cities (cities anticipating

important challenges)? Can one draw lessons that can inform other rapidly urbanizing cities in China and in other countries how to achieve sustainable urban development?

Table 1. Characteristics of different paradigms for urban water management.

Question	Resilient Cities	Eco-Cities	Sponge Cities
What is the definition?	A city able to react to important challenges, like climate change	Eco-cities focus on the social and living environment	A city able to slow, spread, sink, and store water runoff
What are the objectives to be achieved?	Becoming a resilient city and preparing resilience plans	Building an eco-city with water-scaping, as a pleasant place to live	Manage the quantity and quality of water to improve the water environment
What is the role of different stakeholders?	Community involvement is promoted	Role for motivated individuals and project developers	Mainly local government, possibly the private sector
Environmental ambition?	Prepare for environmental hazards	More green, less polluted and an integrated approach	Cleaner water, using natural water treatment processes
Possible solutions?	Adaptation, prepare for challenges	A different type of planning is suggested	Technical options and private participation
A relevant reference	OECD (2018) and Rockefeller Foundation (2014)	Bhatnagar (ed., 2010) and Wong and Yuen (eds, 2011)	Li et al. (2017) and Liang (2018)

UN Habitat has pushed the concept of sustainable cities [4]. Together with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) they started a program to ensure environmentally sustainable local development. It is based on a recognition of the contributions that urban areas make to economic and social development. This sustainable cities program (SCP) wants to achieve good environmental governance at different geographical levels. It supports national and local partners to adopt environmental planning and management. It also promotes integration of good practices into the national legal and policy framework. However, sustainability has many aspects, the environment, economic and financial sustainability and social and institutional sustainability, and does not just concern water management issues.

This paper compares three paradigms, which are currently being used in Asia, resilient cities, eco-cities, and sponge cities, to be able indicate the strong and weak points of these different paradigms and to show the importance of government policies and actions at different levels of governance, including the household level, to implement them.

2. Theoretical Section: Different Paradigms for Urban Water Management

Chinese cities have introduced mitigation and adaptation policies to deal with climate change and environmental policies to reduce pollution. They often also introduce programs to promote cities to become better places to live in. Solutions that keep coming back are: Reduction of greenhouse gases, closing of the water cycle [5], trying to minimize waste and promoting integrated waste management, development of an integrated infrastructure and different transport policies [6]. Other technical solutions are heat exchange systems using underground water and rain water harvesting systems. Liang and Van Dijk [7] analyze the separation of grey and brown water, which allows treatment of grey water on the spot, reusing it for flushing the toilets or irrigating the garden.

A paradigm is defined as a specific approach to an issue, implying an underlying analysis of the problem and clear ideas about the solution. The solution usually implies improved water management. However, also the supply of drinking water, sanitation services and water for commercial use should

be assured. If too much water is the problem, it is often necessary to store water to prevent floods and to use the surplus in times of water shortages.

Through globalization cities have to be more competitive, but they also want to become more green cities. Competitive cities, the cultural city or the eco²cities concept [8] will not be discussed. Green cities as a paradigm, means making cities greener, more environmentally friendly and livable [9]. More and more cities have as objective CO₂ reduction, or even zero emissions, in particular in the 'new urbanism' in England CO₂ reduction is important [10]. Different initiatives went for zero carbon buildings and also the eco-cities concept broadened its meaning and included the concern for carbon emissions. Environmental technologies are used for energy and water management to turn these crucial systems into closed loop systems. Waste water can be considered an asset, because of the potential of existing technologies to generate energy from waste water in the form of heat or bio gas. Paradigms not discussed in this contribution are promoting the circular economy [11], or creating green, clean, healthy and/or vibrant (in economic terms) cities [9].

For improved urban water management one needs to look at governance structures, different infrastructural options and different modes of transportation, some of which are more sustainable than others [12]. The choice between them is often conditioned by history, culture and climate. The use of water for transportation is often at the losing end, but some cities encourage sustainable transportation by introducing shared means of transportation, or encouraging alternative ways of transportation including the use of existing rivers and canals [13].

Initiatives can be taken at the national, the regional, the city, the district, the neighborhood and each with its own governance structure. Different paradigms have been developed to deal with urban water issues. The ones most often discussed in the literature are building a resilient city [14], eco-cities [15], or the sponge city paradigm [16]. These paradigms have been analyzed in Table 1, using six indicators (their definition, the objectives, the role of different stakeholders, the environmental ambitions, the possible solution proposed and relevant references). Have the objectives and ambitions been achieved?

Some recent developments in urban water management are summarized and the different paradigms are compared, taking examples mainly from China. We focus on the challenges provided by flows of water from the rivers, the soil, the rain and the sea and compare what the different paradigms do to deal with the consequences.

3. History of the Urban Water Paradigms in China

China has a history of concepts for environmental model cities. The three most important ones, discussed briefly as a background to the current paradigms, are:

1. The China Environmental Model City Program (EMCP)
2. China Low-Carbon Eco-City Program (LCCEP)
3. China Low-Carbon City Program (LCCP)

3.1. *The China Environmental Model City Program (EMCP)*

The China Environmental Model City Program (EMCP), launched by the Ministry of Environmental Protection in 2009, wants to improve urban environmental performance and sustainability through creating and up scaling best practices found elsewhere in the urban environmental sector [17].

3.2. *China Low-Carbon Eco-City Program (LCCEP)*

The Low-Carbon Eco-City program initiated in 2010, and originally coordinated by the Ministry of Housing, Urban and Regional Development (MoHURD), is building on experience of this ministry with energy efficient building. It was followed up by the green building program, which focused on new urban developments. The objective is sustainable development and the improvement of the quality of urban life.

3.3. China Low-Carbon City Program (LCCP)

The Low-Carbon City Program (LCCP) began in 2010 initiated through the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC). This program is concerned about carbon production. The program builds on experiences and lessons learnt by the NDRC's sectoral approaches to carbon emission reduction and more energy efficiency in the energy sector and material intensive production. LCCP wants to contribute to a low carbon city.

4. Methodological Approach

This is a meta-study, drawing from several evaluation studies. The paradigms discussed have social, institutional, economic, and environmental factors as driving factors contributing to a resilient, sponge or an eco-city. For each case it is necessary to identify:

1. What steps have been undertaken by the government to make the city resilient, to create eco- or sponge cities?
2. Which policies have been developed to plan for a resilient, eco- or resilient city?
3. What policies have been used to involve citizens and other stakeholders in the development process?

How are these policies disseminated to the public and implemented by the different layers of government or different governance structures? Using case studies of Chinese and Western cities, the study will build on the driving forces for each dimension of the three distinguished paradigms to see how they score on these dimensions. The paradigms also have weaknesses. They should take into account social, economic, environmental and cultural considerations. Justice and equality are for example also important but never explicitly included. In particular eco-cities tend to be for the happy few. A second challenge is to manage urban risks, which is only made explicit in the resilient cities paradigm. Decision making should be sustainability-based, which may be the case if critical stakeholders are really involved, which is not always the case.

4.1. Different Paradigms in Urban Water Management

In Table 1 the three different paradigms in urban water management are compared. A section on eco-cities, resilient cities, and sponge cities paradigms will provide the information for the comparison.

4.1.1. Resilient Cities Paradigm

Hurricane Harvey flooded one-third of Houston (in the United States) and displaced more than 30,000 people. The event reminded the experts why the world needs resilient cities: "Hurricane Harvey has caused catastrophic damage and flooding in Houston and across east East Texas, killing dozens and leaving tens of thousands homeless. Monsoon downpours have flooded Mumbai and 1000 people are feared dead across South East Asia. At the same time, flooding has forced thousands from their homes in Niger's capital, Niamey." (<https://newcities.org/>) To avoid such problems more ecological friendly cities are needed and a number of Chinese cities have embarked on the resilient city paradigm, to deal with issues like flooding, water pollution and water scarcity.

Urban resilience has been defined as "the ability to learn, plan, and recover from the hazards to which they are exposed" [18]. This definition of resilience can be made more complete by adding that a resilient city should also be able to deal with hazards in a sustainable way, meaning the environment should be taken into account and the activities should be financially and socially sustainable. Resilience can be considered an indicator of the ability to absorb changes in an ecosystem. The system should then persist and after the temporary disturbance eventually return to its equilibrium. A vulnerability index would measure the lack of resilience [19].

More economically advanced cities, such as Beijing and Rotterdam in the Netherlands, have the capacity to also include disaster resilience in their urban plans. Most of these economically

advanced cities invest in disaster-resilient infrastructure and spatial disaster preparedness measures. Nevertheless, to our opinion this focus on structural measures in making cities resilient occasionally shrouds the non-structural (such as stakeholders' involvement) measures that are equally if not more relevant to sustaining a resilient city [20].

Non-structural measures refer to policies, laws, and regulations in support of disaster risk mitigation and resiliency, these also include awareness-raising and education. Primarily, non-structural measures seek to strengthen the city's institutional and social capitals. Social capital has been identified as one of the factors that make a community or network resilient after a disaster experience [21].

Citizens are the first to respond to disasters. This means that the citizens' level of capacities and networks, supplements the government's efforts on structural measures to address disaster events. Therefore, it is important for the government, citizens, and stakeholders to collaborate in transforming their city into a disaster-resilient city. Resilience will depend on the city's ability to function as a whole following a disaster.

In the resilient city program launched by the Rockefeller foundation (2017) indicators are used trying to assess the ability to learn and recover from the hazards to which cities are exposed. Attempts have been made to incorporate the socio-ecological systems perspective in frameworks for creating resilient cities. This is evident in the frameworks developed by ARUP and the Rockefeller Foundation [22] and the one suggested by OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2018) [14]. Both resilient city frameworks identified social, institutional, economic, and environmental factors as driving factors for building a resilient city.

Both frameworks stress adaptation as well as the interaction of driving forces. Policies to deal with these issues can be distinguished in planning requirements, general policies, subsidies, demand management policies and energy-related activities. Both frameworks also underscore the importance of the collective participation of stakeholders in ensuring city resilience [21]. This is supportive of the UNISDR (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction) 2010 campaign [23] "Making Cities Resilient", which identifies the need for local governments, citizens and private sector to act to build a disaster resilient city.

The frameworks developed by ARUP and the Rockefeller Foundation, and OECD have practical relevance. The Rockefeller Foundation launched in 2013 the 100 Resilient Cities initiative "to help more cities build resilience to the physical, social, and economic challenges that are a growing part of the 21st century" [22]. Cities under this initiative are provided access to "resilience-building tools and services supplied by a carefully selected platform of partners from the private, public, academic, and non-profit sectors". The Rockefeller Foundation partnered with ARUP, and developed the City Resilience Framework (CRF) and City Resilience Index (CRI) in 2014.

The CRF suggests that city resilience is built on four dimensions [22]. First, a resilient city ensures the well-being and health of the people working and living in the city. Second, society enables the people to live peacefully and act collectively. The environment and infrastructure, man-made and natural systems, render critical services, connect and protect the people. Lastly, a strategy and leadership is needed for inclusive, informed, integrated and iterative decision making. Under the four dimensions there are twelve goals, three for each dimension, which guide the city in improving its functions to become resilient. These twelve goals are supported by 52 indicators. The indicators were developed to integrate the seven qualities of resilient systems. The qualities mentioned and discussed below are: "Reflective, robust, redundant, flexible, resourceful, inclusive, and integrated systems".

Reflective systems reflect on past experiences and use these experiences to adapt and adjust standards and norms to address the disturbances. It is a continuous process of evolution rather than a permanent solution to the city's problem [22]. This quality is comparable to the socio-ecological systems resilience model that resilience is a continuous process of transformation and stability. As new disturbances occur a system transforms and adapts again to be able to function like before. Robust systems refer to the built infrastructure that can predict, anticipate and forestall disasters or disturbances and still maintain its function.

Redundant systems as the name suggests are the spare capacity purposely created within the system [22]. A system with redundant properties is similar to having a backup plan. 24 ways are distinguished to achieve the needs, or fulfill certain functions. However, redundant properties should not be considered as an afterthought rather as part of the general conception of the city plan.

Flexible systems have the ability to transform and adapt to changes [22]. Transforming and adapting to changes in a resilient system requires management of the physical, ecological, and social structures in a city. It underscores the need for new knowledge and technologies, which incorporate indigenous or traditional practices and knowledge.

Resilient systems are considered to be resourceful in trying to meet their goals and needs during a disaster [22]. This means stakeholders, individuals, organizations, institutions, both in the public and private sector, can actively seek ingenious ways to recover from disasters and reinforce the system function. Aside from being resourceful, a resilient system is inclusive which means that all stakeholders such as those previously mentioned are included in community consultations and are engaged in community activities.

The CRF emphasized the inclusion of all groups and sectors, especially of the vulnerable groups to avoid isolating or segregating members of society and to contribute to a sense of ownership and vision for creating a resilient city [22]. Last of the qualities of resilient systems is having an integrated system. Integrated systems refer to systems capable of sharing and exchanging information, services and resources rapidly and efficiently at all scale levels. The CRF and CRI were developed based on the perspective that a city is a system in itself and that a resilient city has different components at different levels and scales that are interdependent [22].

As a European example of resilient cities, Rotterdam in the Netherlands has come a long way after its flooding in the 1950s. The city was one of the first members of the Rockefeller Foundation's 100 Resilient Cities initiative. Rotterdam's Climate Initiative (RCI) combined approach to climate change mitigation and adaptation have made Rotterdam one of the leading cities addressing climate change and constructing a resilient city. The city is working on climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies using scientific knowledge and practical strategies that can be implemented together. The integrated approach of the RCI helped to build the integrated long term vision of Rotterdam as a Climate Proof City by 2025 together with its stakeholders. Supportive of this and perhaps an improvement to this vision is the Resilience Strategy the City of Rotterdam released in 2016 for the 100 Resilient Cities program [24]. The Resilience Strategy underscored seven goals geared towards a holistic vision in achieving a resilient city.

OECD (2018) defines resilient cities in a similar socio-ecological systems and resilience perspective, defining "resilient cities as those which are able to absorb, adapt, transform and prepare for the past and future impact of economic, environmental and social shocks or stresses, in order to promote sustainable development, well-being and inclusive growth". Resilient cities promote sustainable development, well-being and inclusive growth. OECD (2018) investigates how cities can increase their resilience and makes suggestions how this can be measured. They distinguish the economy, governance, society and the environment, with, as drivers "for the Economy:

- A diverse number of industries
- A dynamic economy to generate growth
- Conditions allow innovation to take place
- People have access to employment, education, services, and skills training.

For Governance

- Clear leadership and management
- Strategic and integrated approaches are taken by leaders
- Public sector has the right skills
- Government is open and transparent

For Society:

- Society is inclusive and cohesive
- Citizens' networks in communities are active
- Neighbourhoods are safe
- Citizens enjoy healthy lives

For the Environment:

- Ecosystem is sound and diverse
- Infrastructure can meet basic needs
- Adequate natural resources are available
- Coherent policy towards land use"

The qualities of resilient cities according to the OECD (2018) are slightly different: adaptive (instead of reflective), robust, redundant, flexible, resourceful and inclusive. Integrated is not mentioned except that resilient cities have integrated industries, which are diverse and generate growth, because innovation is happening and driving the economy, while the workforce has diverse skills and the infrastructure supports the economic activities. According to the OECD (2018) "society is inclusive and cohesive, citizen networks are active, people have access to public services, urban development is sustainable and adequate and reliable infrastructure is available". Other characteristics are: "Adequate natural resources are available, leadership and long-term vision is clear". Finally, "the public sector has proper resources, collaboration with other governments takes place and government is open and citizens' participation takes place".

The City Resilience Index (CRI) was developed based on the CRF. Indicators have been identified for each of the frameworks, based on four dimensions: Well-being and health, society and economy, environment and infrastructure, and strategy and leadership, and drawn from the twelve goals of resilient systems. The first of the four dimensions, health and well-being concerns people. The three goals that fall under this dimension are reduce human vulnerability, promote diverse livelihoods and employment, and build in effective safeguards for human life and health. Minimal human vulnerability refers to the city's ability to provide basic needs to all stakeholders. Indicators under this goal are provision of affordable and safe housing, sufficient and of affordable energy, access to adequate and safe drinking water, safe, affordable and reliable sanitation, and sufficient and affordable supply of food [22].

Zhang et al. [19] used an integrated approach to measure vulnerability in Beijing. Vulnerabilities to the climatic threats of heat waves, drainage floods and droughts have increased by 5–15% during the period of 2008–2016 in Beijing. High vulnerabilities to both heat waves and drainage floods have been observed in the urban downtown area and high vulnerability to droughts has been observed in the outskirts. The developments of threats like flooding and droughts are analyzed separately for 16 districts and an integrated vulnerability index for all of Beijing is provided. Priority climatic threats in Beijing (in this order of priority) are floods, droughts, heat waves and heavy snow and freezing. In total 21 variables are used to measure the seriousness of these problems. This vulnerability assessment, which addressed climatic threats, provides a holistic understanding of the susceptibility to climate change that could facilitate adaptation to climate change.

4.1.2. Eco-Cities Paradigm

Bhatnagar [15] gives different definitions for eco-cities. In this book some authors have put their own subjective view of what is important in to define eco-cities. Kenworthy [25] stresses the role of transport, Rombout [26] emphasizes the importance of green, he also uses the words garden or lobe cities, while Raj [27] stresses that urban development planning should take both the culture and the environment into account. Solid waste management is also mentioned in the case of eco-cities. How to

deal with waste in a different way? Waste can also block drains and cause health hazards [28]. Solid waste minimization through an integrated waste management strategy is important [29].

The eco-city concept “suggests an ecological approach to urban design, management and towards a new lifestyle” [30]. The focus is on the urban metabolism. Eco-cities have a different way of dealing with the cycles of energy, water, waste and pollution. The eco-cities idea can be compared to the Eco²cities approach launched by the World Bank. Suzuki et al. [8] emphasize two important ambitions of cities in developing countries to achieve greater ecological and reach economic sustainability.

Dimensions of eco-city policies, which will be analyzed before dealing with Asian and European experiences [31] are the ecological aspects, water and waste-related aspects, in relation to energy, the role of transport and infrastructure and the implementation of eco-city ideas. Ecological activities can take place at the regional level, the city level, the neighborhood, building or household level. It is also possible to give eco-labels at these different levels [32]. Secondly, the focus could be on a new town, or a neighborhood. There are also ecological buildings, ecological houses, blocks of houses, or apartment buildings. Examples are sharing heating/cooling systems or a grey water re-use facility. Individual initiatives at the household level are also important, they can take place spontaneously or can be triggered by incentives or by reactions to price decreases or increases for essential services, for example taking public transport if fuel prices increase, or installing double windows to reduce the cost of heating.

Major aspects of an eco-city, after putting such an eco-city in the context of CO₂-neutral, resilient, smart and sustainable cities, are the ecological aspects. Betancourth [30] emphasizes for example the importance of nature conservation in eco-cities. More green has been part and parcel of eco-cities. Trees deserve a place, even if they may hinder the traffic. Green and open spaces in an eco-city can have different functions. Duc Uy and Nakagoshi [33] introduce land suitability analysis to allow cities to maximize the benefits of green spaces. Green space as a percentage of total space gives an estimate of the success of these policies. A last issue is how does a city deal with pollution, something eco-cities try to deal with [34]. Innovations in water and waste water in Beijing are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Smart solutions for urban water issues in Beijing.

Issue	Smart Solution	Reference
Dealing with waste water	Separating grey and brown water and treat them differently	Liang and Van Dijk (2009) [7]
Water shortages	Rain water harvesting and aquifer infiltration techniques	Liang and Van Dijk (2011) [35]
Too much water	Improved water management using electronic sensors	Switch project (Butterworth et al., 2011). [5]
Improve drainage	Water-Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD in Australia), Low-Impact Development (LID in North America) or Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS in Europe)	Switch project (Butterworth et al., 2011). [5]
Governance of urban water issues	Urban management using information technology	Liang and Van Dijk (2012) [36] Qiu Lei and Van Dijk (2014) [37]

Source: Van Dijk (2018) [38].

The need to move away from a car dominated city and to build cities around foot paths, bicycle lanes and public transportation is stressed by Kenworthy’s [25]. Building the right infrastructure is an important step towards an eco-city. It has to do with promoting different means of transportation and with the design of a city. Cars are an important source of air pollution and cause a lot of noise. Choosing the right infrastructure (roads or trains, footpaths or bicycle paths) is an important choice made by physical planners. Integrated transport policies are necessary. However, often specialized

institutions in different parts of the public sector deal with different modes of transportation and there is not always coordination and cooperation between them. The question is asked what can we achieve through physical planning to reduce traffic congestion and travel time? A mass transit system may be introduced, or alternative type of transportation may be promoted. Wong and Yuen [39] emphasize the importance of planning and management of eco-cities. The urban planner or manager may take an activist point of view and try to achieve participation of all stakeholders to obtain the desired result.

The largest number of new initiatives for eco-towns can probably be found in China. More than 100 Chinese municipal governments have proposed to build eco-cities or eco-towns [40]. They often opt for new towns. Tianjin in the north of China has a flagship eco-city project located 45 km from the city. It is developed in cooperation with Singapore. Financing took place under the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). The objective of the project is to develop an economically sustainable, socially harmonious, environmentally friendly and resource conserving city. An evaluation of the relation between eco-city development and sustainable tourism has been carried out [41]. Wu [40] notes that this eco-city is located in “a newly established district, which is a national strategic location comparable to Pudong in Shanghai” in the 1990s. Total investment for the eco-city near Tianjin is expected to reach 30 billion Yuan. China and Singapore each paid half of this. The neighborhood is located on unusable land. This makes the investment less sensitive to outside critique, than when agricultural land would have been used. The story of the Sino-Singapore Tianjin eco-city has been reviewed by UNDP [42]. Did stakeholder build a harmonious and environmentally friendly city? A joint working committee has been established to study the major challenges and an eco-city management committee has been nominated by the Municipal government of Tianjin, a city that has learned from other experiments, such as the economic reforms and resulting business growth in the Binhai New area, also in the coastal area of Tianjin.

4.1.3. Sponge Cities Paradigm

The Chinese authorities have introduced the ‘sponge city’ concept in 2013, to slow, spread, store, and sink runoff. A definition provided by a consultancy firm assisting the city of Wuhan to deal with water is: A sponge city is the collective denominator for a number of smart solutions to capture the water in other parts of the city to prevent flooding of the low lying parts of the city (NRC, 9 January 2019: S10). Cities in the program are improving the runoff of water and the capacity to store temporarily the surplus rain water.

Many cities apply the sponge city paradigm. In Tianjin city they created for example water absorption beds. Infiltration-by-design in Beijing contributes to the recharge of urban aquifers, it may mitigate floods, and opens city surfaces to allow infiltration of water. Cities can choose between cisterns, rooftop gardens, retention ponds and permeable pavements to reduce half to nearly all runoff.

The following activities were implemented in the sponge city project in Zhuanghe (near Dalian) and were studied as examples of the sponge city approach:

- a. Building an underground reservoir of 300 m³
- b. Improving drainage in different ways
- c. Natural waste water treatment
- d. Promotion of water penetration in the soil in different ways
- e. Building a wetland
- f. Allowing waste water reuse by separating brown water and reserving one pipe in the road for that purpose (next to a drinking water, a sewer and a drainage pipe)
- g. Permeable concrete and asphalt
- h. Permeable parking places using plastic to reinforce the ground
- i. Planting grass around the houses
- j. Building roof gardens
- k. Collect rain water from the roof, etc.

The governance structure of this project is that the local government is in charge through its Bureau of planning and some projects have been outsourced, which is different from a Public Private Partnership (PPP). In addition, the involvement of the people, CBOs and NGOs is limited and the local government wants to involve the commercial private sector in year 4, when there is no more money, which is not very attractive for the sector. The officials interviewed said they are too busy spending the available money in time to involve other stakeholders.

4.2. Smart Eco-Cities

On top of these three water management paradigms there are alternative concepts, which are not necessarily focusing on water or water-related issues, but still relevant. In particular the different types of definitions of smart cities are interesting. Research showed that half of the cities studied recently expressed the ambition to be a smart city as well. Smart means making use of information technology to build a smart city. Criteria used for the Smart Cities Awards that are given in China each year are dealing differently with mobility, with IT infrastructure, water management, renewable energy and reuse of waste, safety, cultural development, globalization and governance. Smart or creative cities emphasize the importance of innovations, such as the digital town hall and using IT for other purposes. There are three types of smart city definitions [38]:

- Stressing the role of technology, using the internet of things for all kinds of urban and household problems
- Focusing on the transition and adaptation to rapid changes, this is possible by sharing knowledge, learning from best practices and evaluating different initiatives to tackle the issue at stake (Table 2)
- Pointing to different way of managing cities, focusing on managing the flows and doing it in an integrated way by using ICT and GIS

Originally the focus was on eco-city dimensions only [43], but the concept can be combined with the desire to be a smart city. Smart eco-cities [38] are about managing flows of information, ideas, money, etc., in an integrated way. The information may concern the traffic, the people, pollution or the number of enterprises moving in and out of the city, but also the flows of storm and wastewater are monitored. Developing smart or eco-cities starts with what a city wants to achieve and which flows can be managed differently.

5. Discussion: The Comparison between the Three Paradigms

The concepts analyzed differ substantially in their scope. The resilient and sponge city paradigm have a narrow scope, while the green, eco- and sustainable city concepts are very broad in what they want to change. At the local level the focus of the authorities is often on one aspect, managing water, or cleaning it. The different paradigms may lead to sectoral approaches, for example concerning sustainable drinking water supply. However the issue is how can one achieve adaptation policies in the concerned cities, given the projected changes in water supply?

Evidence has been collected for the three paradigms using different variables to show that the approach is often not integrated. Rarely the implementation is based on a strategic planning document, prepared with stakeholders who could implement the results. Urban management is facilitating such initiatives of stakeholders in the city or neighborhoods. Many initiatives are taken at the neighborhood level, for example information dissemination activities to enable these initiatives, while the households then implement the ideas.

As far as the governance of the initiatives is concerned the concepts remain relatively vague. The resilient and sponge city paradigms think mainly in terms of using government structures, while in the eco-cities paradigm the citizens and their organizations want to be involved through newly created governance structures. In the resilient cities paradigm the potential victims may be involved, while in the sponge city paradigm the idea is to involve the private sector, although this has not happened

in most Chinese cities [44]. In governance terms eco- and sponge city emphasize the involvement of stakeholders, while in resilient cities paradigm the initiative is often put at the local government level.

The conclusion is that there are five types of policies used to implement the three paradigms:

1. At the national level general policies can be formulated to promote water conservation and to avoid flooding.
2. Policies at the city level may improve urban drainage, water storage and infiltration
3. Subsidies, are possible at the local and the national level. They may raise awareness for particular issues, subsidize the adaptation of buildings and help in introducing the innovations mentioned at the neighbourhood level (separating grey and brown water and rain water harvesting), or at the city level (decentralized treatment of grey water and water storage ponds).
4. Planning requirements are usually formulated at the national level. They can force cities to close the water cycle, or make clear that building permits will not be given for construction in lower lying areas of the city.
5. Demand management policies can be developed at the national level. These policies are necessary for reducing the consumption of water and energy and local authorities can help to make available the necessary information and devices.

In practice the sponge city paradigm turns out to be a very technical, a one sector and government initiated approach. Table 3 showed that also for the other paradigms there is a trend of focusing on certain activities or sectors. Sectoral interventions have the advantage of allowing comparison or benchmarking. It is important to choose the relevant dimensions and to use the right indicators to measure the performance. Chinese cities are compared continuously on a number of dimensions such as: Their pollution, the per capita water resources and consumption, the areas in cities available for recreational purposes, etc. (China Daily 4-4-2014: 17).

Table 3. Different paradigms for urban water management, characteristic of each type.

Criterion	Resilient Cities	Eco-Cities	Sponge Cities
Achieving the objectives	Objectives like better water storage achieved	Broad-based approach, more or less successful	Successful in its technical achievements
Governance, stakeholder participation	Still very (local) government centered	More space for local and non-governmental initiatives	Still major role for local government, no time for other partners
The approach to water issues	Based on the challenges	Eco adaptive water management and water an asset in landscape	The focus is on traditional integrated water management
Policy support	Emphasis is on measurement and, policies preventing disaster	Policies can provide incentives to isolate, to use solar energy, etc.	Emphasis is on spending the available budgets in time
Evaluations	Wang Yan et al. (2009) [45] De Jong (2018) [18]	Bhatnagar (ed., 2010) [15], Juke Liu et al. (2016) [31]	Li, et al. (2017) [16], Liang (2018) [44]

Tables 2 and 3 also showed that the initiatives can come from different stakeholders and do not have to come from governments. Project developers and private individuals also take initiatives and incentives can be provided for these stakeholders. The different paradigms deal differently with water issues and only the sponge city paradigm follows the classical integrated water resources management approach. The resilient city paradigm is more in favor of an adaptive water management approach, which mean trying to focus on the most important issues, and solving them together with the relevant stakeholders, rather than going for a government-led top-down Integrated Water Resources Management approach.

Eco-cities can be seen as a new life style. They also require a different type of management, which promotes harmony with the natural environment and long-term sustainability. It may lead to closing the water cycle [5]. The eco-city concept translates a vision what a city should be like into practice. The eco-city paradigm implies an ethical issue of how to deal with poorer people, who cannot afford the additional efforts. The Resilient cities concept is a more defensive concept, trying to avoid certain negative developments.

6. Conclusions

The paradigm to choose largely depends on the objectives a city wants to achieve and its problems. If the emphasis is on the environment eco-cities may be the paradigm, if the emphasis is on the use of IT, smart city may be more appropriate. It is concluded that different stakeholders and several policy instruments are needed to achieve smart eco-cities.

Given climate change and other issues cities are facing, government and stakeholders need to think in terms of closing energy and water cycles where nothing gets lost! The smart eco-city of the future pays attention to managing flows smartly, taking interactions like between water and energy, and infrastructure and means of transportation, into account. Smart ecological cities require integration of different approaches or sectors. This desirable integration could take place in the framework of strategic planning. One can argue in favor of Smart eco-cities starting with a vision what to achieve. Then there is the option of the possibility to use the right technology to drive the desired change, for example a reduction of the dependence on fossil energy by using technologies like temperature exchange equipment and getting energy out of waste water.

Experiences to create environmental sustainability in Chinese cities and one European city were analyzed. The question was to what extent have cities that followed a certain paradigm been successful? In terms of expected solutions most paradigms were quite successful, but often looked at the government to take the initiative. Only in eco-cities more space is usually available from the beginning for the involvement of all kinds of stakeholders. There is a need for more awareness raising concerning what other stakeholders and in particular households can do to achieve a more sustainable city and better living environment and how to create new governance structures to deal with the more important water issues, where other state stakeholders than the state can play a role.

Finance is an issue, but usually not the biggest one. Lindfield and Steinberg [9] note that ‘financing sustainable cities’ can be defined as helping cities moving toward long-term environmental sustainability by “maximizing the amount of revenue derived from existing sources, identifying new sources of revenue, leveraging additional resources from the private sector and accessing international and local funding that supports green investments.”

It is a challenge to pay special attention to the role of poor people in all these paradigms. The conclusion is that implementing the paradigms is easier if the governance structures are more decentralized. Different actors can then play a role; for example, the project developers can sign for a certain approach and the relevant people can receive subsidies for specific environment-friendly activities. Stakeholders can be incentivized to engage in rain water harvesting projects or to build facilities for the separation of grey and brown water. Similarly, demand management can be introduced to limit the consumption of water and electricity

The question was asked whether all ambitions of these paradigms can be achieved? Cities often focus on one or two elements of the paradigm and do not really follow an integrated approach. Secondly, some cities wanted to be eco-cities in the 1990s and are trying to become sponge cities now (Zhuanghe), or smart cities (Shenzhen and Beijing), where they were an eco-city before (both). This has to do with the support received from the national level. The impression is that Chinese cities move from one government supported paradigm to another, without bothering too much about the sustainability of their investments after the end of the projects.

Author Contributions: Writing—original draft, M.P.v.D. M.Z. provided information.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Wong, T.C.; Han, S.S.; Zhang, H. (Eds.) *Population Mobility, Urban Planning and Management in China*; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2015.
2. Zhang, M.; Wang, H.; Jin, W.; van Dijk, M.P. Assessing heat wave vulnerability in Beijing and its districts, using a three dimensional model. *Int. J. Glob. Warm.* **2019**, *17*, 297–314. [CrossRef]
3. IPCC. Global Warming of 1.5 °C. 2018. Available online: <https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/accessed11-2-2019> (accessed on 11 February 2019).
4. UN Habitat. *Sustainable Cities Programme*; United Nations: Nairobi, Kenya, 2018; Available online: http://www.fukuoka.unhabitat.org/programmes/detail04_03_en.html (accessed on 22 April 2018).
5. Butterworth, J.; McIntyre, P.; da Silva Wells, C. *Switch in the City, Putting Urban Water Management to the Test*; IRC: The Hague, The Netherlands, 2011.
6. Dastbaz, M.; Naudé, W.; Manoochehri, J. (Eds.) *Smart Futures, Challenges of Urbanization and Social Sustainability*; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2018.
7. Liang, X.; Van Dijk, M.P. Financial and economic feasibility of decentralized waste water reuse systems in Beijing. *Water Sci. Technol.* **2009**, *61*, 1965–1974. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
8. Suzuki, H.; Dastur, A.; Moffatt, S.; Yabuki, N.; Maruyama, H. *Eco² cities: Ecological Cities as Economic Cities*; World Bank: Washington, DC, USA, 2010.
9. Lindfield, M.; Steinberg, F. *Green Cities*; Asian Development Bank: Manila, Philippines, 2012.
10. Morris, E.S. Down with ECO-towns! Up with ECO-communities, or is there a need for model eco-towns? A review of the 2009–2010 Eco-town proposals in Britain. In *Eco-City Planning*; Wong, T.-C., Yuen, B., Eds.; Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2011; pp. 113–130.
11. Geng, Y.; Zhu, Q.; Doberstein, B.; Fujita, T. Implementing China’s 784, circular economy concept at the regional level. *Waste Manag.* **2009**, *29*, 996–1002. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
12. Litman, T.; Burnell, M. Issues in sustainable transportation. *Int. J. Glob. Environ.* **2006**, *6*, 331–347. [CrossRef]
13. Stead, D. Sustainable urban transport in developing world, beyond megacities. *Sustainability* **2015**, *7*, 7784–7805.
14. OECD. Resilient Cities. 2018. Available online: <http://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/resilient-cities.htm> (accessed on 23 April 2019).
15. Bhatnagar, M. (Ed.) *Eco-Cities, Perspectives and Experiences*; ICFAI University Press: Hyderabad, India, 2010.
16. Li, H.; Ding, L.; Ren, M.; Li, C.; Wang, H. Sponge City Construction in China: A Survey of the challenges and opportunities. *Water* **2017**, *9*, 594. [CrossRef]
17. China’s Ministry of Environmental Protection. Introduction on National Model City for Environmental Protection. 2009. Available online: http://wfs.mep.gov.cn/mfcs/cjmfcs/cmdt/200911/t20091105_181217.htm (accessed on 12 January 2019).
18. De Jong, M. *Governance of Infrastructure in China*; University of Technology: Delft, The Netherlands, 2016.
19. Zhang, M.; Liu, Z.; van Dijk, M.P. Measuring urban vulnerability to climate change using an integrated approach, assessing climate risks in Beijing. *Life Environ. J.* **2019**, *1*, 1–19.
20. Van Dijk, M.P.; Edelenbos, J.; van Rooijen, K. (Eds.) *Urban Governance in the Realm of Complexity*; Practical Action: Warwickshire, UK, 2017; pp. 1–345.
21. Esteban, T.A.O. Collective engagement, Picking up after the storm. In *Urban Governance in the Realm of Complexity*; van Dijk, M.P., Edelenbos, J., van Rooijen, K., Eds.; Practical action: London, UK, 2017.
22. Rockefeller Foundation and ARUP. *City Resilience Framework*; Rockefeller Foundation and ARUP: New York, NY, USA, 2014.
23. UNISDR. The Campaign “Making Cities Resilient”. 2010. Available online: <https://www.unisdr.org/we/campaign/cities> (accessed on 12 March 2019).
24. Rotterdam Climate Initiative. Climate Adaptation. 2017. Available online: <http://www.rotterdamclimateinitiative.nl,accessed21-9-2018> (accessed on 21 September 2018).
25. Kenworthy, J.R. Dimensions for Sustainable City Development in the Third World. *Environ. Urban.* **2006**, *18*, 67–85. [CrossRef]

26. Rombout, E. Sustainable architecture, ecologically sound urban planning and biodiversity thoughts about an ecopolis, Plea for a lobe city. In *Eco-Cities, Perspectives and Experiences*; Bhatnagar, M., Ed.; ICFAI University Press: Hyderabad, India, 2009; pp. 99–142.
27. Raj, K. Culture-environment parity in development planning, A way of ecological balance in growing cities; Ecocities. In *Ecocities, Perspectives and Experiences*; Bhatnagar, M., Ed.; The Icfai Books: Hyderabad, India, 2010.
28. Usunju, J.B.; Schwartz, K.; Schouten, M.A.C.; van Dijk, M.P.; Johnson, W.P. Slums, Socio-economic aspects of improved sanitation in slums. *Public Health* **2011**, *1*, 1–9. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
29. Oduro-Kwarteng, S.; van Dijk, M.P. Regulatory environment for private sector involvement in solid waste collection in Ghana. *Int. J. Environ. Waste Manag.* **2017**, *20*, 35–48. [[CrossRef](#)]
30. Betancourth, C.H. Eco-infrastructures, feedback loop urbanisms and network of independent zero carbon settlements. In *Eco-City Planning*; Wong, T.-C., Yuen, B., Eds.; Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2011; pp. 31–51.
31. Liu, J.; Sun, W.; Hu, W. *The Development of Eco Cities in China*; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2016.
32. Burnett, J. City building-Eco-labels and shades of green. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* **2007**, *83*, 29–38. [[CrossRef](#)]
33. Duc Uy, P.; Nakagoshi, N. Application of land suitability analysis and landscape ecology to urban green space planning in Hanoi. *Urban For. Urban Green.* **2007**, *7*, 25–40.
34. Van Dijk, M.P.; Zhang, M. Sustainability indices as a tool for urban managers, Evidence from four medium-sized Chinese cities. *Environ. Impact Assess. Rev.* **2005**, *25*, 667–689. [[CrossRef](#)]
35. Liang, X.; Van Dijk, M.P. Economic and financial analysis on rainwater harvesting for agricultural irrigation in the rural areas of Beijing. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* **2011**, *55*, 1100–1109. [[CrossRef](#)]
36. Liang, X.; Van Dijk, M.P. Beijing, managing water for the eco city of the future. *Int. J. Water* **2012**, *6*, 270–290.
37. Qiu, L.; van Dijk, M.P.; Wang, H.H. Water pollution and environmental governance systems of the Tai and Chao Lake Basins in China in an international perspective. *Int. J. Water Resour. Prot.* **2014**, *7*, 830–842. [[CrossRef](#)]
38. Van Dijk, M.P. Smart eco cities are managing information flows in an integrated way, the example of water, electricity and solid waste. In *Smart Futures, Challenges of Urbanisation, and Social Sustainability*; Dastbaz, M., Naudé, W., Manoochchri, J., Eds.; Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2018; pp. 149–169.
39. Wong, T.-C.; Yuen, B. (Eds.) *Eco City Planning, Policies, Practice and Design*; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2011.
40. Wu, F. Editorial. *Geoforum* **2012**, *430*, 169–171. [[CrossRef](#)]
41. Dunn, J.; Jamieson, W. The relation between of sustainable tourism and eco-city development. In *Eco-City Planning*; Wong, T.-C., Yuen, B., Eds.; Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2011; pp. 93–109.
42. UNDP. *China National Human Development Report 2013, Sustainable and Liveable Cities: Towards Ecological Civilization*; United Nations Development Program: Beijing, China, 2014.
43. Van Dijk, M.P. Eco-cities of the future, learning from Chinese and Indian experiences. *Artha Vikas* **2013**, *49*, 1–11.
44. Liang, X. Integrated economic and financial analysis of China's Sponge city program for water-resilient urban development. *Sustainability* **2018**, *10*, 669. [[CrossRef](#)]
45. Yan, W.; Jianming, C.; Liou, X.; Junping, L. Resilient Chinese Cities: Examples from Beijing and Shanghai. *Urban Agric. Mag.* **2009**, *22*, 20–21.

