Adaptive Housing Policies in Southeast Asia: Fostering Inclusive Growth and Climate Resilience in a Post-Pandemic Urban Landscape

Adebayo Ayodeji Ala
Department of Architecture, College of Sciences, Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti

Abraham Adeniyi Taiwo
Department of Architecture, College of Sciences, Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti

Tayewo Segun Olanrewaju
Department of Architecture, College of Sciences, Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti

Akinniyi Tunde Akinyemi
Department of Architecture, College of Sciences, Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti

Abstract: *The housing sector in South East Asia has experienced rapid growth and transformation in recent decades, driven by urbanization, economic development, and demographic changes. This paper examines the housing policies and practices in South East Asia, with a focus on Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam. Through a comparative analysis of national housing policies, programs, and projects, this study identifies key successes, challenges, and lessons learned. The paper highlights the importance of effective governance, institutional frameworks, and public-private partnerships in addressing housing needs. It also emphasizes the need for inclusive, sustainable, and resilient housing solutions that prioritize affordability, accessibility, and environmental sustainability. The study's findings offer valuable lessons for other developing nations facing similar housing challenges. By examining the experiences of South East Asian countries, this paper provides insights into the development of effective housing policies and practices that can inform policy decisions and interventions in other regions.*

Keywords*: adaptive housing policies, southeast Asia, growth, climate resilience, post-pandemic urban landscape*

INTRODUCTION

Housing is a basic human right and a key building block of social stability, economic productivity and public health, especially in the context of an accelerating global urbanization. Rapidly urbanizing areas of the world are experiencing growing housing crises, marked by widening gaps in affordability, the proliferation of urban slums and informal settlements and poor provision of infrastructure. These challenges frequently result in less than optimal conditions for living, that can undermine public health outcomes and amplify societal vulnerabilities in times of crisis. For instance, the recent global pandemic highlighted the question of how the absence of adequate housing facilities prevented the poorer population from isolating effectively, which has highlighted pre-existing contradictions and inequalities in the access to housing (IIAS, n.d.). This situation has made housing more than just a socio-economic issue but a crucial public health and national resilience problem, which implies that housing policies now need to explicitly adopt public health considerations as well as disaster preparedness to prevent the spread of diseases and increase the capacity of societies to absorb and rebound from shocks. Southeast Asia with its dynamic economies and their various governments is a strong and instructive case study for housing policy innovation. The region has seen some of the fastest urban growth in the world with an estimated 50% of the entire population of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) living in urban areas as of 2023 and projections for more than 55% of Asia's population to be urbanized by 2030 (Market Research Southeast Asia, 2023).

This demographic shift has generated a huge demand for housing with the Southeast Asia expected to need 50 million more housing units by 2030 (Market Research Southeast Asia, 2023). Countries like Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, and Vietnam have adopted different strategies of housing provision ranging from state-led public housing, public-private partnerships (PPPs), and community-led initiatives. While urbanization is usually considered as an engine for economic growth, the sheer scale of upcoming housing demand and subsequent overcrowding and inadequate living conditions in many cities indicate its deep negative externalities if not proactively handled (Market Research Southeast Asia, 2023). The direct correlation between urban growth and the growth of informal settlements suggests a systemic failure of planning and provision, and therefore a need to re-examine the models for urban development so that housing provision can maintain its supply to keep up with population growth and to be available for all sections of society. The housing sector in Southeast Asia has been heavily influenced by recent events in the world, especially the Covid-19 pandemic and the growing threat of climate change. The pandemic caused a major economic downturn, resulting in more people becoming poor and people generally losing their jobs in the region (Asian Development Bank, 2021).

This economic scarring worsened the existing housing affordability issues for millions of people and exposed and deepened pre-existing inequalities and vulnerabilities surrounding housing access, particularly for the urban poor (IIAS). Compounding these socio-economic pressures is a critical and escalating threat of climate change. Low-lying coastal areas, especially in nations such

as Indonesia and Vietnam, are especially vulnerable to rising sea levels and extreme weather events. These types of environmental hazards disproportionately affect vulnerable communities and informal settlements, resulting in destruction of the homes, displacement, and overstretching the already fragile infrastructure (Jha, Bloch, and Lamond, 2012; Tan et al., 2022; UN-Habitat, 2020). The confluence of these macro-level shocks of economic downturns, public health crises, and climate disasters make for a complex and challenging environment for housing sectors in developing nations. This requires a fundamental change in policy responses that have thus far been reactive, siloed and far from being integrated and resilient housing strategies. Future housing policies need to be designed with the ability to absorb, adapt to and recover from multiple, overlapping external shocks as an inherent feature of their design, building policy resilience as a fundamental design principle (IIAS; Stephens and Hick, 2022; Tan et al., 2022; UN-Habitat, 2020).

Many developing countries are still struggling with major housing issues, such as affordability crises, urban slums, poor infrastructure and unsustainable growth patterns. In spite of various housing interventions, there are still inefficiencies in policies and gaps in their implementation. In contrast, a number of South East Asian countries like Singapore, Malaysia and Thailand have shown substantial progress in housing delivery based on strategic frameworks and public-private partnerships. However, there is still little academic work on how the experience of these countries could be used to address housing reform in other countries. This research aims to fill this gap by systematically examining housing policies and practices in South East Asia in order to draw practical lessons which potentially can be adapted to other developing contexts.

This study is geographically restricted to a few South East Asian countries which includes Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia and Philippines. Thematically it focuses on housing policies relating to affordability, access, financing models, urban planning and sustainability. The study does not attempt to cover rural housing exclusively nor does it look at housing in developed economies outside of the region. It is also restricted to policies and implementation strategies from the year 2000 to the current time.

This research is very significant on a variety of fronts. First, it offers valuable opportunities for policy learning by providing policymakers in developing nations with evidence-based information on good housing approaches. By analysing models based on the common socio-economic and urban development contexts of South East Asia, the study brings out practical frameworks that can be adapted/replicated elsewhere. Second, the study is a meaningful academic contribution as it adds to the current body of knowledge in the field of comparative urban policy. It aims at bridging the gap between the innovative housing policies of South East Asian countries and the wider housing discourse globally and thereby add depth to the scholarly understanding of regional approaches to housing. In terms of the practical relevance of the research, the project is well-placed to have wide-ranging benefits for different stakeholders. Urban planners, housing authorities and development institutions in other developing countries may find the findings particularly useful in adapting housing solutions to their own set of unique challenges. By demonstrating the successes

and failures of different approaches in South East Asia, the study sets the basis for informed policy formulation and implementation. Finally, the research is consistent with the global development priorities, especially as they pertain to sustainable development. The study supports the efforts of achieving the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 11, which seeks to make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable, by focusing on strategies to balance affordability with environmental and social sustainability.

The main goal of this research is a critical analysis of housing policies and practices in selected countries in South East Asia, particularly in identifying frameworks and strategies for understanding affordability and sustainability and making relevant lessons in other developing countries.

To achieve the aim, the study will pursue the following objectives:

1. Identify and analyze the theoretical frameworks that underpin effective housing policies in South East Asia.
2. Evaluate how selected South East Asian countries have implemented policies to enhance housing affordability and sustainability.
3. To explore transferable lessons from South East Asia's housing experiences that could inform policy-making in other developing countries.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Housing policies are government interventions aimed at guaranteeing adequate housing of all citizens. These policies are influenced by larger economic, social and environmental considerations. There are a number of theoretical frameworks that inform housing policy development. The concept of sustainable urban development focuses on the idea of balancing economic development, social equity and environmental sustainability (United Nations, 2016). In terms of housing, this means energy efficient design and resilient infrastructures and planning which should include everyone. For example, in Singapore, eco-towns are equipped with green roofs, rainwater harvesting and energy-saving technologies (Yuen and Kong, 2009). Inclusive housing policies ensure that marginalized groups, such as poor families, migrants and informal settlers, have access to affordable housing. Thailand's Baan Mankong program is a great example in that it provides slum communities with the power to upgrade their own settlements with support from the government (Boonyabancha, 2005). PPPs are using private sector efficiency but with public oversight. Malaysia's PR1MA program to deliver middle-income housing, using private developers with government subsidies, is one example of what this model can achieve (Sengupta, 2017).

Singapore's Housing and Development Board (HDB) has been widely touted as the gold standard for public housing. More than 80% of Singapore's population lives in the HDB flats which are subsidized and sold on a 99-year lease (Phang, 2018). Central Provident Fund (CPF) provides

long-term financing where the citizen can buy homes as a result of mandatory savings (Doling and Ronald, 2014). Malaysia's PR1MA program is focused on the middle-income earners with affordable housing, rent-to-own schemes for low-income families (Sengupta, 2017). However, there are still challenges in rural-urban disparity and speculative pricing (Hui and Omran, 2018). The Baan Mankong program, initiated in 2003, helps slum communities to upgrade their homes with the support of government loans and technical assistance (Boonyabancha, 2005). This participatory approach has seen the tenure security and living conditions of over 300,000 households improved (Archer, 2012). Indonesia's program of FLPP offers subsidized mortgages, however, implementation has been patchy and challenged by bureaucratic delays as well as land tenure issues (Firman, 2016). Industrial workers and urban migrants are the target of Vietnam's Social Housing Development Program that provides low-cost apartments close to factories (World Bank, 2019). However, rapid urbanization has outgrown the supply resulting in informal settlements (Gough and Tran, 2009).

Southeast Asia on the other hand is a rather diverse landscape of housing policies where there are countries that see homeownership and community driven solutions as successful and there are countries that struggle with fast urbanisation and climate change. Singapore is the best example of good housing governance, with a homeownership rate of more than 90% (Phang, 2018). This achievement has been attributed mostly to good government intervention and carefully thought-out financial mechanisms. The Housing and Development Board (HDB) is responsible for public housing and makes sure that housing is affordable through housing subsidies, a requirement to save money via the Central Provident Fund (CPF), and long-term leasehold schemes. By consideration of housing within the broader context of economic and social planning, Singapore has developed a stable, inclusive housing market to meet the needs of the majority of its population. In contrast, Thailand's Baan Mankong program illustrates the power that grass roots participation in solving housing insecurity can have. Initiated in 2003, this community-driven approach empowers the low-income residents to collectively upgrade their settlements with support from the government (Boonyabancha, 2005). Instead of taking a purely top-down approach, Baan Mankong promotes the establishment of partnerships between communities and local authorities and NGOs that will allow slum dwellers to secure land tenure, better infrastructure and build affordable homes. This model has proved sustainable because of its priority given to local knowledge and the creation of long-term resilience which provides a replicable model for participatory urban development.

However, many of the cities of Southeast Asia are plagued by the stresses of rapid urbanisation. In Jakarta and Ho Chi Minh City, population growth has outpaced infrastructure development resulting in severe overcrowding, informal settlement and inadequate public services (Firman, 2016). Rural to urban migration, together with poor urban planning, compounds the shortage of housing and many are left living in poor conditions. Governments often lack the resources or the political will to roll out any large-scale affordable housing programs and the urban poor are left to fend for themselves in dangerous environments.

Compounding these problems is an enhanced threat of climate change, especially in low-lying coastal areas. Indonesia and Vietnam are increasingly exposed to the effects of rising sea levels as well as to extreme weather events, exerts a disproportionate impact on informal settlements (Jha, Bloch, and Lamond, 2012). Flooding and erosion destroy homes, displace communities and strain already fragile infrastructure. Without efforts to proactively adapt to climate displacement (e.g., flood-resistant housing, relocation schemes, and adopting stricter building codes) there are millions who remain vulnerable to environmental disasters.

METHODOLOGY

Design
This study uses a comparative case study research design for the purpose of an in-depth study of housing policies and practices for a select number of Southeast Asian countries. This approach is especially suited to the understanding, explanation and evaluation of complex phenomena relating to housing in different contexts and the identification of transferable lessons. By concentrating on a "small-N analysis", the design allows for a nuanced study of the institutional frameworks, policy instruments and dynamics of implementation that would be difficult to capture in a large-N statistical study. What makes comparative housing research fundamental is the capacity to obtain principles that are not prescriptive, but on the contrary, which can be adapted. While policies are often cultural products of their particular historical and geographical contexts and as such are seldom directly exportable, knowledge of policy instruments and their outcomes in one country can be an important input to analysis and development in another. By enabling for deep contextual understanding in a limited number of cases, all of which vary, it starts to go beyond superficial comparisons and offers insight into underlying mechanisms and principles that can be transferred and adapted. This way, the "lessons learned" are maximized for utility to other developing nations with insights for policy that exists in a particular environment and what makes them successful or not, not just a description of what policies exist.

The study selects five countries in South East Asia as case examples in order to explore housing policies and practices in the region, i.e. Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines. The choice of these countries is guided by a number of important considerations that contribute to the value of comparative policy analysis. First, the countries are a diverse set in terms of economic development levels and governance systems. Singapore is a developed, high-income country with high levels of centralised governance and highly structured housing policies, whereas Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines are upper middle to lower middle-income countries with varying levels of institutional arrangements and policy capacities. This diversity offers the pool to discuss different models of housing policies and governance strategies in different contexts. For example, housing in Singapore is dominated by the centralization of state planning processes and a high level of institutional coordination through authorities, such as the Housing and Development Board, whereas in Thailand there has been a more participatory and community-led approach to the development of housing. Such contrasts mean that a much richer comparative analysis can be undertaken that can help to reveal the extent to which different

governance structures affect housing outcomes. Furthermore, these countries are, altogether, part of a regional landscape that is marked by rapid urbanization, demographics and a growing pressure on housing systems. An examination of the approaches taken by these nations therefore brings insights into approaches being adopted by different governments in an attempt to tackle complex urban housing issues in rapidly developing contexts.

Another major rationale for the choice of these countries is the fact that they suffer from common developmental problems that make their experiences especially relevant for comparative analysis and policy learning. Many countries of Southeast Asia have experienced rapid urban population growth due to rural-urban migration, economic and transformation, and the growth of metropolitan areas. This growth imposes huge pressure on housing supply and infrastructure and urban planning systems. At the same time, these countries are becoming increasingly vulnerable to climate change, as well as flooding, rising sea levels and other environmental risks that have a significant impact on housing sustainability and urban resilience. Additionally, the economic disruptions due to the pandemic of the new coronavirus have exacerbated the need for housing policies that are supportive for economic recovery, social protection, and better living conditions for vulnerable populations. By examining how Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines respond to these intersecting challenges, this study helps to provide a meaningful comparative context for understanding the evolution of housing policies under circumstances of economic transformation and environmental uncertainty. Another practical consideration that provides justification to select these countries is the existence of significant academic literature, policy documentation and international development reports concerning housing policy and urban development in these countries. This availability of credible and diverse data sources allows for a strong analysis of the document, as well as adds to the study's finding reliability.

The main mode of data collection which was considered in this study is comprehensive document analysis. Document analysis is a qualitative research, it is a systematic way of reviewing and interpreting what is already written, in order to extract relevant information from it and find patterns in it and establish analytical insights from it. In this study, a broad array of documentary sources are analysed to offer a general picture of housing policy frameworks and implementation strategies in the countries selected for the study. One important category of documents are official policy documents such as national housing policies, urban development strategies, legislative documents and government reports by relevant ministries or housing agencies. These documents contain detailed information with regard to policy objectives, implementation mechanisms and regulatory frameworks and government priorities with regards to the provision of housing. Another major source of data comes from the academic literature including peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, conference papers and academic theses which look at housing systems and urban development in Southeast Asia. These scholarly works contribute theoretical perspectives, empirical findings and critical evaluations of housing policies to add depth to the analytical content of the study. In addition to academic sources, the study is based on reports generated by international organizations such as the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, UN-Habitat, etc. These organizations often conduct large-scale policy assessments and produce comprehensive

reports with statistical data, comparative evaluations and case studies of housing development in different countries. Furthermore, reputable news sources, publications of think tanks and grey literature are borrowed to reflect on the latest developments, current policy debates and experiences during the implementation, which may not have appeared in academic publications yet. The utilization of multiple documentary sources enables the study to triangulate information, and generate a more balanced and comprehensive study of housing policies in the selected countries.

The data obtained are analysed on the basis of a thematic comparative analytical framework aimed at identifying patterns, similarities and differences in housing policy approaches in the case countries. The analysis starts with the systematic categorization of policies and housing practices in key thematic areas that are central to the effectiveness of housing policies. These thematic areas include mechanisms for housing affordability, strategies for accessibility and inclusivity - especially for vulnerable populations such as low-income households - financing models for housing development, integration of housing policies into broader urban planning frameworks and the incorporation of climate resilience considerations into housing strategies. Once policies and practices are structured on the basis of these themes, the study is a cross-country comparison to explore how different countries address the above issues and how the results of these policies vary from one context to another. This process consists in finding similarities between countries which can be indicative of common regional issues or policy diffusion, and differences generated by variations in institutional structures, governance approaches and economic conditions. Through this comparative process, the study examines the effect of specific policy choices on housing outcomes. For example, Singapore's high extent of public housing, which was implemented through centralized government planning, has been linked to high homeownership rates and low levels of social exclusion. In contrast, Thailand's Baan Mankong programme shows how community participation and collective decision-making can help bring about better tenure security and housing conditions for low-income urban community members. By studying such cases under an overarching analytical framework, the study aims at finding the causal relationships between policy design, implementation strategies and observable outcomes. Ultimately, the analysis goes beyond the description of policies to an understanding of the way and reasons as to why some ways of doing things succeed or encounter limitations.

The last stage of the analysis is concerned with the extraction of lessons that can be used for wider housing policy considerations in developing contexts. The study argues that instead of promoting the direct reproduction of any particular policy model from one country to another, there is a strong need to focus on identifying transferable principles and flexible strategies that can inform policy innovation in other locations. Housing policies are frequently influenced by historical, cultural, and political contexts such that policies that work in one country can rarely be simply transplanted into another without some modification. Therefore, the aim of the study is to distill some underlying policy principles (such as the importance of good institutional coordination, sustainable financing mechanisms, community participation, and long-term urban planning) that contribute to successful outcomes in housing. At the same time, it admits a number of limitations that are

inherent in the research design. Because the study uses mainly secondary sources of data, the analysis is limited by the availability, accuracy, and completeness of existing documentation. Some information on policy implementation, or some experiences on a local level, may not be fully reflected in published materials. Additionally, housing policies and urban environments are dynamic and constantly changing, so the results reflect a snap shot of current and recent developments and do not provide an account of long-term trends. The qualitative nature of the study also means that it does not include qualitative modelling, statistical analysis or primary field research such as interviews or surveys that could add further empirical evidence to the study. Despite these shortcomings, the approach of documentary analysis and comparative framework employed systematically in this study reveals interesting insights about the nature of housing policy formulation and implementation in different Southeast Asian countries to tackle the complex challenges in urban growth.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study point to a number of key lessons that can be used in the housing policy development of other developing nations experiencing rapid urbanization, housing shortages, and widening socio-economic inequalities. One of the most important lessons to emerge from the comparative analysis is the importance of strong and well-coordinated institutions in the effective delivery of housing programmes. The experience of Singapore shows what can be achieved by a committed and well-organized housing authority in changing the housing landscape of a country. Singapore's Housing and Development Board (HDB) has been instrumental in planning, financing and delivering large-scale public housing projects in Singapore, and has enabled the country to have one of the world's highest homeownership rates. The institutional strength of the HDB is its clear mandate, strong political support and linking housing policy to broader national development strategies (Phang 2018). Through centralized planning and successful coordination between governmental agencies, Singapore has been able to ensure the availability of affordable and quality housing to the majority of its population. This way, it explains the importance of building strong institutional capacity within housing governance. In many developing countries there is often fragmented institutional arrangements and weak regulatory frameworks leading to ineffective housing policy and implementation failures. Establishing specialised housing authorities with clear responsibilities, long-term planning capacity and adequate financial resources can thus be a critical element in solving the housing deficits. Comparative housing research also emphasizes the importance of institutional arrangements on the outcomes of housing in different countries, leading to strong governance structures being an important determinant for the success of housing policies (Stephens and Hick 2022). In fast urbanizing parts of Southeast Asia, where housing demands are increasing, competent housing institutions are playing a key role in ensuring that housing programmes are implemented efficiently and sustainably (Doling and Ronald 2014).

Another important takeaway coming out of the study is the success of community engagement in housing development and urban upgrading programmes. Thailand's Baan Mankong programme provides a strong example of how participatory approaches can deliver more inclusive and

sustainable housing outcomes. Unlike traditional top-down housing interventions, the Baan Mankong initiative puts community organizations at the core of decision-making processes, allowing residents of informal settlements to actively participate in planning, financing and implementing housing improvements. The programme offers infrastructure subsidies and soft loans on a direct basis to community groups so that they can collectively design and upgrade their housing and neighbourhood (Boonyabancha 2005). This participatory approach not only helps to improve the physical conditions of the housing but also helps to build social capital and community cohesion, as well as a sense of ownership by the residents on development initiatives. Community savings groups and collective financing mechanisms have been especially effective to mobilize local resources and build trust among residents. Archer (2012) states that savings-driven housing finance has played an instrumental role in the development of community potential in Thailand by allowing poor households to gradually build up financial resources for housing improvements. The engagement of communities in the housing development processes also ensures that housing solutions are more aligned with the needs and priorities of local communities. This approach is in contrast to traditional housing schemes run by the government that often don't work because they don't consider the social and economic reality of poor communities. The lessons from Thailand show that the effective role of local communities and the incorporation of grassroots participation in housing policy design can make a significant contribution to the effectiveness and sustainability of urban upgrading programmes. In many third world countries where informal settlements keep growing as a result of rapid urbanization, community-driven housing strategies are a viable alternative to purely state-driven housing provision. These approaches are especially applicable in regions where government has financial constraints and limited administrative capacity to implement large scale housing programmes (Tan, Tan, and Tan 2022).

A third critical lesson highlighted by the study is the importance of minimize financing mechanisms in expanding access to affordable housing. Housing development requires a lot of financial resources and solely relying on government funding is often not enough to meet the increased housing demand of rapidly urbanizing countries. Successful housing systems thus have diverse financing strategies such as government subsidies, microfincancing schemes, private sector investments and public-private partnerships. In Southeast Asia a few countries have made good use of innovative housing finance models involving a combination of public support and the private sector participation to expand the supply of housing. For example, government subsidies can be used to help reduce the cost of housing for low-income households, while private developers can help to provide technical expertise and investment capital for large-scale housing projects. The political and regulatory tools offered by public-private partnerships enable governments to benefit from efficiency and resources in the private sector while retaining regulatory control of housing affordability and quality (Hui and Omran 2018). Microfinance institutions are also playing an important role in allowing poor households to have access to small loans for incremental housing construction and improvements. Diversified housing finance systems - incorporating both formal financial institutions and alternative mode of finance - are integral for inclusive housing markets in developing economies. Such systems allow more households to access housing finance, especially those who work in the informal sectors and are usually excluded from the traditional

mortgage markets. Moreover, the inclusion of housing finance policies into broader financial sector development strategies can make housing programmes more sustainable by ensuring a stable flow of investment in the housing sector (World Bank 2015).

The higher-level regional context also provides more impetus to have diversified housing finance systems, as urbanization continues to take off in Southeast Asia and other developing regions. Rapid urban population growth has imposed huge pressure on the supply of housing, especially in the big metropolitan areas where land prices and costs of construction are increasing rapidly. According to the United Nations (2016) integrated housing strategies, which incorporate financial innovation, institutional coordination, and inclusive planning, are the principle requirements for sustainable urban development. Without effective housing financing mechanisms, it is often difficult for governments to operate the scale-up of the housing programme or cater to the needs of rapidly expanding urban population. The challenge has been further exacerbated by the economic upheavals brought about by the coronavirus pandemic that has stressed public budgets and decreased household incomes throughout the region (Asian Development Bank 2021). As a result, many governments are seeking the alternative housing finance solutions to support the post-pandemic economic recovery and ensure housing affordability for vulnerable populations. Market research also shows that the urbanization trends of Southeast Asia will continue to shape housing in the next few decades, which will require governments to engage in flexible and innovative financing approaches to meet growing demand (Market Research Southeast Asia 2023). Diversified financing approaches can also help to address climate resilient housing development by leveraging investments for infrastructure development and disaster risk reduction measures in vulnerable urban areas (Jha, Bloch, and Lamond 2012). Integrating housing finance with environmental resilience strategies is of special significance in Southeast Asia where many urban settlements are at risk of growing hazards due to flooding and other climate-related risks (Yuen and Kong 2009).

Overall, the findings of this research point to the need to have effective housing policies in developing countries with a mix of strong institutional frameworks, inclusive community participation and diversified financing systems. These three elements play a part in creating a set of housing systems that are both socially inclusive and economically sustainable. Strong institutions are needed for the governance capacity to plan and coordinate housing programmes and community engagement is required to ensure that housing interventions reflect the needs and priorities of local populations. At the same time, diversified financing mechanisms increase the sources of financing available to housing development, and allow governments to increase the scale of housing provision and reach underserved populations. The experiences of Southeast Asian countries show that successful housing policies are seldom the product of a single intervention but rather the outcome of the interaction of a number of policy instruments and institutional arrangements. Comparative housing research therefore has something to offer policy makers in other developing regions trying to address housing shortages and improve urban living conditions. By adapting these lessons to their unique socio-economic and institutional context, developing

countries can develop housing policies that are more resilient, inclusive and able to meet the challenges of rapid urbanization.

CONCLUSION

The experiences of Southeast Asian countries in addressing housing challenges offer important insights for policymakers in other developing countries that are interested in improving housing access, affordability, and sustainability. Although the housing policies adopted across the region differ greatly in design and implementation, together they show that successful housing policies must be responsive to local economic, social and institutional realities. Policymakers should therefore not blindly adopt housing policies that have been developed in other contexts without regard to the particular conditions of their countries. Instead, flexible, policy models that can be tailored to the local structures of governance, cultural dynamics and economic capacity are more likely to have sustainable and inclusive results. Making policy frameworks fit the local context enables governments to tackle the specific problems of urban development without disrupting policy relevance and effectiveness.

Another important policy priority is strengthening of the rights on land and tenure security. In many developing countries, unclear or informal land tenure systems are often contributing to instability in housing, forced displacement and lack of investment in housing improvements. When residents do not have secure land rights, they may not be able to invest in the upgrading of their homes or communities for fear of being evicted. Establishing transparent and reliable land administration systems can therefore make a substantial contribution to the promotion of housing stability and also to promote public and private investment in residential development. Secure tenure does not just protect populations who are vulnerable to displacement, but also helps to design for the future and create sustainable communities.

Policymakers also need to put more focus on climate adaptation inside housing and urban development plans. Many cities that are rapidly expanding in developing regions are becoming increasingly vulnerable to climate-related risks ranging from flooding, extreme heat to environmental degradation. Integrating climate-resilient housing designs such as flood-resistant building methods and energy-efficient building systems can help reduce vulnerability, which can also improve long-term sustainability. The housing experiences of countries in South East Asia illustrate that successful housing policies are based on the combination of good governance, inclusive participation and environmental sustainability. While no one-size-fits-all housing model can be rolled out across the region, the region's policy innovations may provide valuable lessons that can be learned in an effort to grapple with housing shortages and improve urban living conditions anywhere in the world.

REFERENCES

Archer, D. (2012). Finance as the key to unlocking community potential: Savings-driven housing finance in Thailand. *Environment and Urbanization, 24*(2), 423–440.

Asian Development Bank. (2021). *Southeast Asia rising: Pandemic*. https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/779416/southeast-asia-rising-pandemic.pdf

Boonyabancha, S. (2005). Baan Mankong: Going to scale with "slum" and squatter upgrading in Thailand. *Environment and Urbanization, 17*(1), 21–46.

Doling, J., and Ronald, R. (2014). *Housing policies in South East Asia*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Firman, T. (2016). The continuity and change in mega-urbanization in Indonesia: A survey of Jakarta-Bandung Region (JBR) development. *Habitat International, 52*, 11–19.

Gough, K. V., and Tran, H. A. (2009). Changing housing policy in Vietnam: Emerging inequalities in a residential area of Hanoi. *Cities, 26*(4), 175–186.

Hui, E. C. M., and Omran, A. (2018). Housing affordability in Malaysia: A review of policies and challenges. *Habitat International, 79*, 1–10.

IIAS. *The Review: COVID-19 Southeast Asia*. https://www.iias.asia/the-review/covid-19-southeast-asia

Jha, A. K., Bloch, R., and Lamond, J. (2012). *Cities and flooding: A guide to integrated urban flood risk management*. World Bank.

Lawson, J., Haffner, M., and Oxley, M. (n.d.). *Comparative housing workshop*. https://repository.tudelft.nl/file/File_43069818-368c-45e1-82b4-cf36121c32cb?preview=1

Market Research Southeast Asia. (2023). *Urbanization trends in Southeast Asia transform the region*. https://marketresearchsoutheastasia.com/insights/articles/urbanization-trends-in-southeast-asia-transform-the-region

Phang, S. Y. (2018). *Policy innovations for affordable housing in Singapore*. Springer.

Sengupta, U. (2017). *Housing policy in Malaysia: Towards inclusive urbanization*. Routledge.

Stephens, M., and Hick, R. (2022). *Comparative housing research*. (Preprint). https://rodhick.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Stephens-Hick_Comparative-housing-research_preprint.pdf

Tan, S. K. K., Tan, R. S. S., and Tan, R. S. S. (2022). Informal settlement resilience upgrading-approaches and applications from a cross-country perspective in three selected metropolitan regions of Southeast Asia. *Journal of Urban Management, 14*(15), 8985.

UN-Habitat. (2020). *World cities report 2020: The value of sustainable urbanization*. https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2020/10/wcr_2020_report.pdf

United Nations. (2016). *The New Urban Agenda*. UN-Habitat.

World Bank. (2015). *Stocktaking of the housing sector in East Asia and the Pacific*.

World Bank. (2019). *Vietnam urbanization review: Technical assistance report*.

World Bank. (2022). *Housing finance in emerging and developing economies: The role of institutional investors*.

https://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/099200106282235291/pdf/P175518042548402084910c362b33089ca.pdf

Yuen, B., and Kong, L. (2009). Climate change and urban planning in Southeast Asia. *Cities, 26*(1), 13–15.