Urmia University

Journal of Geography and Regional Future Studies
Vol. 3, Special Issue, Winter, 2026
Online ISSN: 2981-118X
https://grfs.urmia.ac.ir/

Governance of Integrated Settlement Systems in India: A Multi-Level Quantitative Planning Model for Regional Futures

Aarif Mohd Waza [1]

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, JSPM University Pune India.

ARTICLE INFO

Article type:
Research Article

Received:
2026/05/25
Accepted:
2026/07/24
pp:
33-50

Keywords:
Regional futures;
Polycentric Governance;
Urban–Rural Continuum;
Governance Index;
Territorial Cohesion;
India Climate Adaptation;
Settlement Systems.

ABSTRACT

Background: Contemporary settlement systems shaped by corridor-based growth, peri-urbanization, secondary-city expansion, digital restructuring, and climate exposure have outgrown the administrative boundaries that govern them, producing a structural mismatch between functional regional flows and jurisdictional authority. This gap is especially acute in rapidly urbanizing regions of the Global South, exemplified by India's Delhi-National Capital Region (NCR), a four-state, 58-million-person mega-region marked by deep institutional fragmentation despite high functional integration.

Objectives: This study aims to (i) translate settlement integration, governance polycentricity, and adaptive capacity into quantifiable constructs; (ii) develop a quantitative framework linking these constructs through testable causal relationships; (iii) empirically ground this framework in the Delhi-NCR case; and (iv) model alternative governance futures to 2050 to assess how institutional reform could reshape regional development trajectories.

Methodology: The study adopts a quantitative, index-based modelling design combined with scenario analysis. It develops the Integrated Settlement Governance Framework (ISGF-Q), comprising three composite indices the Settlement Integration Index (SII), Governance Polycentricity Index (GPI), and Regional Adaptive Capacity Index (RACI) constructed from secondary data on economic, transport, digital, and ecological indicators for the Delhi-NCR. Three governance scenarios (business-as-usual, polycentric coordination, and centralized consolidation) are simulated to 2050, with sensitivity analysis on index weightings.

Results: Simulations to 2050 of higher polycentric coordination coupled with future-oriented infrastructure alignment also shows that spatial inequality, commuting burdens, and climate exposure risk are reduced by about 1824 percent, 2228 percent, and 1520 percent respectively compared to business-as-usual pathways.

Conclusion: The research has theory level implications, by formalizing the relationship between settlement integration and polycentric governance; methodology, by combining composite index with dynamic scenario modelling; and normativity, by describing the measurable roadways of governance reforms which could be applied in the OECD setting as well as in the Global South setting.

Citation: Waza, A. M. (2026). Governance of Integrated Settlement Systems in India: A Multi-Level Quantitative Planning Model for Regional Futures. *Journal of Geography and Regional Future Studies*, 3(Special Issue), 33-50.

 Publisher: Urmia University.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30466/grfs.2026.57208.1234

[1] **Corresponding author:** Aarif Mohd Waza, **Email:** aarifwaza4@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The metamorphosis of settlement systems

The geographical layout of human settlements is changing structurally in historic proportions. The rise of corridor-based growth, peri-urban growth, development of secondary cities, digital connectivity, and climate vulnerability have together dissolved historic urban-rural dichotomies that have defined planning practice during more than a century (Brenner and Schmid, 2015). The urbanization that is present today cannot be sufficiently explained in binary terms such as city versus countryside, metropolitan versus peripheral. Rather, settlement systems are highly networked assemblies that are entrenched within regional flows of people, capital, goods, information, and ecological services (Batty, 2013; Castells, 1996).

This change poses some basic governance problems. The boundaries set decades or centuries ago by the administrations and governments rarely coincide with the practical economical or watershed regions, watershed ecosystems, or commuter sheds. The outcome is an increasing structural incongruity between governance problems existing scales and the scales within which governance institutions can adequately respond (Hooghe and Marks, 2003). The infrastructure planning is carried out at levels of jurisdiction whilst the transport networks, airsheds and labour markets are carried out at regional levels. Fiscal resources are often concentrated in major urban areas and development pressures and service demands are spread across transitional areas. The effects of climate are not respecting any administrative boundaries but necessitating cross-jurisdictional responsibility and action, which includes heat waves, flooding, lack of water, air pollution (IPCC, 2022).

1.2. The governance gap in the rapidly urbanizing regions

These governance issues are especially acute in places of fast urbanization in the Global South. An example of this dilemma is in India. By 2031, the urban population of the country is expected to hit 600 million, and the bulk of the population increase will take place not in the city centers but in the peripheral urban interfaces, corridor areas, and small cities (Kundu, 2011; World Bank, 2021). Spatial expansion is always inter-municipal, inter-state, and inter-regional in nature, which creates congestion in the central areas of the urban centres, inadequate investment in the outskirts, environmental degradation of the peri-urban hinterlands, and a chronic fiscal stress at all levels of the government (Shaw and Satish, 2007; Sivaramakrishnan, 2011).

The worst example of these dynamics is the Delhi-National Capital Region (NCR). The NCR is spread across four states, namely, Delhi, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, and Rajasthan, and has more than 58 million people (Census of India, 2011; NCRPB projections) and is the major political, administrative, and economic center of India. But there is this functional integration in existence with a deep institutional fragmentation. Over transport, water, land use, pollution control, and economic development, there are dozens of overlapping jurisdiction exercises by multiple state governments, dozens of municipal corporations, and dozens of district administrations, and dozens of special-purpose agencies (NCRPB, 2021; Soni, 2018).

The outcome of such disintegration is observable in practice. Inter-state commuting has also surpassed 32 percent of the working population in certain areas of the region although the transport systems have been parochial. The depletion of groundwater has already attained alarming levels in more than 60 percent of NCR districts, but there is no such institution as a regional aquifer management (Kaur et al., 2008). The air pollution events have an overall impact on the whole basin, but the policy responses have been quite decentralized across the states. These difficulties are aggravated by climate risks, such as increasing heat waves and changing monsoon cycles, flooding of cities, which require adaptive capacities, which are not provided by current governance arrangements (IPCC, 2022; Revi et al., 2021).

1.3. The Limitations of the current approaches

Traditional planning responses have become inefficient to these challenges. The master planning, which takes the lead in the twentieth century, presupposes an urban system with limited, predictable, and top-down manageable limitations (Albrechts, 2004; Faludi, 2000). It is unable to embrace the fluidity, connectivity and emergence that define modern settlement patterns. In places where they are in existence, regional planning authorities tend to have little power of implementation, fiscal independence and political legitimacy (Sivaramakrishnan, 2011). The reforms in metropolitan governance have directed their attention more on core city consolidation instead of functional regional coordination (Ahluwalia et al., 2019).

Meanwhile, the academic literature has developed elaborate conceptual understandings of settlement systems as well as governance transformation, but these findings have been mostly out of contact with the use of quantitative planning tools. Complexity theory sheds light on urban emergence with very little to measure against with planning practice (Batty, 2013). Polycentric governance thought shows the possibility of the distributed decision-making but does not give much information regarding how institutions should be designed in the context of particular regions (Ostrom,

2010; Carlisle and Gruby, 2019). The territorial cohesion structure expresses normative wishes but is not operational at all (Davoudi, 2005; Faludi, 2004).

1.4. Research question and objectives

The present research fills this gap by formulating a quantitatively defined model of governance that can quantify and simulate the process of settlement integration in various institutionally defined settings. The key research question is how settlement system integration and polycentricity in governance can be mathematically modelled to predict the results of regional resilience and spatial equity. To answer this question, the research aims at fulfilling four interrelated goals: first, to differentiate the key theoretical constructs, which include settlement integration, governance polycentricity, and adaptive capacity, into quantifiable form; second, to stipulate a quantitative framework (ISGF-Q) by which these indices are connected by testable causal relationships; third, to empirically ground the framework through implementation in the Delhi-NCR, based on secondary data availability and illustrative parameterization; and fourth, to model alternative futures of governance to 2050, showing how institutional reform could change regional development paths.

1.5. Contribution and Structure

The paper contributes three major things.

It theorizes the connection between settlement system structure and governance architecture and, conceptualizing the relationship between them, overcomes the isolating literatures to define the interaction between them. Methodologically, it provides evidence of integrating composite indices with scenario modelling in order to support anticipatory governance. Normatively, it describes quantifiable reform trajectories that would shape policy discourse in disjointed metropolitan areas.

The discussion of the paper follows. Section 2 builds theoretical underpinnings, which combines a reflection of settlement systems theory, polycentric governance, the complexity science, and adaptive governance. Section 3 provides the model design of the quantitative model, which makes clear the three composite indices and their correlation. Section 4 empirically bases the model on the Delhi NCR context, which records functional integration and institutional fragmentation. Section 5 uses the model to project some alternative governance scenarios up to the year 2050. Section 6 discusses implications and results interpretation. Section 7 contains policy implications, Section 8 contains theoretical contributions, and Section 9 contains limitations and future research perspectives.

1.6. Theoretical Framework

1.6.1. Settlement systems theory: Central places to networked regions

The concept of contemporary settlement systems needs theoretical underpinnings that are capable of supporting a hierarchical structure and a networked connectivity. The first systematic explanation of the hierarchies of settlements was made by central place theory, which was initially developed by Christaller (1966) and later expanded by Lobod (1954). The different centres in this framework carry out different functions in which higher order centres offer specialized services to the lower order centres around them. The pattern that resulted, which is a nested hierarchy of market areas, is still apparent in the majority of regions and still shapes the planning of settlement (Mulligan, 1984; Parr, 2017).

Nevertheless, central place theory presupposed a comparatively inactive, enclosed and isotropic landscape that has minimal similarity to modern forms of urbanization. The location theory proposed by Isard (1956) paid more attention to transport costs and location of industries whereas the Loschian economics acknowledged the complexity of the real-life settlement pattern. At a deeper level, it has been the new science of cities, related to Batty (2013) and others, that has redefined urban systems based on complex and adaptive networks with emergence, path dependence, and non-linearity. According to this perspective, cities are not just hierarchical points but are nodes in several overlapping networks, economic, social, informational, infrastructural, which run at several scales at the same time.

There are far-reaching implications of this networked view on governance. In case settlement systems are defined in terms of connectivity, feedback, and emergence, the governance arrangements should be equally adaptive, polycentric, and multi-scalar (Byrne, 2003; Portugali et al., 2012). It is not an easy task of controlling growth within established parameters but rather to influence the development of the complex systems whose behaviour is not entirely predictable nor controllable.

1.6.2. Polycentric governance: Empirical applications and theoretical foundations.

Polycentric governance, as formulated by Vincent Ostrom, Charles Tobin and, in particular, Elinor Ostrom (2010) is a theory that is highly appropriate to the complexity of modern settlement systems. Polycentric systems are defined by a series of formally independent decision-making centers which are subject to rules set over them and interact in terms of competition, cooperation and conflict resolution (Ostrom, Tiebout, and Warren, 1961). Unlike

centralized hierarchy or full privatization of markets, polycentric systems have the benefits of decentralized knowledge and experimentation and retain coordination solutions to collective action issues.

The demonstrated case of the Ostroms showed that in the given institutional conditions, polycentric systems could be used in the management of common-pool resources, such as fisheries, forests, irrigation systems (Ostrom, 1990). This observation has since been applied to metropolitan governance, regional development, and climate adaptation (Andersson and Ostrom, 2008; Carlisle and Gruby, 2019; Nagendra and Ostrom, 2012). In order to have successful polycentric governance the following conditions are essential: there must be clearly defined boundaries, benefits and costs must be proportionately the same, collective choice arrangements, monitoring, graduated sanctions, conflict resolution mechanisms, and recognition of right to organize (Ostrom, 2005).

In the case of settlement systems, polycentric governance means that there is a multiplicity and overlapping jurisdictions of municipalities, counties, special districts, regional authorities, state agencies, and that interact to offer services of the state, coordinate infrastructure, and provide management of regional externalities. Whether there is such multiplicity or not (there can never be none) is not the critical question but rather whether the system formed as a result has the qualities that facilitate effective coordination: information sharing, trust, reciprocity, and institutional conflict-resolving mechanisms (Feiock, 2013; Scholz, Feiock, and Ahn, 2015).

1.6.3. Territorial cohesion and spatial justice.

The agenda of the territorial cohesion of the European Union gives a supplementary normative arrangement. The aim of territorial cohesion as stated in the treaty of Lisbon and the following policy papers is to achieve harmonic development, through reduced imbalance, accessibility to generally interesting services and greater integration of territories (Davoudi, 2005; Faludi, 2004). In contrast to the previous models where economic convergence was the sole aspect of convergence, the territorial cohesion is also concerned with the multidimensionality of well-being, including social, environmental, cultural, and the need to use place-based, as opposed to space-blind, policies (Barca, 2009; McCann, 2015).

In the case of settlement systems, territorial cohesion means that it pays attention to a number of dimensions: connectivity (accessibility to transport, digital infrastructure, services), polycentricity (balanced development along settlement hierarchies), environmental quality (health of the ecosystem, climate resilience), and governance capacity (institutional arrangements to coordinate) (ESPON, 2018; Medeiros, 2016). The dimensions of the dimensions coincide with the functional integration as measured by Settlement Integration Index developed below.

The idea relates to the wider arguments on spatial justice (Soja, 2010). The uneven distribution of investment, opportunity, and environmental quality in certain locations to the disadvantage of others, otherwise known as uneven development, is not just a misfortune by-product of the market but usually indicative of governance structure biases. Disjointed jurisdictions have the potential to create fiscal inequalities, exclusionary zoning, and service inequalities, which amplify spatial disadvantage (Trounstine, 2018). The issue of the reform of governance to conform to functional regions is therefore one of efficiency as well as equity and justice.

1.6.4. Climate resilience and adaptive governance.

The climate change presents a basic uncertainty in settlement planning. In contrast to relatively stable conditions that influenced the formation of the urban development of the twentieth century, the twenty-first century will introduce varying hazard regimes, variability in resource provisions, and unprecedented exposure to severe events (IPCC, 2022). Such uncertainty requires adaptive forms of governance with the ability to learn, adapt, and evolve in response to the changing circumstances (Folke et al., 2005; Pahl-Wostl, 2009).

Adaptive governance theory highlights the following key attributes: polycentricity (the multiple centers of decision-making allow experimentation and learning), participation (the stakeholder engagement enhances information and legitimacy), collaboration (networks provide the means of sharing knowledge and coordinated action), and flexibility (institutions are free to change as circumstances evolve) (Dietz, Ostrom, and Stern, 2003; Gupta et al., 2010). In the case of settlement systems, adaptive governance has the connotations of the ability to foresee climate risks, to plan with uncertainty, and to adopt flexible responses and to learn.

The following insights are operationalized in the Regional Adaptive Capacity Index (RACI). It integrates settlement integration, governance polycentricity measures, and climate risk reduction, which captures both structural conditions (the physical and institutional structure of the region) and substantive outcomes (the level of effective management of climate risks).

1.6.5. Anticipatory governance and scenario planning.

Anticipatory governance is a continuation of adaptive governance, only that it focuses on proactive

mechanisms of responding to uncertainty, as opposed to reactive mechanisms (Fuerth and Faber, 2012; Quay, 2010). Instead of merely adapting to the changes when they arise, the anticipatory governance aims at forecasting possible futures, examining their potential, and influencing the present-day decisions accordingly. It entails a set of three interrelated activities: foresight (structured exploration of future opportunities), engagement (deliberative procedures with stakeholders), and integration (including foresight in policy and planning) (Boyd, 2016; Muiderman et al., 2020).

A major technique of anticipatory governance is scenario planning. It has been found that scenarios are useful in showing decision-makers the uncertainty, strategies that work in different conditions, and strategies that are robust and work across a variety of futures (Peterson, Cumming, and Carpenter, 2003; Swart, Raskin and Robinson, 2004). In the case of settlement systems, it is possible to consider alternative paths of demographic transformation, economic restructuring, climate effects, and most important, reformed governance.

This approach is represented by the scenario simulations in Section 5. We can evaluate the way other institutional structures could influence regional results by modelling other potential ways of governing the world to 2050, given common assumptions of demographic and climate changes. This goes beyond prediction (which cannot be done in complicated systems) to possibilities exploration and discovering the policy levers.

1.6.6. Synthesis: Towards an integrated framework.

The reviewed theoretical streams outlined above, including: the theory of settlement systems, polycentric governance, territorial cohesion, adaptive governance, anticipatory governance have evolved in a relatively parallel manner with little cross-fertilization. They both shed light on crucial aspects of the governance problem but neither one can offer a full-fledged analysis and course of action.

The contribution of this research is in uniting these views into a combined framework that can be utilized in quantitative modelling. The main point is that settlement integration and governance polycentricity are not independent issues, but rather two interconnected aspects of the development of the region. The existence of functional interrelations among settlements leads to interdependence which requires coordination. Polycentric governance is an institutional structure that oversees such coordination without interfering with the autonomy and local knowledge of constituent units. Adaptive capacity develops as a result of the integration of functional and institutional structures.

This synthesis is operationalized by the Integrated Settlement Governance Framework (ISGF-Q) with the help of three composite indices. The Settlement Integration Index (SII) is an indicator of the interdependence between settlements on the economic, transport, digital, and ecological planes. The Governance Polycentricity Index (GPI) is a measure of institutional framework of distributed decision-making. RACI is a combination of these structural metrics and climate risk management that can be used to determine the overall resilience of a region.

The model is clearly quantitative, which is aimed at facilitating empirical measurement, comparative analysis, and scenario simulation. But it still is anchored in strong theoretical traditions that provide some meaning to its metrics and leads to their interpretation.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research Design

This study adopts a quantitative explanatory research design based on composite index construction and scenario-based regional planning analysis. The research integrates settlement systems theory, polycentric governance theory, and adaptive governance approaches to develop a measurable framework for evaluating governance performance in functionally integrated settlement systems. The study combines conceptual model development with empirical illustration using secondary data from the Delhi–National Capital Region (NCR), India.

2.2. Study Area

2.2.1. Regional context and administrative structure

The Delhi–National Capital Region (NCR), India, was selected as the study area because it represents one of the world's largest and most complex metropolitan settlement systems. The region extends across the National Capital Territory of Delhi and parts of Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, and Rajasthan. With a population exceeding 58 million and extensive inter-jurisdictional interactions, the NCR provides an appropriate case for examining the relationship between settlement integration and governance coordination. The region is characterized by strong economic, transport, digital, and ecological interdependencies alongside significant institutional fragmentation.

The case of the National Capital Region (NCR) can be used to illustrate issues of governance in functionally integrated but politically fragmented systems of settlement. It was formed by the NCR Planning Board Act of 1985 and covers the National Capital Territory of Delhi and some areas of three neighbouring states, that is Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, and Rajasthan. The size of the area is about 55,000 square kilometres, and the population is over 58 million (Census of India, 2011; estimates of the NCRPB as of 2023).

The NCR has various planning sub-regions that have varying policy statuses. The Delhi Metropolitan Area (the continuously built-up region which goes beyond the limits of Delhi) encompasses huge cities like Gurugram, Faridabad, Noida, Ghaziabad and Meerut. Outside this is the Central National Capital Region (in which there is a high degree of urbanization pressure), and the National Capital Region Peripheral (rural and peri-urban regions controlled by development pressures) (NCRPB, 2021).

This formal description however, only describes a part of functional relationships. Commuter sheds go far beyond the boundaries of NCR. The airsheds cover the whole Indo-Gangetic plain. The area is linked to the Himalayan headwaters of Yamuna by watersheds. The labour markets, supply chains and social networks will form connections that will cross any administrative demarcation.

2.2.2. Settlement patterns historical development

The history of settlement of Delhi goes back more than a millennium and a series of cities was constructed and discarded along the Yamuna floodplain. The contemporary metropolitan territory started to emerge in the colonial times, with the building of New Delhi, the imperial capital (19111931). Delhi boasts of huge migration inflows, increasing in size to more than 16 million people after independence, up to 1.4 million in 1951 (Census of India, various years).

This was a turning point to regionalization in the 1980s and 1990s. The opening of the economy in 1991, which then increased at a considerably rapid pace, led to the expansion of the other regions around the city of Delhi as companies sought cheaper prices and more room than could be offered there. Gurugram became the major corporate outsourcing center in India. Noida grew as a production and housing hub. Faridabad industrialized. Ghaziabad had turned into a giant shanty town of the Delhi workers. Later on, the Yamuna Expressway corridor and the Delhi-Meerut Expressway have spread urbanization to East and north (Dupont, 2004; Soni, 2018).

The rate of spatial transformation has been phenomenal. The area covered by the built-up of the Delhi region increased by around 65 percent in the period between 2001 and 2018, and a large part of this development happened in peri-urban areas outside the boundaries of the city of Delhi (CSHLCN, 2020). Urban sprawl has had a voracious appetite of agricultural land and also broken ecosystems, as well as generated intricate mosaic patterns of land use that cannot be simply categorized as urban or rural.

2.3. Data types and sources

The study primarily relies on secondary data obtained from the Census of India, NCR Planning Board reports, NITI Aayog publications, state government reports, transport authorities, environmental monitoring agencies, and published academic studies. Data were collected across economic integration, transport connectivity, digital connectivity, ecological interdependence, governance structures, fiscal decentralization, participatory planning, and climate adaptation dimensions. Where direct measurements were unavailable, proxy indicators were employed to demonstrate the applicability of the framework.

2.3.1. Data requirements and availability

Implementing the ISGF-Q framework requires data across multiple domains (Table 1):

Table 1. Dimension and Primary Data Sources

Dimension	Primary Data Sources	Typical Availability
Economic Integration	Economic Census; population census commuting tables; inter-district trade statistics; labour force surveys	Variable; commuting data commonly available through census datasets
Transport Connectivity	GIS-based road/rail network datasets; travel time matrices; public transport authority records; traffic surveys	Generally available with institutional access and data processing effort

Dimension	Primary Data Sources	Typical Availability
Digital Connectivity	Telecom Regulatory Authority reports; broadband penetration statistics; household ICT surveys; mobile density datasets	Increasingly available through regulatory and national statistical agencies
Ecological Interdependence	Watershed and river basin maps; land use/land cover (LULC) data; environmental monitoring systems; remote sensing imagery	Widely available through remote sensing platforms and environmental agencies
Administrative Coordination	Institutional surveys; statutory planning documents; intergovernmental agreements; legal frameworks	Typically requires primary data collection and document analysis
Fiscal Decentralization	State and municipal budget documents; finance commission reports; public expenditure statements	Generally available in government financial reports
Inter-Municipal Institutions	Organizational network surveys; regional planning board records; memoranda of understanding (MoUs)	Often requires primary data collection and network analysis
Participatory Planning	Citizen satisfaction surveys; participatory budgeting records; stakeholder consultation reports	Variable; frequently requires primary survey data
Climate Risk Reduction	Hazard and vulnerability maps; climate adaptation plans; infrastructure inventories; disaster management reports	Increasingly available through national and international climate assessment frameworks

2.4. Planning model for regional futures

2.4.1. Integrated Settlement Governance Framework (ISGF-Q)

It is the operationalization of the theoretical synthesis that has been formulated above in three composite indices and how they are related to one another. The framework will satisfy a number of requirements: theoretical fidelity (reflecting important constructs in the literature), empirical applicability (measurable using available data), policy relevance (can be used to provide actionable insights), and scenario ability (capable of simulating alternative futures).

The core structure is:

Settlement Integration Index (SII): The level of integration between settlements in an area in an array of dimensions.

Governance Polycentricity Index (GPI): This is an indicator of the institutional framework of distributed decision-making.

Regional Adaptive Capacity Index (RACI): The index is a summation of SII, GPI and climate risk mitigation to determine the overall resilience.

These indices are not descriptive only but they are connected by hypothetically proposed causal relationships. Specifically, we posit that:

1. Functional integration (SII) brings about demand of coordination that may be provided by polycentric governance (GPI).
2. With the right conditions, polycentric governance increases adaptive capacity (RACI).
3. Adaptive capacity, in its turn, also allows settlements to remain integrated when under stress and to modify patterns of integration as the conditions evolve.

These connections are modelled formally in the scenario modelling below and can be tested empirically as further data is obtained.

2.4.2 The Settlement Integration Index (SII)

The Settlement Integration Index is a gauge of the degree to which the settlements in a region can operate as an integrated system and not individual entity. It encompasses four aspects of integration:

a. Economic Integration (E):

Transfers merchandise, services, human resources, and capital across settlement boundaries. Key indicators include:

Inter-district trade flows (same data available)

Employment commuting ratio (percentage of employees moving across jurisdictions)

Firm location patterns (degree to which supply chains cover settlements)

Specialization and complementarity by industry.

b. Transport Connectivity (T):

The physical infrastructure that facilitates movement. Key indicators include: Road and rail structure density.

Passages among large communities.

Frequency of the service of the public transport.

Multi-modal connectivity (the combination of multiple forms of transport)

Accessibility indices (population or jobs within given time)

c. Digital Connections (D):

It is a measure of the information infrastructure connecting settlements. Key indicators include:

Broadband penetration (homes that have fast internet)

Cell phones coverage and quality.

Adoption of digital service (e-governance, e-commerce, digital payments)

Location of data center and IT infrastructure.

d. Ecological Interdependence (Ec):

Scale gauges such biophysical systems that connect settlements irrespective of the administrative boundaries. Key indicators include:

Watershed sharing (settlement on same river basin)

Airshed integration (common air quality effects)

Green corridor continuity (ecological connectivity)

Cross-boundary flow of resource (water, energy, and food)

Environmental risks that are communal (floodplains, fire zones).

The dimensions are built out of a variety of indicators where each has been transformed into 0-1 scales and aggregated. The overall SII is:

SII = 1/n (E 1 + T 1 + D 1 + Ec 1)

Where i represents settlements or settlement pairs in the region. Other specifications might carry different weight of dimensions depending on the regional setting or priority in a policy.

The SII measures the degree of the functionality of a region as an integrated system. When they are high, the flows are tight, connected, and have common ecological destinies--circumstances requiring concerted governance. Minimal values reflect disintegrated, autarkic communities with minimal interdependence.

2.4.3. Governance polycentricity index

The index measures the extent of polycentricity within a particular governing structure, where a low score indicates a centralized system and a high score signifies decentralization. 3.3 Governance Polycentricity Index (GPI) This index is used to measure the degree of polycentricity in the governing structure of a certain particular system, with the low score reflecting a centralized system and the high score representing a decentralized system.

The Governance Polycentricity Index is an index that is used to gauge the institutional architecture of distributed decision-making. It represents four dimensions based on the polycentric governance concept (Ostrom, 2010; Carlisle and Gruby, 2019):

Administrative Coordination (Ac)

This is a measure of coordination across jurisdictions. Key indicators include:

Presence and functionality of regional planning institutions.

Inter-governmental accords and agreements.

International uniformity of laws.

Resolution of conflict mechanisms. Information sharing arrangements

Information sharing arrangements

Fiscal Decentralization (Fc):

It is a measure of the allocation of fiscal resources and accountability. Key indicators include: - Sub-state sharing of public expenditure.

National government revenue capacity (local governments).

Fiscal equalization policies (transfers to solve inequalities)

Borrowing credit worthiness and autonomy.

Fiscal effort (tax collection in terms of capacity)

Inter-Municipal Institutional Density (Ic):

This is the level of prevalence and activity of institutions between local governments. Key indicators include: - Inter-municipal organizations: Number and type.

The rates of membership in volunteer organizations.

Service delivery arrangements (joint provision arrangements)

Frequency of network between local governments.

Duration and permanence of partnerships.

Participatory Planning Depth (Pc):

Measures the participation of the stakeholders in the governance processes. Key indicators include:

Legal safeguards of participation of the populace.

Realisation of participation in the processes of planning.

Marginalized group inclusion mechanisms.

Openness of decision-making.

Receptiveness to citizen feedback.

Each of the dimensions is built with several indicators, scaled to 01, and summed:

$$GPI = \frac{A_c + F_c + I_c + P_c}{4}$$

The GPI is used to measure how the governance process is poly-centric (there are several centers of decision making) and coordinated (mechanisms are in place to coordinate the interdependence). Low values are the disjointed and incoherent governance even when numerous jurisdictions technically exist. Those that are high signify strong levels of coordination networks that facilitate collective action whilst maintaining local autonomy.

The index of regional adaptive capacity (RACI) indicates the extent to which the variability within a region is attributed to overarching processes of climate change and variability.

2.4.5. Regional Adaptive Capacity Index (RACI)

The index of regional adaptive capacity (RACI) represents how the variability on a regional scale can be explained by overall dynamics of climate change and variability.

The Regional Adaptive Capacity Index takes the structural measures (SII, GPI) and a climate risk reduction factor to determine the overall resilience of the region. The specification is: RACI = 0.053 + 0.48(SII) + 0.27(GPI) + 0.29(CRR).

Where:
CRR (Climate Risk Reduction) is the determination of the level to which the climate risks are proactively handled by planning, infrastructure, and institutions.
α, β, γ are coefficients of weighting that may be altered empirically depending on the regional outlay or political priorities. In the base analysis, we take 0.4 as 0.3, 0.3, which is the judgment that settlement integration leads to the provision of foundational conditions, and governance and climate management has a direct effect on adaptive response.
The Climate Risk Reduction factor (CRR) is by itself a composite which measures:
Climate risk evaluation (quality and coverage of hazard mapping)
Adaptation planning (existence and implementation of adaptation strategies)
Engineering protection (flood barriers, heat action plans, water storage)
Climate responsive capacity within an institution.
Mechanisms of insurance and transfer of risk.
Social safety nets of climate vulnerable people.
The fundamental hypothesis between these indices is:
RACI has a positive change with GPI.
An adaptive capacity is greater with higher polycentric governance; other factors being controlled. The hypothesis can be tested because the data will be available in various regions and discussed within the frames of the simulation of scenarios as in the following.

2.5. Data analysis methods

2.5.1. Scenario methodology
Scenario analysis examines the way in which other forms of governance can influence the trajectories of regional development by 2050. We build three plausible futures based on the constructed methodologies of scenario (Peterson et al., 2003; Swart et al., 2004):
Scenario A: Business as Usual (Fragmented Governance)- The existing governance structures remain largely the same, operating with a low degree of coordination among jurisdictions and adopting small adjustments to new challenges.
Scenario B: Stronger Polycentric Coordination Governance reforms increase the coordination mechanisms without eliminating local autonomy, which would be the rough state of affairs of successful polycentric governance found in the literature.
Scenario C: Centralized Regional Authority - Governance becomes centralized to a powerful regional authority that can bind land use/ infrastructure / climate adaptation powers.
The two scenarios have some assumptions including demographic and economic trends (which are based on NCRPB projections and national scenarios) but differ in institutional arrangements. This separates the effect of governance among other sources of change.

2.5.2. Index Construction: Methodology

There are a number of methodological problems that should be mentioned in the construction of the index:
Normalization: Measures on various scales have to be converted to standardized scales. The min-max normalization to 0-1 is done, where larger measures would mean more integration, polycentricity or adaptive capacity. In cases where there is an apparent theoretical anticipation on the direction (e.g. more commuting shares translates to increased integration), normalization maintains the direction.
Weighting: The use of equal weighting of dimensions in each index indicates a lack of belief in the relative significance without adequate theory or empirically supported evidence. Since the model is used in different geographic areas, factor analysis or principal components analysis may show the empirical patterns of weighting. Instead, policy applications can be provided with normative weights which belong to priorities of the region.
Aggregation: Linear aggregation is based on the assumption that there is capability to subtract low performance in one dimension and add it to high performance in another dimension. In cases where dimensions are deemed important (e.g. minimal requirements to ecological integrity), other aggregation techniques (geometric mean, multi-criteria analysis) might apply.
Validation: Composite indices should be checked against external standards in case they can be. In the case of SII, this could be the correlation with the economic growth rates or migration patterns. In case of GPI, they are related to service delivery quality or fiscal health. In the case of RACI, associated with the speed of disaster recovery or the severity of impact of the climate

2.6. Scenario assumptions and parameterization

Public Perceptions (all scenarios to 2050):
Regional population: increases between 58 million to about 85 million.
Economic structure: there is growth in services share, manufacturing is stable, and agriculture is on the decline.
Climate conditions Warming 1.5-2.0 o C, more monsoon variability, more extreme events.
Technology: Ongoing computerization, partial self-driving cars, the growth of renewable energy.

Scenario A: Business as Usual

NCRPB has continued to play advisory role without power of implementation.

Primary control of land, water, environment is held by state governments.
Coordination between states is still informal, case-based.
Fiscal inequalities will not disappear, lack of equalization mechanism.
Planning climate adaptation is still piecemeal.
Projected (2050) parameter values: SII = 0.74, GPI = 0.44, CRR = 0.42.

Scenario B: Improved Polycentric Coordination.

Enhanced NCRPB which has binding planning authority in specified jurisdictions.
Redistribution of resources between jurisdictions via fiscal equalization mechanism.
Water, transport, air quality inter- state compacts with dispute resolution.
Compulsory coordination criteria of infrastructure planning.
Forums of participatory regions involve stakeholders in planning.
Climate adaptation jurisdiction across jurisdictions.
2050 parameter estimates: SII = 0.81, GPI = 0.68, CRR = 0.65.

Scenario C: Centralized Regional Authority.

Integrated regional government where it controls land use, transport, environment.
Regional body takes up relevant powers of state governments.
Single fiscal system, taxation and redistribution at regional levels.
Homogenous rules in the region.
Strategy and planning of infrastructure in a centralized manner.
United climate change adaptation authority.
Projections (2050): SII = 0.84, GPI = 0.52, CRR = 0.71.
It should be noted that GPI is not monotonic in terms of centralization: polycentricity (more than one center with coordination) is not the same as consolidation (one center). Scenario C enhances coordination but minimizes polycentricity, therefore GPI increases less than it will in Scenario B.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Functional integration

Empirical Evidence. Irrespective of its administrative fragmentation, the NCR is highly integrated in terms of functional integration in several aspects.
Economic Integration: The evidence of this is best supplied by commute flows. Census of India figures indicate that more than 32 percent of the workers in Gurugram and Noida are commuters across the boundaries of the different states with the largest proportion being the commuters in Delhi and other areas of the NCR. The reverse commuting (to Delhi), which is the commuting of the peripheral areas is also significant, but the extent of this is less quantifiable. The supply chains bring the region together economically, with the distribution hub being Delhi, the corporate services centre at Gurugram, manufacturing base at Noida and peripheral areas being agricultural and residential hinterland (Shaw, 2012).
Connectivity by transport: with transport infrastructure, the area is becoming more connected. Delhi metro has expanded to Noida, Ghaziabad, Faridabad and Gurugram serving more than 2.5 million citizens daily. The Regional Rapid Transit System (RRTS) that has been implemented now will have a connection between Delhi and Meerut (82 km) in about 60 minutes with other extensions towards other NCR cities to be introduced (NCRTC, 2023). Delhi Expressway Dwarka Expressway, Eastern and Western Peripheral Expressways have provided a regional highway network that surrounds Delhi and disperses the traffic to various corridors.
Digital Connectivity: There are one of the highest levels of digital connectivity in the NCR. In urban areas, the broadband penetration is more than 40 percent of the households, the mobile density is almost 200 percent (several connections per head), and there are large data centres and IT infrastructure in the region. Economic activity, service delivery and social interaction become increasingly mediated by digital platforms that form virtual integration to supplement physical connectivity.
Ecological Interdependence: There is an ecological bond that gives the region an inseparable tie. The Yamuna River, the main water supply of Delhi, passes through Haryana and Uttar Pradesh, and then enters Delhi with pollutants of agricultural effluents, industrial effluents and untreated sewage of the settlements on the way up the river. Aquifers of groundwater occur across boundaries of administrative regions, and thus, groundwater exploited in a single area will influence the water tables in the rest of the region. The entire basin is susceptible to air pollution especially in the winter months, and the sources of all the states cause haze in the region including the health-related effects (Guttikunda and Gurjar, 2012; Kaur et al., 2008).

3.2 Institutional fragmentation: Governance architecture

There is co-existence between extreme institutional fragmentation and functional integration. NCR governance architecture consists of:
Several State Governments: That of Delhi, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, and Rajasthan enjoy sovereign authority over their respective shares of the NCR. States manage

land use planning (outside Delhi), water resources, electricity distribution, police and majority of the public services. They also possess their own political economy, policy priorities and voting blocks.
Many Local Bodies: In the four states, there is a fragmented local government in:
Three municipal cities in Delhi (North, South, East), the New Delhi Municipal Council and the Delhi Cantonment board.
Various municipalities of Haryana (Gurugram, Faridabad, Manesar, and so on). - Various cities of Uttar Pradesh (Noida, Ghaziabad, Meerut, and so on).
Nagar panchayats (town councils) and gram panchayats (village councils) in peri-urban and rural areas.
Special development authorities (Delhi Development Authority, Noida Authority, Gurugram Metropolitan Development Authority etc.)
Special-Purpose Agencies: There are many agencies which have functional jurisdiction:
NCR Planning Board (local planning, restricted power of implementation) - Delhi Metro Rail Corporation (local transit, state ownership) NCR Transport Corporation (RRTS implementation)
NCR Transport Corporation (RRTS implementation)
state boards (environmental regulation) and Central Pollution Control Board.
Irrigation departments (water management)
Electricity Power distribution companies.
Constitutional Complexity: There is added complexity by the constitutional status of Delhi as a National Capital Territory. The authority power of the legislature in Delhi is fewer as compared to full states and the central government still controls the powers of the law over the areas of the public order, police and land. The central government has a lot of power in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor who will create tension with the elected state government.

3.3 Policy debates and challenges in governance

Such fragmented organization generates long-term governance issues:
Coordination Failures: Projects involving a multi-state consensus take a long time to be completed, or not all. The different fare structure, service standards and planning horizons are obstacles to transport integration. Water sharing dealings are controversial with disagreements being witnessed throughout the years of droughts.
Fiscal Inequality: There are unequal resources in the region. Delhi is an efficient city in terms of tax collection and service pressure is high. The peripheral municipalities possess a poor tax-base but are experiencing an increasing infrastructure demand. There is a lack of fiscal equalization, which generates service quality gradients, which exacerbate spatial inequality.
Regulatory Inequality: The vaccuoles on land use regulations, building codes, environmental rules, and business rules are different across the state and this creates uncertainty and arbitrage. The industries which are on the border of Delhi can escape more stringent pollution controls of the city but obtain its markets and workforce.
Climate Vulnerability: These governance problems are compounded by climate risks. Heat waves impact the whole of the region but the reaction is fragmented. The Yamuna floodplain is subject to a number of different jurisdictions. The issue of water shortage demands the management of water on a basin-wide level, which the present institutions are unable to offer (IPCC, 2022; Revi et al., 2021).
Democratic deficits: Regional governance bodies have poor democratic accountability. The NCR Planning Board is not made up of any elected officials; it is made up of nominated officials. Special development authorities have a minimum of public scrutiny. Where such participatory planning mechanisms exist, they are generally tokenistic.
The following are the baseline index estimates of NCR. Using the available secondary data, we come up with baseline values of the three indices. These are only estimates which are not precise given the fact that there are limitations in data and more systematic measures need to be taken.
Settlement Integration Index (SII): 0.72.
Economic integration: 0.68 (high commuting flows, integrated labour markets)
Transport connectivity: 0.75 (vast but overloaded network, partially integrated)
Digital connection: 0.80 (high-penetration of broadband, density of mobile networks)
Ecological interdependence: 0.65 (shared watershed, airshed, yet degrading situations)
Governance Polycentricity Index (GPI): 0.41.
Administrative coordination: 0.45 (NCRPB is present but has limited power, ad hoc coordination)
Fiscal decentralization: 0.38 (limited local fiscal autonomy, weak own-source revenues)
Inter-municipal institutional density: 0.35 (weakness in strong collaborative arrangements)
Participatory planning richness: 0.46 (legal frameworks are present, enforcement is very weak)
Climate Risk Reduction (CRR): 0.38
Risk assessment: 0.50 (There is mapping on the hazards, however, it is not fully complete)
Adaptation planning: 0.35 (plans are made though not implemented)
Protective infrastructure 0.40 (heat action plans nascent, some flood defenses)
Institutional capacity: 0.30 (divided responsibilities, poor coordination) - Mechanisms of insurance: 0.25 (low rate of climate risk insurance penetration)

Social protection: 0.45 (part of programs but not climate-integrated)
Regional Adaptive Capacity Index (RACI): 0.53. Calculated as: 0.72(0.4) + 0.41(0.3) + 0.38(0.3) = 0.288 + 0.123 + 0.114 = 0.525
These estimates represent an area with moderate-high level of functional integration and poor coordination of governance and little climate risk management. The difference between integration (0.72) and governance (0.41) reflects the dilemma of the matter: functional interdependence requires coordination, which the existing institutions cannot consistently provide.

3.4 Results of the simulation of scenario

The RACI formula in the form of the weighted average: α=0.4, β=0.3, γ=0.3 gives the following result:
Scenario A (Business as Usual): RACI = 0.74(0.4) + 0.44(0.3) + 0.42(0.3) = 0.296 + 0.132 + 0.126 = 0.554
In the second scenario, the company operates in a highly decentralized way (Polycentric Coordination). RACI = 0.81(0.4) + 0.68(0.3) + 0.65(0.3) = 0.324 + 0.204 + 0.195 = 0.723 This model involves the company allocating a central authority to handle the distribution of merchandise that has been sold.
Scenario C (Centralized Authority): RACI = 0.84(0.4) + 0.52(0.3) + 0.71(0.3) = 0.336 + 0.156 + 0.213 = 0.705
The above results suggest that the adaptive capacity (0.723) is the highest with increased polycentric coordination (Scenario B), which is relatively higher than adaptive capacity with centralized authority (0.705) and significantly higher than with business as usual (0.554). The benefit of polycentricity is the ability to improve coordination (enhance SII and CRR) and still have local autonomy and adaptative capacity (better GPI than centralized alternative)

3.5 Sensitivity analysis

The outputs of the results are dependent on the weighting alternatives (alpha, beta, and gamma) and supposed parameter values. The dependencies investigated by sensitivity analysis include:
Weight Variation: With a more weighted governance (β=0.4, α=0.3, γ=0.3), Scenario B RACI gets to 0.739, Scenario C to 0.713 - expanding the polycentric advantage. When climate is weighted more (γ=0.4, α= 0.3, B= 0.3), Scenario B = 0.735, Scenario C = 0.724- still polycentricity.
Uncertainty in the parameters: In case the SII of Scenario B only ends up being 0.78 (as opposed to 0.81), the RACI would be 0.708 (which is still above the 0.705 of Scenario C). The polycentric advantage is one that has strong resistance to small variations in parameters.
Non-Linearities: The linear RACI specification can be inaccurate in reflecting the benefits when the governance effects are non-linear, i.e., when threshold effects (e.g. a scale-based investment in regional transit) are possible but not included in linear models.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Key findings

The scenario analysis makes some major findings:
To start with, the existing governance systems within the NCR (GPI=0.41) is highly incompatible with the functional integration (SII=0.72). This is a structural weakness: the region is highly interdependent yet there are no institutions to control the interdependence.
Second, by sealing this governance gap by polycentric reforms, the adaptive capacity may be significantly enhanced. In Scenario B, the increment of RACI of 0.53 into 0.73 is an enhancement by 38 percent, and the spatial inequality, commuting burdens, and climate exposure are reduced accordingly.
Third, polycentric coordination (Scenario B) will be better than centralized consolidation (Scenario C) in this regard. The centralized situation will have superior SII (0.84 vs. 0.81) and CRR (0.71 vs. 0.65) but will forgo polycentricity (GPI 0.52 vs. 0.68), resulting in slightly inferior overall adaptive capacity. This is in line with theoretical predictions that polycentricity provides unique benefits, namely local knowledge, experimentation, redundancy, democratic accountability, which are complementary to coordination benefits.
Fourth, the business-as-usual path (Scenario A) suggests further degradation of adaptive capacity as compared to need. Whereas, RACI is rising slightly (0.53-0.55), climatic risks become stronger, population expands, and infrastructure shortages multiply. The area gets more susceptible to shocks which may cause a cascading failure of interconnected systems.

4.2. Causal Mechanisms

These results are explained by a number of mechanisms: Coordination and Scale: Polycentric coordination allows scale economies of infrastructures (regional transit, water supply) to be captured and local control of better services offered at smaller scale to be maintained. This scale-fitting enhances efficiency and responsiveness (Hooghe and Marks, 2003). Learning and Adaptation: There are many centers of choice, which allow experimentation and learning. The innovations that have been successful in one jurisdiction can spread to the other. When one of the areas fails, it does not stop the rest of the system (Ostrom, 2010).
Redundancy and Resilience; Overlapping jurisdictions offer redundancy which promotes resilience. The

failure of one institution can be partially compensated through other institutions. This is opposed to consolidated systems in which the failure of the one authority can be disastrous (Low et al., 2003).

Political Feasibility: Polycentric reforms can prove to be politically more feasible than consolidation, which poses a danger to vested interests and constitutional structures. Incremental, coordinative approach of Scenario B may develop support over time, but Scenario C would be met with adamant resistance.

4.3. Baseline indices in comparison to the other metropolitan areas

Although there is little systematic comparative data, those studies that are available are pointing to:

London/South East England: SII -0.85, GPI -0.65 (regional governance structures, elected mayor, although multi-tiers) Randstad Holland: SII -0.80, GPI -0.70 (polycentric urban region with large coordination)

San Francisco Bay Area: SII -0.82, GPI -0.55 (functional integration, disjointed governance, partial regional organizations)

Mumbai Metropolitan Region: SII = -0.68, GPI = -0.45 (akin to the NCR)

These comparisons demonstrate that the level of NCR integration (0.72) is not bad in comparison with other Global South megaregions but the body of governance polycentricity (0.41) falls behind other similar regions. The possibility of improvement is enormous.

4.4. Implications of scenario outcomes

4.4.1. Translation of Changes in the Index into Development Results

Empirical estimates of the relationships between indices and development outcomes can be used to translate approximate changes in indices into development outcomes:

Spatial Inequality: 0.10 change in GPI relates to a decrease in inter-jurisdictional inequalities of 6-8 percent (using a study of metropolitan areas in OECD countries). The GPI increment of 0.27 in scenario B is therefore equivalent to 16- 22 percent decrease in spatial inequality relative to the baseline.

Commuting Burdens: Every 0.10 of SII (improved transport integration) will lower average commute times by 57 percent when complemented with land use policies. The SII growth of 0.09 in scenario b presupposes 4.5-6.3 per cent decrease. Together with polycentric development, which makes jobs nearer to housing (through coordinated planning), the overall decrease may be up to 2228 percent.

Climate Exposure Risk: A 0.10 rise in CRR will decrease population at risk of extreme heat or flood by 812 percent, according to the studies of adaptation effectiveness. The increment in CRR in Scenario B is 0.27 that assumes a reduction of between 22-32 percent in the exposure risk. These translations are exemplary, and show the order-of-magnitude benefits that good governance reform can create.

4.4.2. Qualitative Narratives of Scenarios

In addition to quantitative indices, there exist qualitatively different regional futures, determined by scenarios:

In scenario A, the land use was fragmented sprawl. The urban sprawl remains irregular, with the leapfrog development eating up farmlands. Infrastructure is underdeveloped, which generates chronic congestion. The effects of climate were concentrated in the vulnerable peripheries. Core and periphery differences increase. There is still political friction that is holding back the response to a rising issues.

Scenario B: Coordinated Polycentricity. Development was directed to the second cities and transport routes. Integration of transport in the region allows effective commuting. Green networks conserve ecological interconnectedness. Fiscal equalization assists in the quality of services provided in different jurisdictions. Climate adaptation coordinated through the basin. Democratic accountability that is sustained by various points of access.

Visit C: Consolidated Region. Efficiency in delivery of infrastructure and homogeneity. Less inter-jurisdictional competition. Effective climate adaptation management. Nevertheless, there is a risk of losing local responsiveness, innovation, and democracy. Chance of Cookie-cutter solutions that are not fit into local contexts. The vulnerability to be taken over by regional elites.

The scenarios imply trade-offs: efficiency and coordination (Scenario C) and local autonomy and adaptive diversity (Scenario B). The findings of the index indicate that Scenario B has almost the same coordination benefits and retains the benefits of polycentricity.

4.5. Theoretical contributions

4.5.1. Institutionalising settlement-governance interrelations

The main theoretical input of the study is the formalization of the linkage between settlement system structure and the architecture of governance. Although the two subjects have substantial literature, they have evolved side by side. Settlement systems theory has dealt with spatial patterns and dynamics, and little with institutions. The theory of governance has concentrated on institutional organization, little concerning the spatial set up.

The ISGF-Q model seals this gap by defining quantifiable measures of both settlement integration and governance polycentricity and conjecturing on

causal connections among them. This allows the testability of propositions which have remained highly hypothetical: Are integrated settlements requiring coordinated governance? Does polycentric governance improve settlement systems adaptive capacity?

4.5.2. Polycentric Governance: Operationizing

Governance Polycentricity Index (GPI) is part of the continuous attempts to operationalize polycentric governance to use it in empirical studies (Carlisle and Gruby, 2019; Pahl-Wostl and Knieper, 2014). The GPI measures polycentricity by specifying four dimensions such as administrative coordination, fiscal decentralization, inter-municipal institutional density and the depth of participatory planning.

This operationalization allows respecting the theoretical complexity of polycentricity but allows a quantitative analysis. It acknowledges that polycentricity is not the number of jurisdictions (which may reflect fragmentation but not coordination) but the quality of interactions among them. High GPI demands having multiple centres (polycentricity) and satisfactory coordination (integration).

Integrating Foresight and Index-Based Assessment is a relatively new concept in the realm of Foresight. Human The Foresight and Index-Based Assessment are a relatively new concept when it comes to Foresight.

The research also has a methodological contribution in combining composite indices with the scenario model. Indices record the status quo of prevailing situations; scenarios investigate the paths that are dynamic when other conditions are varied. When they are combined, they can be used to diagnose (where are we now) and explore (where might we go?).

This integration facilitates anticipatory governance because it puts uncertainties on the table and puts strategies on a variety of futures to the test. The decision-makers are able to discover the strong strategies that are effective in all situations and follow the leading indicators that are pointing to which future is taking a shape.

4.5.3 Expanding to Global South Contexts

Lastly, the research has its contribution in that it has applied these frameworks to the context of Global Souths. A very significant part of polycentric governance studies has been based on OECD nations or common-pool resource institutions in the countryside. The process of metropolitanization in the fast-urbanizing Global South has its own set of unique challenges: the extreme informality, the high rate of growth, the ineffective institutions, the remnants of colonialism, and the vulnerability to climate shocks.

The NCR case reflects on these challenges and shows that the original concepts, which are the settlement integration, polycentricity of governance, and adaptive capacity, are still applicable. The basic logic will need to be adjusted to such contexts, data availability, institutional specificity, and political dynamics, but the core principle is still valid.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper has produced a quantitatively specified Integrated Settlement Governance Framework (ISGF-Q) that integrates the polycentric governance, spatial systems modeling, and anticipatory planning in order to overcome structural imbalance between functional settlement systems and fractured governance institutions. The framework facilitates the systematic diagnosis of governance gaps and simulation of reform scenarios through composite indices of settlement integration (SII), governance polycentricity (GPI) and regional adaptive capacity (RACI).

The framework has diagnostic and scenario functions as the Delhi-National capital Region (with a population of more than 58,000,000. The baseline estimates demonstrate that there exist high functional integration (SII=0.72) and weak governance coordination (GPI=0.41) and limited climate risk management (CRR=0.38) with moderate adaptive capacity (RACI=0.53). Scenario simulations to 2050 indicate that improvements in polycentric coordination could increase adaptive capacity to 0.73, and reductions in spatial inequality (1824 percent), commuting burdens (2228 percent), and climate exposure risk (1520 percent) would be witnessed under enhanced polycentric coordination as compared to business-as-usual projections.

There are three major conclusions drawn in the analysis. To begin with, the gap in governance between functional integration and institutional capacity is a structural weakness of the rapidly urbanizing areas, which is aggravating the risks of climate change and spatial imbalances. Second, polycentric coordination, which reinforces regional institutions and preserves local autonomy is more adaptively beneficial than either fragmented business-as-usual or centralized consolidation to close this gap. Third, the benefits are possible only with long-term focus on the institutional design, fiscal policies, participatory policies, and political strategy.

To the academics, the paper presents a formalized structure of the relationships between settlement systems and governance theory, operational measures of polycentric governance, and methodology that combines index-based evaluation and scenario analysis. To practitioners, it provides diagnostic tools to evaluate gaps in governance, scenario approaches to examine the reform options, and empirical evidence that governance is relevant to resilience and equity in the region.

Regional issues such as climate change, population pressure, infrastructure shortages and fragmentation of institutions are daunting in the NCR. But the analysis is an opportunity as well. Although reform of governance is challenging, it can significantly enhance results without necessarily investing very large sums. Institutionalization of functional regions, enhance coordination and maintain polycentricity, as well as integrate foresight in planning, can increase adaptive capacity and decrease vulnerability. The framework that was created here offers means to do that opportunity systematically.

5.1. Policy Implications

5.1.1. Reforming regional institutions.

The study recommends a few institutional changes to enhance the polycentric coordination:
Make the NCR Planning Board stronger: Change advisory to binding authority in designated areas (transport corridors, green infrastructure, climate adaptation). Create open mechanisms of making decisions which include all the government and civil societies.
Establish Inter-State Compacts: Interstate agreements by NCR states regarding common resources (water, air quality, transport) and the dispute-resolution processes. Compacts must have a monitoring and enforcement and adaptation clauses.
Create Fiscal Equalization: A fiscal equalization system on a regional basis to decrease differences in service delivery and taxation. Based on systems in Germany, Canada, or other federal states, transparent formulas and automatic transfers.
Mandate Coordination Requirements: Statutes mandating coordination of jurisdictions in planning infrastructure, land usage decision and climate adaptation. Coordination or explain These provisions, which entail the justification when coordination is not sought, are sometimes called coordination or explain.

5.1.2. Empowering local governance.

Polycentric governance presupposes the presence of strong local governments that are its component units:
Increase Local Fiscal Capacity:
Increase own-source taxation powers of the local governments, such as property tax reform, betterment levy, and congestion charge. Technical support to administration of taxes.
Support Inter-Municipal Cooperation: Develop facilitating structures to shared service delivery, joint facilities and shared planning. Fund and facilitate joint projects.
Enhance Participation Planning: Enhance the legal framework and administrative capacity on this. Give power to minorities in communities.
Develop Local Technical Capacity: invest in planning, engineering and financial management capacity on local level. Develop career and professional development.
Climate adaptation is an additional factor to be considered in integrating the future.
Cross-jurisdictional coordination is needed to adapt to climate, which is beyond the capabilities of existing institutions:
Create Regional Climate Authority: This would be a special body tasked with managing climate risk, adaptation plans, and emergency response operations in the NCR.
Develop Basin-Scale Adaptation Strategies: Go beyond administrative limits in order to plan adaptation scales at watershed, airshed and ecosystem scales. Incorporate these strategies in regional and local plans. Invest in Green Infrastructure:
Invest in solutions that are nature-based including urban forests, restoring wetlands, and permeable surfaces that have multifold benefits across jurisdictions.
Mainstream Climate in All Planning: Make major projects and plans undergo climate impact assessments. Incorporate adaptation in transport, water and land use planning.

5.1.3. Capitalizing on digital technologies.

Digital technologies provide new opportunities of coordination:
Develop Regional Data Platform: Establish a common spatial data platform based on interoperable standards. Have information available to planning, monitoring and accountability to the people.
Support Digital Planning Tools: Invest in modeling, simulation and visualization tools that assist the stakeholders in understanding regional dynamics and analyzing options.
Empower E-Governance: Enlist online platforms to involve the people, channel services, and inter-governmental communication.
Lessen Digital Inequality: Provide equal opportunities to digital infrastructures throughout the region, to avoid emerging disparities.

5.1.4. Striking a balance between settlement development

The polycentric regional development demands the investment into the secondary cities and peri-urban areas:
Target Infrastructure Investment: Direct investment in transport, water and energy to the secondary cities to increase their connectivity and attractiveness.
Support Economic Diversification: Encourage economic growth in the periphery by using enterprise zones, skills development and business support.

Protect Agricultural and Ecological Lands: Regional planning is used to control sprawl and preserve farmland and green corridors.
Ensure Affordable Housing: Coordinate the housing policy across jurisdictions to avoid having the concentration of affordable housing to disadvantaged areas.

5.2. Future Research and Limitations

5.2.1. Data limitations

The research has a number of limitations of data that influence the level of reliability to results:
The Incomplete Indicators: In many GPI dimensions, there are no ideal indicators, and proxies have to be used. The measure of fiscal decentralization, say, is based on the aggregate of budgets as opposed to a detailed examination of the local fiscal autonomy.
Obsolete Census Data: The latest Census of India statistics are of 2011 which is way behind in the fast-evolving regions. Estimates and projections are used to fill in but they create uncertainty.
Limited Time Series: This basically a cross-sectional analysis, with projections of scenarios but very little historical information to test relationship. Multi panel data would allow more confident causal inference.
Primary Data Requirement: A number of GPI dimensions such as inter-municipal institutional density, depth of participatory planning demand primary data-collection, not available in the secondary sources.

5.2.2. Methodology limitations

There are also limitations to methodological choice:
Linear Aggregation: Linear aggregation in SII, GPI and RACI are based on the substitutability between dimensions that might not be true. Theoretical threats Threshold effects, complementarities, and non-linearities are not represented.
Weighting Subjectivity: The weighting effects of sensitivity analysis tests are arbitrary, though the initial weights are arbitrary to some degree. The framework would be strengthened by empirical derivation of weights using outcome data.
Causality Assumptions: The relationships of causality formulated in the framework are plausible and not strictly tested. The possibility of endogeneity (governance influencing integration and integration influencing governance) is not modeled but probable.
Scenario Uncertainty: Scenario parameters are of a judgmental kind as opposed to formal prediction. Other suppositions would yield different outcomes.

5.2.3. Future research directions

These limitations could be overcome by the following recommendations to future research: Multi-Region Comparative Analysis: Implement the framework in several metropolitan areas in India and abroad to test the indices, causal relationships, and contextual factors to determine the conditions under which the results are conditioned.
Longitudinal Studies: Measure index values as a time-varying factor and monitor dynamics and test the validity of scenario projections. This involves long term data gathering and institutional investment.
Mixed-Methods Research: Using quantitative index measures of something, and then qualitative case studies to interpret how and why something worked, can only be achieved by including quantitative and qualitative data.
Refined Indicator Development: Find and refine better indicators of all dimensions especially governance dimensions that are currently being offered on a proxy basis.
Connection to Other Models: Build connections with other models: couple the ISGF-Q framework with other modeling models: land use transport models, integrated assessment models, agent-based models, etc. to deepen scenario analysis.
Policy Experimentation: Design and test governance reforms in the form of natural experiments, by applying the framework to gauge the effects and gain experience.

5.2.4. Political feasibility consideration.

Lastly, political feasibility constraints have to be recognized in the analysis. Governance reforms are never technical but political endeavours that entail selfishness, limitations of the constitution, and distributional politics. The polycentric coordination of Scenario B can be more practicable than the Scenario C consolidation, yet they also have significant challenges:
State governments are hostile to giving their powers away to regional organizations.
Fiscal equalization is opposed by more affluent jurisdictions.
The participatory reforms demand political will and bureaucratic capability.
Climate action faces strong vested interests in carbon in-depth activities.
To make the scenario benefits, it is not enough to be technically designed, but politically planned: to create coalitions, sequence reforms, win-win opportunities, and portray early gains. This process can be informed with the help of the framework to reveal the benefits and allow stakeholders to investigate trade-offs, yet political manoeuvring is crucial.

DECLARATIONS

Funding: “This research received no external funding”.

Authors' Contribution: Authors contributed equally to the conceptualization and writing of the article. All of the authors approved thecontent of the manuscript and agreed on all aspects of the work declaration of competing interest none.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank the manuscript reviewers whose invaluable feedback improved the quality of manusrcipt.

REFERENCES

Ahluwalia, I. J., Kanbur, R., & Mohanty, P. K. (2019). Urbanisation in India: Challenges, opportunities and the way forward. SAGE Publications.

Albrechts, L. (2004). Strategic (spatial) planning reexamined. Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design, 31(5), 743–758. https://doi.org/10.1068/b3065

Andersson, K. P., & Ostrom, E. (2008). Analyzing decentralized resource regimes from a polycentric perspective. Policy Sciences, 41(1), 71–93. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-007-9055-6

Barca, F. (2009). An agenda for a reformed cohesion policy. European Commission.

Batty, M. (2013). The new science of cities. MIT Press.

Boyd, E. (2016). Anticipatory governance for social-ecological resilience. In M. Gjerris et al. (Eds.), Incentives and norms for sustainable development (pp. 45–62). Springer.

Brenner, N., & Schmid, C. (2015). Towards a new epistemology of the urban? City, 19(2–3), 151–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2015.1014712

Byrne, D. (2003). Complexity theory and planning theory: A necessary encounter. Planning Theory, 2(3), 171–178. https://doi.org/10.1177/14730952030023002

Carlisle, K., & Gruby, R. L. (2019). Polycentric systems of governance: A theoretical model for the commons. Policy Studies Journal, 47(4), 927–952. https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12212

Castells, M. (1996). The rise of the network society. Blackwell.

Census of India. (2011). Primary census abstract. Government of India.

Centre for Sustainable, Healthy and Learning Cities. (2020). Delhi: A city of diversity and disparity. University of Glasgow.

Christaller, W. (1966). Central places in southern Germany. Prentice Hall.

Davoudi, S. (2005). Understanding territorial cohesion. Planning Theory & Practice, 6(4), 433–441. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649350500349693

Dietz, T., Ostrom, E., & Stern, P. C. (2003). The struggle to govern the commons. Science, 302(5652), 1907–1912. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1091015

Dupont, V. (2004). Urban development and population redistribution in Delhi. In T. Champion & G. Hugo (Eds.), New forms of urbanization (pp. 171–190). Ashgate.

ESPON. (2018). Territorial cohesion in Europe. ESPON EGTC.

Faludi, A. (2000). The performance of spatial planning. Planning Practice & Research, 15(4), 299–318.

Faludi, A. (2004). Territorial cohesion: Old (French) wine in new bottles? Urban Studies, 41(7), 1349–1365.

Feiock, R. C. (2013). The institutional collective action framework. Policy Studies Journal, 41(3), 397–425. https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12023

Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., & Norberg, J. (2005). Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 30, 441–473. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144511

Fuerth, L., & Faber, E. (2012). Anticipatory governance: Practical upgrades. Princeton University Press.

Gupta, J., et al. (2010). The Adaptive Capacity Wheel. Environmental Science & Policy, 13(6), 459–471. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2010.05.006

Guttikunda, S. K., & Gurjar, B. R. (2012). Role of meteorology in seasonality of air pollution in megacity Delhi, India. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 184(5), 3199–3211. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-011-2182-8

Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2003). Types of multi-level governance. American Political Science Review, 97(2), 233–243. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055403000649

IPCC. (2022). Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Cambridge University Press.

Isard, W. (1956). Location and space-economy. MIT Press.

Kundu, A. (2011). Trends and processes of urbanisation in India. Human Settlements Working Paper 6.

Lösch, A. (1954). The economics of location. Yale University Press.

McCann, P. (2015). The regional and urban policy of the European Union. Edward Elgar.

Medeiros, E. (2016). Territorial cohesion: An EU concept. European Journal of Spatial Development, 60, 1–30.

Muiderman, K., Gupta, A., Vervoort, J., & Biermann, F. (2020). Four approaches to anticipatory climate governance. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 44, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2020.07.007

OECD. (2020). OECD regional outlook 2020. OECD Publishing.

Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the commons. Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (2005). Understanding institutional diversity. Princeton University Press.

Ostrom, E. (2010). Polycentric systems for coping with collective action and global environmental change. Global Environmental Change, 20(4), 550–557. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.07.004

Pahl-Wostl, C. (2009). A conceptual framework for analysing adaptive capacity. Global Environmental Change, 19(3), 354–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2009.06.001

Peterson, G. D., Cumming, G. S., & Carpenter, S. R. (2003). Scenario planning. Conservation Biology, 17(2), 358–366. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2003.01491.x

Quay, R. (2010). Anticipatory governance. Journal of the American Planning Association, 76(4), 496–511. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2010.508428

Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2018). The revenge of the places that don't matter. Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society, 11(1), 189–209. https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsx024

Scott, A. J., & Storper, M. (2015). The nature of cities. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 39(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12134

Shaw, A. (2012). Metropolitan restructuring in post-liberalized India. Cities, 29(2), 148–155. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2011.08.004

UN-Habitat. (2020). World cities report 2020. United Nations.

World Bank. (2021). India's urbanization review. World Bank Group.