



**REHDA
INSTITUTE**
Training • Research • Education

Senior Leadership Circle Roundtable

SUMMARY REPORT



Date

Tuesday, 28 July 2026



Time

9.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.



Venue

M World Hotel, Petaling Jaya

TABLE OF

Contents

01	Executive Summary	3
02	Introduction	4
03	Pre-Event Survey Findings	5
04	Roundtable Discussion & Key Outcomes	8
05	Conclusion & Moving Forward	13
06	Acknowledgements	16

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

REHDA Institute convened the Senior Leadership Circle Roundtable on 28 July 2026 at M World Hotel, Petaling Jaya, bringing together more than 50 senior representatives and observers from Government, industry, academia, finance, professional bodies and international institutions. Held as a closed-door prelude to the REHDA Institute Regional Housing Conference 2026, the Roundtable also advanced the Malaysia–Cambridge Urban Platform (MCUP) as a vehicle for deeper research, knowledge exchange and policy collaboration. A pre-event survey, expert provocations and three facilitated discussion tables examined two connected questions: how Malaysia should rethink housing affordability and how housing, infrastructure, sustainability and smart-city approaches can be better integrated to create sustainable places.

**50+
SENIOR
STAKEHOLDERS**

**2
THEMATIC
DISCUSSIONS**

**3
FACILITATED
TABLES**

**MCUP
RESEARCH TO
IMPLEMENTATION**

A clear direction emerged: Malaysia’s housing and urban challenges are not simply issues of unit supply or price. They require a more integrated, demand-informed and place-based approach that connects households, housing, jobs, transport, infrastructure, climate resilience and data.

WHAT EMERGED

- Affordability should move beyond a single price-to-income benchmark towards a multidimensional framework reflecting household capacity, financing, location, transport and recurring costs.
- Housing intelligence needs to become more granular, longitudinal and integrated. Transaction data alone cannot reveal unmet or constrained demand.
- Sustainable places require housing to be planned together with employment, transport, amenities, infrastructure and climate resilience.
- TOD and smart-city tools should be adapted to Malaysia’s climate, behaviour and institutional context, with technology supporting rather than replacing human judgement.

MOVING FORWARD

- Develop a more localised and multidimensional Housing Affordability Framework.
- Integrate housing, demographic, financing, employment, transport and spatial data to strengthen demand forecasting and policy analysis.
- Better align housing with employment centres, public transport and infrastructure investment.
- Test Malaysian-specific TOD, urban regeneration and climate-resilience approaches through practical pilots and case studies.
- Use MCUP as a research-to-implementation platform for co-created research, policy development, pilots and evaluation across Government, industry and academia.

POLICY MOMENTUM

In his closing remarks, YB Tuan Nga Kor Ming emphasised data-driven housing reform, integrated urban planning and cross-sector collaboration and noted that insights from the Roundtable would be considered in the National Housing Policy 2026–2035. The longer-term test is whether these ideas translate into practical research, policy and pilots that help create cities that are not only liveable, but “lovable”.

INTRODUCTION

REHDA Institute convened the Senior Leadership Circle Roundtable on 28 July 2026 at M World Hotel Petaling Jaya, bringing together more than 50 senior representatives from Federal Government Ministries and agencies, professional bodies, academic institutions and property developers for a focused, closed-door high-level dialogue on some of Malaysia's most pressing housing and urban development issues. The session was further enriched by international perspectives from the United Kingdom (UK), the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Hong Kong and Singapore.

Held as a prelude to the REHDA Institute Regional Housing Conference 2026 under the ASEAN Real Estate Conference (AREC) 2026, the Roundtable provided a trusted setting for decision-makers to examine complex issues, challenge prevailing assumptions and identify practical areas for collaboration.

The Roundtable also marked an important step towards advancing the Malaysia–Cambridge Urban Platform (MCUP), an initiative of the Ministry of Housing and Local Government (KPKT) to deepen collaboration between Malaysia and Cambridge in housing, urban development, policymaking, research and professional capability building. The initiative was conceived following engagements between a Malaysian delegation led by YB Tuan Nga Kor Ming, Minister of Housing and Local Government and Cambridge professors during the REHDA Institute Asia Real Estate Leaders (AREL) UK Study Tour in March 2026. MCUP is envisaged as a structured platform connecting Government, industry and academia through executive education, joint research, policy and industry forums, innovation pilots and practitioner exchanges.

To support a focused and evidence-informed dialogue, the process began with a pre-event survey to capture participants' perspectives on key housing and urban development issues. The survey provided an initial indication of the priorities, concerns and areas of interest among senior stakeholders, serving as an important backdrop to the discussions.

During the event, two thematic sessions were structured around an opening provocation, table discussions and feedback sharing. Participants were organised into three discussion tables, each supported by a facilitator and a Key Insights Lead, to encourage candid exchanges and capture the key observations and outcomes.

This summary report consolidates the pre-event survey findings and key Roundtable outcomes, before drawing together the overarching conclusions and proposed directions for moving forward.

PRE-EVENT SURVEY FINDINGS

The pre-event survey covers housing supply and demand, affordability measurement, sustainable housing, smart cities and potential areas of collaboration under the MCUP. Overall, the respondents agreed that housing planning should increasingly focus on delivering the right housing, in the right location, for the right households, rather than pursuing uniform supply targets. The following are the key findings from the pre-event survey.

i) Moving from Supply Targets to Demand-Driven Housing

Overall, the respondents agreed that the housing supply–demand mismatch has become more evident, although the issue differs across States, income groups and housing segments. Most respondents did not believe that the mismatch is caused solely by housing policy, but rather by a combination of policy design, market dynamics and socioeconomic changes.

Several respondents highlighted that uniform affordable housing quotas and fixed selling price ceilings often fail to reflect local housing demand. These policies may unintentionally encourage developers to build products that satisfy regulatory requirements rather than actual market needs. *Bumiputera* quota implementation and lengthy release processes were also cited as contributing to unsold units in certain locations.

Respondents also pointed to broader structural issues, including slow household income growth, financing constraints, increasing land and construction costs, changing household demographics, migration patterns and employment concentration. Many noted that affordability should not be measured solely by house prices, as transport costs, maintenance fees and access to employment significantly influence whether a home is truly affordable.

Overall, respondents recommended shifting towards a needs-driven and evidence-based housing system supported by better data. They proposed more flexible affordable housing policies, periodic reviews of quotas and price caps, greater tenure diversity (including rental and rent-to-own) and stronger integration between housing, employment centres and public transport.

ii) Affordability Requires a More Holistic and Localised Measure

There was strong consensus that Malaysia should adopt a multidimensional housing affordability framework instead of relying solely on conventional affordability measures such as the Median Multiple. Affordability should be understood at the local level, as national averages may conceal significant differences between local housing markets. Respondents also highlighted the value of examining housing and transport costs together, effectively shifting the question from whether a house is affordable to purchase towards whether a household can afford to live there and access economic opportunities.

Respondents proposed a more comprehensive framework incorporating measures such as:

- **Financial indicators** (household income, residual income, mortgage eligibility, financing approval rates, rental affordability, savings required for down payments and total housing costs)
- **Household characteristics** (household size, tenure preferences and household formation patterns)

- **Supply indicators** (housing supply pipelines, approved developments, existing stock, occupancy, vacancies, unsold completed units, property transactions, rental markets and absorption rates)
- **Location & connectivity** (accessibility to public transport, schools, healthcare facilities, employment centres and other amenities)

Many respondents believed that artificial intelligence (AI), geospatial analytics, predictive modelling and digital twins could improve demand forecasting and policy simulation. However, they stressed that these technologies would only be effective if supported by accurate, integrated and frequently updated datasets with clear governance arrangements.

iii) Sustainable Housing Goes Beyond Green Buildings

Respondents perceived sustainable housing as extending well beyond environmental sustainability. Sustainability should be assessed across the full lifecycle of a development, integrating environmental performance with affordability, accessibility, liveability, resilience, commercial viability and long-term management.

Location and connectivity featured prominently. Sustainable housing should provide reasonable access to employment, public transport, education, healthcare, community facilities and everyday services, while encouraging walking and reducing excessive commuting. **Long-term affordability** was also emphasised, including not only the purchase or rental price but also maintenance charges, utilities, transport and other recurring costs.

Environmental considerations identified by respondents included energy and water efficiency, passive design, renewable-energy readiness, durable materials, sustainable drainage, rainwater harvesting, green infrastructure and resilience to flooding, heat and other climate risks.

At the same time, sustainable development must remain **commercially and financially viable** and be supported by **effective building and strata management** after completion. Long-term maintenance is essential to preserve housing quality and community wellbeing. Sustainable housing should therefore be evaluated using measurable outcomes such as occupancy, resident satisfaction, operational costs and environmental performance.

iv) Smart Cities: From Technology to Better Decisions

The survey also revealed a relatively consistent interpretation of a smart city: **technology should be an enabler rather than the objective itself**. The value of a smart-city platform lies not in the technology itself, but in its ability to turn integrated and timely data into better planning, forecasting and coordinated action.

Respondents described smart cities as connected, people-centred and resilient urban environments that use integrated data, technology and effective governance to improve decision-making, service delivery, resource allocation and quality of life. An integrated platform should combine data from multiple agencies, including land use, planning approvals, housing supply, property transactions, rental markets, demographics, employment, transport systems, infrastructure capacity and climate risks. This could provide an earlier indication of emerging mismatches in location, price and housing type.

Respondents viewed Geographic Information Systems (GIS), Artificial Intelligence (AI), predictive analytics, real-time dashboards and digital twins as valuable tools for improving housing demand forecasting, infrastructure planning and policy evaluation. These technologies could help identify future housing shortages, simulate development scenarios and coordinate housing with transport and infrastructure investments.

Transport and mobility were frequently highlighted as practical areas through which integrated data could improve both urban management and forecasts of future housing needs. However, respondents cautioned that these tools would depend on reliable underlying data, interoperability, privacy and cybersecurity safeguards, clear ownership and access arrangements and appropriate human monitoring.

v) Malaysia-Cambridge Urban Platform (MCUP) Vision & Priority Research Areas

Respondents envisaged MCUP as a **research-to-implementation platform**, with its success ultimately measured by its ability to translate knowledge and research into practical solutions that can be tested, implemented and where successful, scaled. Potential outputs identified included housing-demand forecasting methodologies, affordability and accessibility frameworks, climate-risk assessment tools, data-governance protocols, pilot housing projects, executive education programmes and joint research publications.

To support this vision, respondents identified three key research areas for prioritisation under MCUP:

- 1. Integrated Data, AI and Digital Twins for Housing Demand Forecasting**
- 2. Transit-Oriented Development and Urban Regeneration Models**
- 3. Housing Affordability Framework**

Among these, integrated data and advanced analytics emerged as a particularly important foundation for improving demand forecasting and supporting more informed housing and urban planning decisions. The other priority areas would provide opportunities to translate this stronger evidence base into more responsive needs-driven solutions.

Respondents also proposed complementary research areas, including integrated land-use planning, infrastructure coordination, climate resilience, smart-city governance and digital planning, highlighting the potential for MCUP to address housing and urban development through a broader, integrated framework.

Overall Survey Takeaway

The pre-event survey highlighted a clear call for a more integrated, needs-driven and place-based approach to housing and urban development. Across the responses, four recurring priorities emerged:

- i. Understanding actual household demand
- ii. Measuring affordability more comprehensively
- iii. Coordinating housing with transport, infrastructure and sustainable place-making
- iv. Strengthening the use of integrated data and analytics

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION & KEY OUTCOMES

Building on the findings from the pre-event survey, the Roundtable provided an opportunity for participants to examine two interconnected themes in greater depth:

- i. **How should Malaysians rethink housing affordability?**
- ii. **How can housing, infrastructure, sustainability and smart-city approaches be brought together to create better places?**

The Roundtable commenced with context-setting presentations by **Sr Malathi Thevendran**, Director of Research and Education at REHDA Institute and **Professor Jennifer Schooling**, Professor of Digital Innovation and Smart Places at Anglia Ruskin University and Fellow of Darwin College, Cambridge.

Sr Malathi set the scene by highlighting several structural challenges confronting Malaysia's housing market. Despite the requirement to provide price-controlled properties, the market continued to record 52,064 completed but unsold residential and serviced apartment units in Q1 2026, up from 47,806 units in 2019. Moreover, completed unsold units in the price range of less than RM300,001 increased from 22% of the units in 2019 to 29% of the units in Q1 2026, indicating that pricing is not the main issue.

Meanwhile, conventional affordability measures do not always reflect actual market behaviour. Malaysia's Median Multiple stood at 4.2 in 2024, indicating that we are seriously unaffordable under the Housing Affordability Rating. However, analysis of PR1MA projects revealed that around 86% of their projects would be classified as unaffordable under the Median Multiple approach despite recording an average sales rate of more than 91%. This is further supported by the high home ownership rate of 78%. These contradictions highlight deeper structural issues in how housing affordability, demand and market needs are measured and interpreted. No one multiplier should be adopted. Median multiple ratios differ depending on the locations, types of property and households.

Professor Jennifer subsequently introduced the Malaysia–Cambridge Urban Platform (MCUP) and its potential to support research, knowledge exchange, policy collaboration and the development of practical solutions.

Co-moderated by Professor Jennifer and Sr Malathi, the Roundtable then proceeded through two thematic discussions:

- i. Demystifying Housing Affordability
- ii. Where to Start to Build Sustainable Places?

Each session began with an expert provocation, followed by facilitated table discussions and feedback sharing, enabling participants to examine the issues from Government, industry and academic perspectives and identify areas of convergence.

Roundtable Discussion 1: Demystifying Housing Affordability

The first discussion was framed by **Professor Li Wan**, Professor of Planning at the Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge, who challenged conventional assumptions surrounding housing affordability. His opening provocation highlighted the wider relationship between housing wealth, affordability and economic growth and cautioned that increasing housing supply does not necessarily result in lower prices. Instead, housing supply must also be understood in terms of location, access to employment and amenities, tenure, dwelling type and access to finance.

A key proposition arising from his provocation was that a meaningful affordability measure should help answer three fundamental questions: who faces housing unaffordability, where does it occur and why? More importantly, the measure should ultimately support policy change rather than merely describe market conditions.

The table discussions broadly reinforced this proposition and highlighted five key areas for consideration.

i) Revisit What “Housing Affordability” Actually Means

A recurring theme was that **affordability is not a uniform condition and cannot be adequately represented by a single national benchmark**. Existing indicators tend to rely on broad, cross-sectional information and may not sufficiently reflect differences between locations, household types and changing housing needs.

Participants questioned, in particular, how conventional measures such as the Median Multiple should be interpreted. Rather than simply classifying a housing market as affordable or unaffordable, the discussion raised the more important question of which households are experiencing affordability constraints.

The circumstances of a first-time homebuyer, fresh graduate, low-income household or M40 household may differ considerably. Similarly, the concept of affordability may need to be considered differently across social housing, public housing and the open market. The discussion highlighted the need to recognise differences in income, expenditure, household composition, cycles of life, financing capacity and housing preferences.

ii) Move from Broad, Static Data to Granular and Localised Housing Intelligence

There was broad agreement that Malaysia possesses considerable housing and socio-economic data, but **accessibility, granularity, frequency and integration remain key constraints**.

Participants highlighted the limitations of relying predominantly on broad datasets such as household income, census information, property transactions and quarterly market statistics. Data at National, State or even District level may be too general to assess affordability and housing demand within individual localities accurately.

The discussion called for more localised, longitudinal and linked datasets combining housing, household income, employment, demographics, financing, transport and other relevant information. This would enable affordability to be tracked over time and provide a clearer understanding of how household circumstances and housing needs evolve.

Participants also highlighted an important limitation of transaction data: it records properties that households were able to purchase, but does not capture unmet or constrained demand. For example, households that need housing but are unable to purchase because of price, financing, location or other barriers. Accordingly, better measurement of housing demand should go beyond historical transactions to understand effective demand and future housing needs.

iii) Look Beyond House Prices to the Total Cost and Accessibility of Housing

Participants strongly supported **broadening the concept of affordability beyond the purchase price of a property**.

Participants highlighted the importance of considering:

- proximity and accessibility to employment;
- public transport and commuting costs;
- access to schools, healthcare, amenities and community facilities;
- housing quality;
- financing and repayment capacity; and
- recurring housing costs, including property management and maintenance charges.

Transport emerged as an important consideration. A lower-priced home located far from employment centres may not necessarily provide a more affordable living arrangement once commuting costs and travel time are taken into account. Hence, participants raised the possibility of incorporating housing and transport expenditure within the affordability assessment.

iv) Financing Capacity is an Integral Part of Affordability

Financing was highlighted as another critical dimension that conventional affordability measures may not sufficiently capture.

The discussion indicated that housing financing is generally available in Malaysia; however, eligibility remains a significant issue. A household may appear able to afford a property based on its income-to-price ratio, yet remain unable to secure financing. Participants noted that affordability is, in practice, also an individual financial issue involving the household's ability to demonstrate repayment capacity to financial institutions.

Questions were also raised over the reliance on historical income information to assess future repayment capacity. Such information may not fully reflect the household's actual monthly financial burden, particularly when other recurring housing and living costs are considered.

Affordability assessments should more closely reflect actual repayment capacity and living costs, rather than income alone.

v) Towards a Multidimensional Housing Affordability Framework

Taken together, the Roundtable supported developing a more comprehensive and multidimensional affordability framework. This is necessary to inform differentiated interventions across housing supply, price-controlled housing requirements, financing assistance, rental and rent-to-own options, infrastructure provision and spatial planning, according to the needs of different household groups and locations.

Rather than relying solely on a price-to-income ratio, participants suggested bringing together measures covering income, local housing costs, housing-cost burden, financing eligibility, transport expenditure, location and other relevant household circumstances.

However, developing such a framework will depend heavily on improving access to and integration of existing data. Substantial information already exists across systems and agencies, including Housing Integrated Management System (HIMS), Bank Negara Malaysia (BNM), *Pangkalan Data Utama* (PADU) and other datasets, but much of it remains siloed. Greater integration and analytical use of these datasets could enable information to be translated into better evidence for policymaking.

Roundtable Discussion 2: Where to Start to Build Sustainable Places?

The second discussion broadened the conversation from housing affordability to the wider question of what makes a sustainable, liveable and resilient place and how housing, infrastructure, transport, climate considerations and smart-city approaches can be better integrated.

In her opening provocation, Professor Jennifer Schooling framed sustainable places as those that bring together good housing, employment and a thriving economy, effective transport access, social spaces and green spaces. She also highlighted pressures including flooding, overheating, pollution and congestion, underscoring the need for planning and infrastructure systems to respond to both present and future urban challenges.

Participants were asked to consider whether existing infrastructure and planning systems could support future urban growth while responding to climate risks, the role of Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) in supporting sustainable cities and how better data, modelling and smart-city tools could ensure that housing and infrastructure are delivered where future demand will arise.

i) Sustainable Places Require an Integrated Ecosystem

A central theme was that sustainable urban development requires a shift from planning individual housing projects towards planning complete places and urban systems. Housing must be planned together with employment opportunities, schools, healthcare, commercial activities, public transport, community facilities, green spaces and other amenities required for daily life.

This was particularly relevant to Transit-Oriented Development (TOD). Participants observed that TOD should not be reduced to building higher-density housing near a rail station. Instead, an effective TOD should function as a people-centric and community-driven ecosystem, where housing, employment, transport, amenities and social infrastructure are planned together.

Professor Jennifer, in her conclusion, highlighted the opportunity, particularly in urban regeneration areas, to connect new development with existing communities and create economic opportunities for surrounding residents rather than allowing developments to function as isolated enclaves.

ii) Address the “Chicken-and-Egg” Challenge of Infrastructure and Development

Participants highlighted the importance of ensuring that infrastructure provision is aligned with the location and timing of future development.

The discussion pointed towards a more proactive, infrastructure-led planning approach, whereby transport, utilities and supporting infrastructure should be considered early in the development process rather than being addressed only after demand and congestion have materialised.

However, placing the full upfront burden of social and physical infrastructure on developers can make large-scale developments difficult to deliver. Stronger coordination between public-sector infrastructure investment and private-sector development would be required.

iii) Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Must Be Adapted to the Malaysian Context

While TOD was widely recognised as an important component of sustainable urban development, participants cautioned against adopting international models without sufficient consideration of Malaysia's local conditions.

One Table questioned whether conventional TOD benchmarks such as an 800-metre walking catchment reflect Malaysia's tropical climate, pedestrian environment and mobility patterns. Participants also highlighted continuing dependence on private vehicles and the importance of first- and last-mile connectivity in determining whether residents actually use public transport.

The discussion suggested that successful TOD requires attention to the human element. The mere proximity of housing to a rail station does not guarantee behavioural change. Public transport must offer a sufficiently convenient, connected and attractive alternative to private vehicles, while the surrounding development must provide the services and amenities residents require.

Participants also highlighted community acceptance as a practical issue in urban intensification. Concerns surrounding density, congestion and changes to existing neighbourhoods can create resistance to development around established areas. This reinforces the need for appropriate stakeholder engagement and for the benefits of TOD to extend beyond individual developments to surrounding communities.

Participants also raised the potential of allowing more intensive development above and around transport stations, drawing on Hong Kong's experience where development around MTR stations contributes to both place-making and rail infrastructure funding. However, regulatory and land-administration considerations would need to be examined in the Malaysian context.

Equally important was coordination between Ministries, planning authorities and implementing agencies. Participants observed that policy clarity at the national level does not always translate consistently into implementation. Regulatory requirements and differences in local interpretation can present challenges to delivering higher-density housing and mixed-use development around transport nodes. Hence, stronger alignment between planning policy, transport investment and development implementation was important.

Dato' Jeffrey Ng Tiong Lip, Chairman of REHDA Institute, in his summary reinforced the broader principle that lessons from international experience should be carefully interpreted against Malaysia's own market, institutional and policy conditions rather than directly adopted from another country.

vi) Climate Resilience Must Be Planned Beyond Individual Developments

Participants raised concerns that lower-income communities can be particularly exposed to environmental risks, including where lower-cost housing is located in areas more vulnerable to flooding. This creates the potential for affordability challenges to be compounded by climate vulnerability and additional financial risk.

More fundamentally, the discussion highlighted the limitations of addressing climate resilience by individual development. Professor Jennifer summarised that flood and drainage systems operate across natural catchments rather than administrative or project boundaries. A development may adequately manage its own runoff, but subsequent development upstream can change the overall hydrological conditions and undermine downstream mitigation measures. Climate-resilience planning needs to be considered at a broader catchment, city or regional scale, supported by coordination across jurisdictional boundaries.

CONCLUSION & MOVING FORWARD

The Senior Leadership Circle Roundtable demonstrated that Malaysia's housing and urban challenges are becoming increasingly interconnected and cannot be addressed through isolated policy interventions. Housing affordability is influenced not only by house prices and household income, but also by financing capacity, location, employment, transport, recurring living costs and changing household preferences. Similarly, the creation of sustainable places depends on the effective coordination of housing, infrastructure, mobility, economic opportunities, community facilities and climate resilience.

Across both thematic discussions, the strongest recurring message was **the need for greater integration**. Malaysia already possesses substantial housing, socio-economic, financing, spatial and infrastructure data, alongside a wide range of policies and initiatives. The challenge lies in connecting these resources more effectively, improving their accessibility and granularity and translating them into timely insights that can support more responsive policy and investment decisions.

The discussions also highlighted **the limitations of uniform national benchmarks and one-size-fits-all solutions**. Housing markets and household circumstances differ considerably between States, districts and localities, while approaches to TOD, sustainable development and smart-city planning must reflect Malaysia's own climatic, cultural, institutional and market conditions. Future policy should therefore become increasingly household-based, demand-informed and place-specific, supported by stronger evidence and closer coordination across Government, industry and academia.

Importantly, the Roundtable was not intended to prescribe immediate solutions to every issue identified. As Professor Li Wan observed, it represented a "problem discovery process", an opportunity to establish a clearer understanding of the underlying challenges and practical constraints before developing appropriate responses. This provides an important foundation for MCUP to move from dialogue towards co-created research, pilot initiatives and policy solutions that are grounded in the Malaysian context.

In conclusion, the discussions pointed towards a broader transition from supply-led and sector-specific interventions towards an integrated, data-informed and place-based approach to housing and urban development. Success should increasingly be measured not simply by the number of homes or infrastructure projects delivered, but by whether people can access suitable housing, employment, mobility, amenities and resilient communities that support long-term quality of life.

The Roundtable identified several areas that could form the basis of the next phase of collaboration under MCUP and related housing and urban policy initiatives.

i) Develop a More Comprehensive and Localised Housing Affordability Framework

Further work should be undertaken to develop a multidimensional affordability framework that moves beyond reliance on a single price-to-income ratio. The framework should consider household financial capacity, financing eligibility, housing and transport expenditure, recurring costs, location, accessibility and other factors affecting a household's ability to sustainably occupy a home.

Importantly, affordability should be assessed at an appropriate geographical scale to reflect differences across States, districts and localities and should be capable of identifying who is facing affordability constraints, where and why.

ii) Strengthen Housing Demand Forecasting and Data Integration

Malaysia has substantial data resources across Government agencies and other institutions, but greater integration is required to transform these datasets into actionable intelligence.

Future work could explore how housing, demographic, income, financing, employment, transport, land-use and infrastructure information can be linked to provide a more accurate understanding of actual, unmet and future housing demand. This should include consideration of emerging tools such as artificial intelligence, predictive analytics and digital twins, while ensuring that technology supports rather than replaces informed human decision-making.

This direction is closely aligned with the Minister's remarks that systems such as HIMS are establishing the foundations of a more transparent and data-driven housing ecosystem and that AI, big data and predictive analytics have the potential to improve demand forecasting, reduce supply mismatches and support smarter housing and urban planning.

iii) Better Align Housing, Employment, Transport and Infrastructure Planning

The Roundtable reinforced that housing should not be planned independently of where people work and how they move.

Greater coordination is required between housing development, employment centres, industrial and commercial growth, public transport, schools, healthcare, utilities and other supporting infrastructure. Planning should increasingly consider the total ecosystem of a place, rather than treating housing supply as an isolated numerical target.

The Minister similarly emphasised that homes must be connected to transport, employment opportunities, education, healthcare, open spaces and public amenities and that good housing policy must therefore proceed together with good urban planning.

iv) Develop Malaysian-Specific Approaches to TOD and Sustainable Place-Making

TOD presents significant opportunities to improve accessibility, reduce dependence on private vehicles and better integrate housing with economic activity. However, future models should reflect Malaysia's climate, mobility behaviour, land and regulatory systems, development economics and community needs.

Potential areas for further study include first- and last-mile connectivity, development above and around transit stations, appropriate density, urban regeneration around existing transit nodes, infrastructure financing and the sequencing of housing and social infrastructure.

KPKT's ongoing emphasis on developing public housing near TOD areas provides an opportunity for selected projects or locations to serve as practical case studies or pilot initiatives, allowing different approaches to be tested and evaluated.

v) Integrate Climate Resilience into Wider Spatial Planning

Climate resilience should move beyond individual development interventions towards a broader spatial approach.

Flooding, heat and other environmental risks do not follow project or administrative boundaries. Future research and planning should therefore examine resilience at the catchment, city and regional levels, integrating climate projections with housing, infrastructure, land-use and socio-economic data.

Particular attention should be given to ensuring that affordable and lower-income communities are not disproportionately exposed to environmental risks, reinforcing the principle that sustainability, affordability and social inclusion must be considered together.

vi) Use MCUP as a Research-to-Implementation Platform

MCUP provides an opportunity to convert the issues identified through the Roundtable into a structured programme of collaborative research and implementation.

Rather than beginning with predetermined solutions, the next phase could establish a shared knowledge base and clearly defined research questions, followed by comparative studies, policy development, pilot projects and evaluation. This approach would allow Government, Cambridge, REHDA Institute, industry and other stakeholders to jointly test what works in the Malaysian context before considering wider application.

Priority workstreams could include housing affordability measurement, integrated data and housing-demand forecasting, TOD and urban regeneration, climate resilience, smart-city planning and other areas identified through the pre-event survey and Roundtable.

vii) Strengthen Government–Industry–Academia Collaboration

In his closing remarks, YB Tuan Nga Kor Ming stressed that the complexity of housing and urban challenges means that they cannot be addressed by Government alone, but require partnership among policymakers, industry and academia. He also indicated that the insights generated through the Roundtable would be considered in the formulation of housing policy.

At the time of the Roundtable, the Minister further announced the forthcoming National Housing Policy 2026–2035, noting that the Ministry would carefully consider the recommendations and insights arising from the discussions. He emphasised that good policy must respond to present challenges while anticipating the needs of future generations.

The Roundtable therefore represents a starting point rather than an end in itself. Its longer-term value will depend on whether the ideas and partnerships generated can be translated into research, policy, pilots and measurable implementation outcomes.

As the Minister concluded, the shared task ahead is to turn good ideas into meaningful action and translate vision into reality, working collectively towards cities that are not only liveable, but “lovable”, for Malaysia and future generations.

Acknowledgements

REHDA Institute gratefully acknowledges the following organisations for their participation and valuable contributions to the Senior Leadership Circle Roundtable on 28 July 2026. Their collective expertise, insights and constructive engagement contributed significantly to the depth of the discussions and the overall success of the Roundtable.

Attendance on 28 July 2026 included:

1. **Ministry of Housing and Local Government of Malaysia** - YB Tuan Nga Kor Ming, Minister of Housing and Local Government
2. **Ministry of Housing and Local Government of Malaysia** - Dato' Jayaselan A/L K. Navaratnam, National Housing Technical Advisor to the Minister of Housing and Local Government
3. **Ministry of Housing and Local Government Malaysia** - En. Tarmizi Bin Ab. Rahman, Deputy Division Secretary (Housing Policy Branch), Housing Planning Division
4. **Ministry of Economy of Malaysia** - En. Wan Ahmad Asmady bin Wan Md Din, Deputy Director (Housing and Local Government), Social Services Division
5. **Ministry of Economy of Malaysia** - Dr. Nadia Monira binti Mohamed Taib, Principal Assistant Director (Housing), Social Services Division
6. **Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Sustainability (NRES)** - Datuk Muhammad Yasir bin Yahya, Undersecretary (Land, Survey and Geospatial Division)
7. **PLANMalaysia** - Datuk TPr. Dr. Alias Rameli, Director General
8. **PLANMalaysia** - Datin TPr. Dr. Chee Ping Ngang, Director of the Research and Development Division
9. **Bank Negara Malaysia (BNM)** - En. Endran bin Fadzil, Director, Financial Surveillance Department
10. **CIMB** - Ms. Ivy Ong, Head of Secured Lending Products
11. **Malayan Banking Berhad (Maybank)** - Ms. Tracy Pan, Executive Vice President and Head of Mortgage for Community Financial Services
12. **OCBC Bank (Malaysia) Berhad** - Mr. Adrian Chew Roy Fook, Executive Director, Head of Enterprise Real Estate, Commercial Banking
13. **Cagamas Berhad** - En. Kameel Abdul Halim, Chief Executive Officer
14. **Prasarana Integrated Development Sdn Bhd (PRIDE)** - En. Syed Redza Algadrie, Chief Executive Officer
15. **PR1MA Corporation Malaysia** - Ts. Brian Iskandar Zulkarim, Group Chief Executive Officer
16. **PR1MA Corporation Malaysia** - The Late Dato' Wan Hashimi Albakri, Member of Corporation (MoC)
17. **PR1MA Corporation Malaysia** - En. Afiq Syarifuddin bin Ahmad Nazari, Head of Division, Development
18. **Railway Assets Corporation (RAC)** - Ms. Lena Ng Hwei Ling, Chief Operating Officer (Property)
19. **Federation of Malaysian Manufacturers (FMM)** - Dato' J. Palaniappan, Vice President
20. **Malaysian Institute of Property and Facility Managers (MIPFM)** - Professor PMrg. Sr. Dr. Ting Kien Hwa, Deputy President
21. **Our Hong Kong Foundation (OHKF) (Hong Kong)** - Mr. Ryan Ip, Vice President
22. **EdgeProp Malaysia** - Mr. Alvin Ong, Managing Director

Attendance on 28 July 2026 included:

23. **Global Asia Consulting** - Dr. Wan Zokhri bin Wan Idris, Managing Partner
24. **MHub** - Mr. Jason Ding, Co-founder
25. **PropertyDoctors (Singapore) Pte Ltd (Singapore)** - Dr. Lee Nai Jia, Director
26. **Anglia Ruskin University (UK)** - Professor Jennifer Schooling, Professor of Digital Innovation and Smart Places
27. **University of Cambridge (UK)** - Professor Li Wan, Professor of Planning
28. **University of Malaya** - Sr. Dr. Chin Hon Choong, Senior Lecturer / Head of Research Centre for Sustainable Urban Planning and Real Estate, Faculty of Built Environment
29. **Asiabina Holdings Sdn Bhd** - Dato' Yong Chai Seng, Group Managing Director
30. **Gamuda Land** - Ms. Wong Siew Lee, Chief Operating Officer of Project Operations
31. **Jaya Depan Group Sdn Bhd** - Mr. Jason Tee, Director
32. **Kimlun Corporation Berhad** - Datuk Ir. Fong Tian Yong, Independent Non-Executive Director
33. **MKH Berhad** - Ts. Dr. Foo Chee Hong, Manager of Product Research & Development
34. **PNB Merdeka Ventures Sdn Bhd** - Mr. Wayne Wong, Head, Residential & Hospitality
35. **REHDA Malaysia** - Datuk Ir. Ho Hon Sang, Immediate Past President
36. **REHDA Malaysia** - Datuk Tan Hon Lim, Secretary General
37. **REHDA Malaysia** - Dato' David Lim Boon Huat, National Treasurer
38. **REHDA Malaysia** - Ms. Shanaz Azwin binti Datuk Hj Muztaza, National Council Member
39. **REHDA Malaysia** - Ms. Shirley Ho, Industry Affairs, Senior Manager
40. **REHDA Institute** - Dato' Jeffrey Ng Tiong Lip, Chairman
41. **REHDA Institute** - Tan Sri Teo Chiang Kok, Trustee
42. **REHDA Institute** - Datuk Ng Seing Liong JP, Trustee
43. **REHDA Institute** - Datuk Seri (Dr) Michael KC Yam, Trustee
44. **REHDA Institute** - Mr. David Chong, Chief Operating Officer
45. **REHDA Institute** - Sr. Malathi Thevendran, Director, Research & Education
46. **REHDA Institute** - Ms. Huong Yu Sin, Assistant Manager, Research & Education
47. **REHDA Youth** - Mr. Choy Kin Mann, Chairman
48. **REHDA Youth** - Mr. Max Lee Yeong Khuin, Deputy Chairman



ABOUT THE ROUNDTABLE

The Roundtable brought together senior representatives from Government, industry, academia, finance, professional bodies and international institutions to examine housing affordability and the creation of sustainable places.

KEY FOCUS AREAS

01 | Housing Affordability

A more multidimensional, localised and demand-informed approach.

02 | Sustainable Places

Connecting housing with jobs, transport, infrastructure and resilience.

03 | Integrated Data & Malaysia-Cambridge Urban Platform (MCUP)

Turning research, data and collaboration into practical solutions.

Contact REHDA Institute:

Wisma REHDA,
No. 2C, Jalan SS5D/6, Kelana Jaya
+603-7803 6006 / 2978

www.rehdainstitute.com | Training • Research • Education