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**Title of report**

***Wither Indian Cities: Urban Reforms and Counter Strategies*** A national consultation on JnNURM held on April 15-16, 2006, Mumbai. (2007) Committee for the Right to Housing and Hazards Centre (Sanchal Foundation)

**Objective**

The objective of the consultation was to bring together groups, activists, academicians and urban development experts to discuss the implications of market driven urban development envisaged under the JnNURM and the framework of a collective response to the Mission.

**Key discussion points**

* *Land use patterns and exclusion of the poor* Relying on market-based solutions have always led to the exclusion of the poor, and the current relaxation of land use regulations in favour of the market is testimony of the continuation of the trend. This is evident in the use of old mill land for the construction of malls and unaffordable housing in Mumbai, and slum evictions for the Asiad Games Village and Commonwealth Games Village in Delhi.
* *Emerging forms of urban governance* New urban governance being promoted in Indian cities is aimed at facilitating market development, making cities “globally investible” and minimising risks to the private sector. New types of institutions are created that bypass democratic structures; centralise decision making while decentralising debt burdens; force market-based financing while reducing local fiscal powers; and promote elites to influence policy while the poor lose out. The JnNURM is unconstitutional, risky and expensive for the country at large but highly beneficial to the globally connected elite, domestic and international business, and donors.
* *Urban reforms and livelihoods* Liberalisation and privatisation have led to the informalisation of work, resulting in depression of wages, insecurity of work and other social problems. One can observe the simultaneous increase in informal labour. The risk of harassment from the state brings the question of citizenship to the fore. It is therefore, critical to understand the links between the informal sector, poverty and growth.
* *Transport sector reforms* Transport planning has been geared to promoting the use of motorised private vehicles while a majority of the people walk, cycle or use public transport. Metro rail is being promoted as the panacea for urban transport problems but studies show that it is far less effective and more expensive than a bus-based transport system. An ideal high capacity bus rapid transport system would also have separate lanes for pedestrians and non-motorised vehicles as well as space for hawkers and vendors as transport corridors are natural markets.
* *Water sector reforms* In the contemporary trend to privatise public agencies, the focus has shifted from private sector participation to promoting private management. However, for reforms to be successful there is a need to evolve a demand approach, higher accountability, institutional innovation and change in management and accounting rules. It is essential to resist privatisation but also advocate for reforms that focus not only on higher technology and organisational restructuring but also on social dimensions such as inclusion and sustainable service delivery.
* *Exclusion and inclusion in cities* Globalisation has revolutionised the way people move and communicate, and technology has played a big role in this. Capital concentrates in cities where appropriate infrastructure exists, attracting workers. Governments in India have aided capital, allowing the benefits to go private corporations and their shareholders while disenfranchising the poor. In contrast, the urban poor in many Latin American countries were able to organise themselves and able to successfully win pro poor policies such as in situ development and security of tenure. However, a similar community and political organisation is necessary to fight contemporary social and economic exclusion.

**Conclusion**

The two important decisions taken in the consultation were:

1. Committee for the Right to Housing will set up an urban resource centre in Mumbai and all other groups will help CRH in this endeavour.
2. Regional consultations will be organised in Allahabad, Jaipur, Chennai, Nasik, Bangalore, Hyderabad, Jamshedpur and Srinagar.

**Title of report**

***Urban Renewal or Cities of Exclusion?*** A report of the national seminar on JnNURM, February 15-16, 2007 (2008) Hazards Centre

**Objective**

To make a serious public and collective attempt to identify common issues across urban India and to develop a concerted effort to deal with the general trend of urban renewal, as planned and implemented by bureaucracies and consultants without reference to the needs of the people.

**Discussion**

The consultation was preceded by several micro studies and consultations in sixteen cities across the country. The consultations found resonance with five key trends:

1. City economies are moving from manufacturing to services
2. The workforce is being evicted from both work and shelter
3. Their space is being taken over by the large private corporation
4. The slogan “Clean and Green” is anti-working people
5. The working poor have to build alliances to resist

The two-day seminar saw participation of more than one hundred people from a large range of organisations. Some key issues discussed were

* *The process of exclusion seems to remove the poor and poverty*. CDPs are prepared by private consultants and do not involve the people. The Planning Commission argued that the corporate sector was involved to minimise corruption. A similar attitude is reflected in the outlook of the judiciary towards the poor. It was agreed that a common strategy was required to challenge and counter the oppressive policies of the state and the collusion of bureaucrats, technocrats and the judiciary.
* *Mission being driven by loans and conditions imposed by loan-giving institutions.* The NURM sees a large role for the private sector and incentivises private participation in planning, building and financing development of cities. Despite 30% of JnNURM budget being allocated for BSUP, private consultants have reduced this to 10%.

**Conclusion**

The national workshop aimed to reach a consensus on the JnNURM and passed five resolutions:

1. The NURM should be implemented by one department or ministry. This ministry should proactively make all information public, particularly that related to finance management, conditions for loans, and the arrangement for repayment.
2. All policy decisions must be tabled and discussed in the parliament and state legislative assemblies.
3. Ward sabhas and Ward committees should be constituted as mandated by the 74th Constitutional (Amendment) Act, and be given the extensive right to formulate local development plans which should be integrated to make the City Development Plan (CDP).
4. CDPs prepared by bureaucrats and technocrats should not be accepted.
5. The NURM should have provision for livelihoods, not just infrastructure and services for the poor.

**Title of report**

***Resolutions of the National Consultation on JnNURM and RAY, February 3-4, 2012.*** *New Delhi*

**Resolutions**

After discussions with officials from the Ministry of Urban Development, Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Planning Commission, Rajiv Awas Yojana (RAY), and the National Technical Advisory Group, the participants at the Consultation unanimously resolved as follows:

1. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation cease all steps to implement the RAY until a comprehensive social audit has been done of the BSUP (Basic Services for the Urban Poor) component of JnNURM, and it can be determined that the RAY is indeed an improvement over the BSUP.
2. the Ministry of Urban Development make public the assessment conducted by Grant Thornton so that people can compare the methodology, data, and findings with their own experiences ‐ as given, for example, in the Mid‐Term Review carried out by Citizens' Groups in 2009.
3. Social audits, in the nature of public hearings in different cities at the ward level, be carried out of both sub‐Missions and be done in concert with elected Municipal Councilors and local voluntary groups and mass organisations working with urban poor communities, and efforts be made to compare the performance of the BSUP with earlier rehabilitation and service provisioning schemes of the State Governments and Urban Local Bodies.
4. The findings of either the Grant Thornton report or the High Powered Expert Committee recommendations that a new version of JnNURM be launched through bilateral discussions between the Centre and States only. All these recommendations, in fact, ignore the larger perspective that the reforms and private sector initiatives have failed and the way forward is to strengthen public participation.
5. The Ministry of Finance and the Planning Commission that they closely scrutinise the actual performance of both the sub‐Missions and to refuse sanction for further ad‐hoc schemes and grandiose budgetary provisions until detailed audits have been completed and made public for transparent and accountable governance. In particular, a grievance window has to be established where citizens can complain or voice their views when public consultations do not take place before the preparation of CDPs, DPRs, and during implementation of specific projects.
6. We shall conduct independent reviews of the Mission in as many cities and towns as our financial and organisational capacities will permit. In this we appeal to the National Advisory Council to seriously consider and encourage this public initiative, through which we would not only critically analyse JnNURM and RAY but also endeavour to formulate alternative policies and plans that would both benefit the common people as well as contribute to national well‐being.

**Title of report**

***JnNURM Learning for RAY or Matter of Policy: Discussion from the National Consultation JnNURM and RAY on February 2-4, 2012, New Delhi.*** Letter to Ms. Aruna Sundarajan, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation.

**Key questions**

1. It is widely known that many beneficiaries of BSUP housing are unable to pay the beneficiary contribution for flats. There have been several instances of rejection of these projects in cities like Indore and Bhubaneshwar. What lessons have been learn for RAY?
2. Institutional credit has not been available for the poor who are unable to pay the beneficiary component of BSUP flats. Yet, the RAY proposes a credit risk guarantee fund, ignoring the failure of the market to provide credit to what it deems to be high risk. Instead of providing risk funds for high cost housing, why can RAY not make cheap credit available for the poor to upgrade their existing houses at minimal cost?
3. There is evidence that less than 1% of land is occupied by the poor and that in many cities, municipalities own 60-70% of the urban land. There is also evidence that the poor are capable of building houses incrementally. Instead of first bringing land under private control and then trying to increase its access to the poor, as unsuccessfully proposed by JNNURM, why is RAY not directly providing tenure security to the poor?

**Title**

***Challenges to a Mission*** A National Seminar in Delhi in 2008

**Objective**

“Challenges to the *Jn*NURM”, was the third in a series of seminars organised by the Hazards Centre on the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (*Jn*NURM).The seminar was organised to further the discussions on the *Jn*NURM from the previous seminars and also to review the debate surrounding the mission.

**Discussion Points**

The seminar was divided into four sessions that examined the technical aspects of the mission, the process for participation and consultation, the theme of infrastructure versus basic services for the urban poor and some strategies for the future. Some of the issues that the sessions attempted to address included whether the *Jn*NURM was a part of globalisation, the linkages between urban renewal and employment, the role of civil society in the review of the mission, the efficiency of the private sector etc.

Some of the discussion points from these sessions are summarized below:

* **The *Jn*NURM was discussed as one of the governments neo-liberal programmes that that facilitated a larger role for the private sector in service provision.** For instance, the reforms on property, governance and participation were interpreted as provisions that aided real estate companies purchase, develop and sell large areas of land at high prices. Also, the *Jn*NURM toolkit recommends levying user charges for basic municipal services. This would require the involvement of the private sector in basic service provision.
* **The *Jn*NURM was discussed as being only one of the several policies that envisage a large role for the private sector in the development of infrastructure.** For instance, the Rashtriya Awas Niti envisages a large role for the private sector in the provision of housing for the urban poor. In fact, it was noted that the *Jn*NURM facilitates its implementation by mandating the repeal of the Urban Land Ceiling and Regulation Act.
* **The *Jn*NURM was not considered pro-poor.** This is asat the state level, about two-thirds of the money under *Jn*NURM was allocated to projects in four big States– Maharashtra, Andhra, Gujarat and Karnataka. Even for BSUP sub-mission, three-fourths of the money has been allocated to these states. Also, under the BSUP sub-mission the involvement of the private sector in housing and service provision has rendered these services unaffordable for the urban poor. Furthermore, the creation of wage employment opportunities is not permitted under the mission.
* **The opportunities for participation in th*e Jn*NURM were discussed as being inadequate and narrowly defined.** The City Development Plans (CDPs) and Detailed Project Reports (DPRS) were usually not based on need assessment studies and did not reflect the concerns of the citizens. Additionally, the enactment of a community participation law is one of the mandatory reforms of the mission. However, it is not clear how a “community” should be defined and also how this law will differ from the 74th Amendment. There is also a lack of representation of civil society in groups and committees constituted to oversee and review the mission.

**Resolutions**

* The formation of a group of citizens and organisations that would raise and discuss *Jn*NURM related issues in all cities. The organisations could share data, pamphlets and reports amongst themselves.
* The preparation of a Citizens Review on the *Jn*NURM to challenge the government’s mid-term review of the mission.
* The preparation of a draft toolkit on how to prepare a peoples plan that is sustainable and worker friendly.
* The preparation of an action plan to protest against the *Jn*NURM

**Title**

***JnNURM and the Urban Poor* A** Policy Paper under the TULCI component of GoI-UNDP Project on National Strategy for the Urban Poor 2007

**Objective**

To examine the City Development Plans of 15 cities Chennai, Chandigarh, Bangalore, Pune, Ahmedabad, Ludhiana, Jaipur, Mumbai, Indore, Kolkatta, Hyderabad, Lucknow, Guwahati, Coimbatore and Raipur

**Key Findings**

TheCDPs of the cities have been analysedon their involvement with the *Jn*NURM’s sub-mission on Basic Services to the Urban Poor (BSUP). Some of the key findings from the paper are given below:

* **Most of the CDPs studied allude to a shift in employment from the primary and secondary sectors to the tertiary sector.** **However, the factors responsible for this shift in employment patterns are not discussed and neither is there an examination of whether cities are equipped for this change.** Furthermore, the documents do not clearly specify how this economic transition will be made. While some CDPs acknowledge that this transition is usually associated with increasingly unorganised and informalised systems of employment, there is no attempt to address these issues in the plans. For instance, while Hyderabad’s CDP states that city is being transformed into a knowledge based economy, it does not provide a solution for its low average gross district product per capita, the proportion of low-income households or the impoverishment of its working class. Ludhiana is a notable exception though and does not mention a transition to the tertiary sector.
* The vision statements of cities in their CDPs were analyzed for an understanding of a city’s priorities. Most vision statements articulated the cities desire to become “world class”, a “prime metropolis” and “vibrant”. At the same time, the vision statements also articulate a commitment to be “inclusive” and to provide basic services to all the city’s residents.
* **Although CDPs were supposed to be developed with stakeholder consultation, many CDPs do not document the proceedings of these consultations or discussions in detail. Also, many CDPs suggest that there were no consultations/discussions, on issues concerning the urban poor.** For instance, the CDPs of Chennai and Mumbai do not have many details on the stakeholder consultations. On the other hand, Jaipur’s CDP documents discussions held with slums, traders’ associations, unions, NGOs, Resident Welfare Associations, groups of students at their schools, elected representatives etc. Similarly, Ludhiana’s CDP includes details of stakeholder consultations, but unfortunately the discussions reported hardly focussed on issues of urban poverty.
* **Many of the CDPs did not contain information on the individuals/organisations that had authored the document.**
* Funds allocated for BSUP are usually a very small part of the total budget given in the CDP/.
* **Most CDPs favour the participation of the private sector in municipal service provision and the enforcement of charges for municipal services.**

**Conclusion/resolutions**:

* The report argues that while most urban centres are moving towards a service based economy, they are not equipped to deal with the consequent problems of informal and casual labour. The *Jn*NURM does have provisions for employment generation and hence the issues of informal labour and the “cheapening of work have not been addressed in CDPs.
* The report suggests that *Jn*NURM’s lack of focus on the urban poor has been reflected in the vision statements of the cities.
* The fact that the CDP is often derived from existing plans and projects cannot negate the need for participatory consultations, the report argues.
* It is imperative that the CDPs explicitly list their authors. This will help citizens hold the authors of the report accountable for their plans.

**Title**

***Response to Land Tenure Issue in Slum Free City Planning (SFCP), RAY* in National Workshop, Ahmedabed, 2010**

**Objective**

To share the outputs of the National Workshop on ‘Land Tenure Issue in Slum Free City Planning’ held on 30‐31 August, 2010 in Ahmedabad.

**Discussion Points**

* The Hazards Centre had undertaken several studies with citizen’s groups in order to examine the difficulties faced by the poor and alternative strategies to growth and development. Some of their research reports include: People’s Housing Policy (2003), *Zamin kahan hai*? (2005) by Sajha Manch, Delhi Master Plan 2021: What is to be done? (2007), a fact‐finding report on the eviction and resettlement process in Delhi (2007), a policy paper titled “JnNURM National Strategy for the Urban Poor” (2007) and the Citizen’s Review of the mission (2009).
* The reports suggest that some of the government policies and processes which are people centric and pro-poor are not implemented in their spirit. For instance, in Delhi, various acts and schemes have provisions for the improvement of slums, however usually, these provisions are used to evict of slum dwellers The reports also suggest that private sector indirectly influences the system.
* *Zamin kahan hai* counters the government’s claim that there is no land in the city for the poor, and argues that there is land available in Delhi for the slums dwellers and the homeless.
* The surveys conducted by citizens’ group in 26 cities on the *Jn*NURMfound significant gaps between the City Development Plans (CDPs) and Detailed Project Reports (DPRs). The report also noted that a very small component of the total budget is allocated to the BSUP submission in most cities.

**Conclusions:** Some of the suggestions and recommendations made by the people, and recorded in these reports include:

* An alternative policy of in‐situ land reform to regularize squatters and unauthorized settlements and provide security of tenure
* The provision of housing loans up to 50,000 on easy terms against mortgage of land.
* Resettlement is necessary should be within 1 kilometre of the original site. Also, multi‐storeyed housing is not a desirable option.
* The provision of basic urban services through public agencies at a cost.

**Title**

**Response to the advisory note on Community Participation in the process of conducting socioeconomic survey under the Slum Free City Planning Scheme (SFCP) of Rajiv Awas Yojana**

**Objective**

This letter was addressed to the Secretary, Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation with suggestions on the process of conducting the socioeconomic survey from the workshop at CEPT University, Ahmadabad.

**Discussion Points**

* The role of the citizens in the SFCP had been confined to data collection and administering surveys. It is important to include citizens in the planning process as well.
* The responsibility for participatory planning must rest with Urban Local Bodies. Planning for the SFCP cannot be assigned to Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) and their role must be confined to facilitating the process.
* Several meeting need to be organised with the community to ensure that the plan reflects their realities. While several meetings have been planned with the administration and NGOs, there is a provision for only for one community sabha. This marginalizes the main stakeholders of the project - the community. Also, the process of community participation must lead to the formation of community associations that can articulate the concerns of the community.
* The schedules designed for the surveys are complicated and not user friendly. They need to be prepared in consultation with communities to ensure that they can be self-administered.
* It is unclear how the data collected will be developed into a people’s plan.
* Objective indicators of identifying a settlement as a slum should be used and squatters and pavement dwellers must be covered in the programme.

**Title: How Inclusive are our Cities? Implications for the 12th Five Year Plan from the perspective of the Urban Poor**

**Objective:** This consultation was organized in Bangalore on the 27-28th January 2012 with the objective of assessing the inclusivity of the policies and programmes related to the urban poor including issues of housing, basic services, social infrastructure, rights-based initiatives and governance.

**Discussion Points:**

1. The broad context for the consultation was the assertion that economic growth has excluded the urban poor. Speakers discussed the convergence between the objectives of the government/planning commission and the private sector. They argued that this convergence is reflected in policies like the *Jn*NURM and the United Progressive Alliance’s Report to the People. The need for a comprehensive approach to urban poverty that assured the urban poor of dignity, decent housing, food, education, social security, livelihoods etc was discussed. The need to revisit Article 38 and 39 of the Constitution of India for a vision of equitable growth was recognized.
2. Some speakers contested these views and argued that there was no trade-off between growth and equity. They argued that the Planning Commission’s plans are inclusive as they are drafted after consultations and feedback and also that the *Jn*NURM was pro-poor. The government was also undertaking programmes like the National Urban Livelihood Mission, programme on providing shelter to homeless, programme on incremental improvement in slums under JNNURM, programme on street vendors, initiative on food security, health, education etc.
3. The consultation examined issues related to housing for the urban poor. In this context the Rajiv Awas Yojana was considered a significant programme of the government as it promised the poor minimum shelter and a reasonable standard of living. However, the granting of land titles was discussed as being counter-productive as it was felt these titles would be grabbed better-off and powerful in communities. Data from the Census 2011 was discussed as suggesting that large cities were exclusionary. This is as in the 65 cities in which the *Jn*NURM was implemented have showed a significant decline in the growth rate of population. It was argued that this decline implies that these cities are not inclusive for rural migrants. Other housing problems like the size of units and land issues were also discussed.
4. The fact that a large amount of water is being diverted from agriculture to industries and cities was discussed. It was predicted that there would be contestations over water between agriculture, industries and cities in the future; these contestations will challenge our knowledge of resource management and governance. The costs to the denial of water were discussed – these include the economic costs of purchasing water, the loss of productive time and various health costs.
5. Labour laws were implemented by labour unions and not by the management of factories. Labour unions should represent society. The importance of collective bargaining was stressed.
6. The relationship between the lack of basic municipal services and the poor quality of childcare in slums was discussed. Some important points that were presented at the session included the fact that there is very little data on underprivileged children; that childcare in slums is complicated by the lack of health services, food security, poor water, sanitation and shelter; and that both the government schemes that pertain to childcare, the ICDS and the RGCS have low coverage amongst several other problems.
7. Discussions on health revolved around how the public health system is weak due to its sub-standard treatment services, shortage of staff and health facilities and shortage of essential drugs.
8. The much debated right to food bill was discussed as being exclusionary as it abolishes the Public Distribution System (PDS) for the urban poor.

**Recommendations:** Some of the recommendations made by panellists and participants are summarized below:

1. An alternative model of growth which emphasizes planning around livelihood focussed urban development must be adopted. There is a need for planning at the grass roots.
2. Slums should be looked at as labour pockets. All labour laws must be implemented to ensure a wage; contractual and casual work must be abolished.
3. The degree of people’s participation in public policy must be increased.
4. Policy must provide for innovative people-built housing and services and to regularise all ‘illegal’ – but affordable and liveable – housing.
5. Universal and equal access to all state-managed welfare services
6. Social audits of all projects must be conducted

**Title**

Whither Urban Renewal? Mukhopadhyay, P. (2006, March 11). Economic and Political Weekly, pp. 879-884.

**Abstract**

The Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission is an ambitious programme to build infrastructure in India’s cities and towns. However, the mission does not sufficiently recognise that the core urban deficit is not the lack of infrastructure but the lack of local self-governance.

**Discussion**

* The JnNURM was launched in keeping with the Common Minimum Programme of UPA I government to create “economically productive, efficient, equitable and responsive cities”. Rapid urbanisation puts pressure on city resources that need to be dealt with and this has traditionally been addressed by policy that attempts to stem migration. The JnNURM is an attempt to help cities gain the fiscal strength to be capable of harnessing the benefits of this growth.
* The JnNURM has been criticised for its adoption of a neoliberal reform trajectory and forcing uniform policy conformity among ULBs through an executive instrument, overriding efforts at different types of decentralisation in various states. A major objection is to the effort to move towards full cost recovery, commercialise urban and civic services, introduce private participation and make land management flexible. However, the problems are not because these will have adverse effects on the poor but because the benefits will not be as envisaged. Without sufficient monitoring and accountability mechanisms, the JnNURM will be used to benefit the private sector.
* There are other more pressing concerns with the JnNURM. The same agency is responsible for monitoring and financing, raising the question of objectivity. Also, the success of the programme lies in having good quality data for planning, but JnNURM does not fund this in the preparatory stage. Yet, CDPs and DPRs are being prepared.
* Having two separate components, one addressing the poor, reflects the old mindset that the rich need infrastructure the poor need amelioration. It makes a misplaced suggestion of the importance of security of tenure but does little to address this problem. It also assigns the same amount of grant to all cities irrespective of population.
* There is no mention of environmental sustainability.

**Conclusion**

* Ideally, governments should allow citizens to decide infrastructure needs on their own. Cities should plan on the basis of data and with a cadre of professional urban managers who would be capable of responding to citizens needs. The role of central and state governments should be to enable ULBs to become strong local governments.
* The electorate should be able to reward or punish the local government for the progress on JnNURM but decisions are taken at the state level. A clear road map is needed to make the mayor, not the chief minister of a state, the head of the city.

**Title**

NURM and the Poor in Globalising Mega Cities Mahadevia, D. (2006, August 6). *Economic and Political Weekly*, pp. 3399-3403.

**Abstract**

The central government’s National Urban Renewal Mission is expected to convert select cities into “world class” urban centres. The submission for basic services that falls under the NURM would benefit the poor only if they have security of tenure and their settlements and dwelling units get connected to these networks. The land question is central to making affordable housing available for the poor. Since the mission does not address this question, how would a city become world class without reaching out to half its population? The mission will instead encourage processes that would displace the poor, rather than include them in the process of city transformation.

**Discussion**

* The NURM would cover 60 cities: seven category A or mega cities, 28 category B or other metro cities and remaining the 25 of the 28 listed in category C as urban agglomerations (UAs) with less than one million population. The rationale for the mission is based on the expectation that overall reforms would lead to high economic growth and to a higher rate of urbanization (40 per cent by 2021). The other stated rationale is to achieve the targets of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in these cities – with five of the eight MDGs on poverty, health and gender equality being addressed.
* The NURM has two submissions: (a) Submission for Urban Infrastructure and Governance (UIG), which will be administered by the ministry of urban development (MUD), and (b) Submission for Basic Services to the Urban Poor (BSUP), which will be administered by the ministry of urban employment and poverty alleviation (MUEPA).
* The NURM will be implemented first, by formulating a city development plan (CDP) indicating policies, programmes and strategies, and financing, followed by the preparation of detailed project reports (DPRs) for the identified projects by urban local bodies (ULBs)/parastatal agencies.
* For mega cities, the central grant contribution would be 35 per cent of the total project cost in case of the UIG submission and would go up to 50 per cent for BSUP submission. For the next two categories of urban centres, the central government grant contribution remains the same for both the submissions. For the BSUP submission the state government’s grant contribution is taken away and the state government, ULBs, parastatals and beneficiary contributions make up the rest of the financial requirements.
* The most contentious part of the NURM is the conditions/prerequisites for accessing central funds. There are a set of mandatory reforms for the ULBs/ parastatals and for the state governments, and there are a set of optional reforms, to be accomplished during the mission period.
* For the urban poor, besides the BSUP submission, two mandatory reforms for the ULBs/parastatals are important; (i) internal earmarking within local bodies’ budgets for basic services to the urban poor; and (ii) provision of basic services to the urban poor including security of tenure at affordable prices, etc.
* The repeal of ULCRA is the first major concern: With its repeal, theoretically there is no other instrument through which affordable land can be made available to the urban poor. The second important concern is that the CDPs are to be framed by consultancy firms, without any public debates, and their documents may not be covered under the RTI.
* Land costs are not to be covered in project costs. City governments will most likely make land available by freeing lands from the slums. Lands would also be required for raising financial resources. Earmarking at least 20-25 per cent of developed land in all housing projects has been suggested as an optional reform and hence, the state and city governments have no tool at their disposal to make lands available for the housing of the urban poor. The land question is central to making affordable housing available to the poor along with other facilitative mechanisms such as microcredit and affordable basic services provision. Since this question is not to be addressed by this mission, how would a city become a “world class city”, without reaching out to half of its population?

**Conclusion**

* The problems that the urban poor are facing in the mega cities of India today, mainly the lack of shelter with a secured land title and access to basic services at affordable costs, do not get addressed by the NURM.
* BSUP submission and other infrastructure projects would benefit the urban poor only if they have security of tenure and their settlements and dwelling units get connected to these networks.
* NURM might well turn out to be a mission for improving a certain type of infrastructure, which is being demanded by the business class and middle class lobbies in the mega and large cities.

**Title**

New Geographies of Power and Injustice in Indian Cities. Bannerjee-Guha, S. (2009, May 30). Neoliberalising the 'Urban': Economic and Political Weekly, pp. 95-107.

**Abstract**

An adequate understanding of the contemporary neoliberal urban process requires a grasp of its politico-economic ideological framework, multi-scalar institutional forms, diverse socio-political links and multiple contradictions. This paper examines the active engagement of neoliberalism that is not only moulding the concept of “urban”, but is simultaneously intensifying unevenness in inter-urban and intra-urban development. It focuses on the National Urban Renewal Mission, the official carrier of neoliberal urbanism, and its various implications. The paper illustrates the process of restructuring in a few cities in different states, most importantly, in Mumbai, the country’s budding “international financial centre”, with a focus on specific “development” projects.

**Discussion**

* The new urban order post 1970s saw the dismantling – deregulation and privatisation – of state-owned and state-provided services, and the role of the state changed to an entrepreneurial one – ostensibly in keeping with the new market-driver global economy.
* At the city-level this ideology of free markets, liberated from state interference in theory takes a coercive form of state intervention to facilitate market rule. It is characterised by increasing constraints in planning and the political capacity of elected municipal governments, privatisation of basic services, withdrawal of the state from urban development, escalating support for public-private partnerships, especially in infrastructure projects, increasing gentrification to expand space for elitist consumption and a growing exposure to global competition reflecting the power of a disciplinary finance regime and a hegemonic cultural framework.
* This framework has made metropolises in the Global South the stage for intense conflicts resulting from the conflicts between the global and local. The homogeneous planning vision for developing “world class cities” has aggravated the contradictions of centrality and dispersal in the existing institutional landscape. The overall character represents a gradual fragmentation of territories, economic decline and displacement of a large majority, increasing socio-spatial inequality and a simultaneous emergence of new/modern activities in specific locales, implying an aggravation of “spaces of difference”.
* Cities were seen as engines of growth and the NURM was launched to help them achieve that potential. It is supposed to help them improve their fiscal strength, but reduces their budgetary allocations and political capacity. Local governments are required to implement CDPs that they have not authored. The repeal of ULCRA has increased the demand for land for speculation, making slums increasingly vulnerable to real estate developers. Proposals for infrastructure projects have been approved and funds released, while those for BSUP have not been released or remain unutilised. The inherent contradiction of the two makes it difficult to reconcile them within the same plan. Housing for the poor are located on the outskirts and vendors are labelled encroachers of public space in order to create slum-free cities.

**Conclusion**

* The concept of “new urbanism” has its central element resting on the alleged shift of capital from the primary circuit of production to the secondary circuit of built environment, precisely a move towards financial manipulations as sources of profit.
* With the changing position of the Indian economy with the introduction of new economic policies and the role of the “urban” therein, thrust was put on private investment in urban development that went against the previous policy of urban decentralisation.
* The focus on large cities fitted the bill of a larger neoliberal world order in which economic changes had huge organisational and spatial implications for cities, characterised by a rescaling of their functions, activities and relations. Forging a link with a wider process of capital accumulation, the global-local nexus in the contemporary urban development praxis under NURM succinctly symbolises a state-supported urban neoliberalism initiated as a market imperative.
* The current entrepreneurial regime in India is all set to revive the competitive position of urban economies through privatisation, de-municipalisation and re-commodification of social and economic life (Leitner 1990) at an unprecedentedly large scale.
* The regional component of the global strategy of the post-Fordist economy operates through fragmentation and distribution of production and services, more importantly, financial services at wider spatial scales in the form of interrelated sub-processes. Several cities, including those in the Global South, are assigned specific roles in the hierarchical system for making the capital accumulation process more efficient.

**Title**

A Glass Half Full? Urban Development (1990s to 2010). Mehta, M. and Dinesh Mehta (2010, June 10). *Economic and Political Weekly,vol xlv no 28*, pp. 20-23.

**Abstract**

The Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission adopted a reform-linked funding approach, the culmination of two decades of active debate and experimentation in the urban development sector. Yet, progress of both fund utilisation and reforms under the programme has been tardy. As a second phase of the mission is planned, the three major themes of importance are decentralisation, especially in the fiscal arena, commercial financing of infrastructure projects, and service delivery to the urban poor.

**Discussion**

1. *Decentralisation*

The 74th CAA assured fixed tenure to democratically elected local governments along with

reservation of seats for women, transfer of several functions to local governments, the establishment of ward committees (WCs), district planning committees (DPCs) and metropolitan planning committees (MPCs), and the constitution of finance commissions to devolve of financial resources. However, many states have not established WCs, DPCs and MPCs, not constituted finance commissions, and many state governments have enacted laws that constrain local governments.

1. *Commercial financing of infrastructure projects*

Since the 1990s, a number of measures have been introduced by the central government to facilitate commercial finance for urban infrastructure including tax exemptions on municipal bonds, setting up a pooled finance development fund (PFDF), viability gap funding to meet the shortfalls in PPPs, and credit assessments of major cities under the JnNURM. However, the JnNURM experience over the past five years suggests that very little commercial/private financing has come to the urban infrastructure sector and only a few PPPs in service provision were successful. There are three possible reasons for this.

* Availability of JnNURM funds to ULBs with highest credit rating may have crowded out commercial borrowing.
* Weak regulatory framework implies poor ability of ULBs to recover operating costs.
* Provision of services is fragmented and ULBs lack the capacity for developing and implementing PPPs that can manage the entire activity cycle.
1. *Service delivery to the urban poor*

Higher investment in urban infrastructure has not translated to improved service delivery. Only recently the central government has instituted service level benchmarks and the central finance commission has recognised these for performance-based grants to ULBs. However, service agencies do not have operational autonomy. Only a few of them have made efforts to provide services to the urban poor, and the focus of the JnNURM has been on constructing houses rather than on the BSUP.

**Conclusion**

Cities have become more, not less, dependent on central and state governments. While the urban reform agenda has moved forward on many counts, a second round of reforms for stronger governance, accountability with operational autonomy and regular performance assessments is needed.

**Title**

**Redefining the Inclusive Urban Agenda in India.** Kundu, D. a. (2011, January 29). Economic & Political Weekly, vol xlvi no 5, pp. 55-63.

**Abstract**

Urban renewal, with a focus on inclusive development of urban centres, is one of the thrust areas in the National Common Minimum Programme and accordingly the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission was launched. This paper analyses the present urban development policies with a focus on coverage at the state and size-class levels, the extent of equity and effectiveness of the programme. It works out the interdependencies of infrastructural investment in the public sector with those of socio-economic indicators. The study shows that only 58% of the urban population has been covered under JnNURM, the coverage being high in the developed states and metropolitan cities. Of the 5,161 towns/cities, 4,207 are yet to be covered. An analysis of the funding pattern clearly brings out the big city bias. The phenomenon of large-scale underutilisation of the funds and inability of the smaller urban local bodies to prepare detailed project reports and generate matching resources can be addressed by making special provisions for unconditional general grants, especially those in the economically backward states. This will certainly help in making the growth process more inclusive, where the urban poor would be partners in the developmental process.

**Discussion**

* The JnNURM aims to encourage reforms and fast-track infrastructure development with a focus on efficiency in urban infrastructure and services delivery mechanism, community participation, and accountability of ULBs towards citizens. The primary objective of the JnNURM is to create economically productive, efficient, equitable and responsive cities. To achieve this objective, it focuses on integrated development of infrastructure services; securing linkages between asset creation and maintenance for long-run project sustainability; accelerating the flow of investment into urban infrastructure services; planned urban development; renewal of inner-city areas and universalisation of urban services to ensure balanced urban development.
* The reform agenda, which is tied to fund disbursal, is often ambiguous. The milestones for the implementation of the reform agenda are easy to monitor as these can be ascertained based on an overview of the legislative changes, administrative orders, etc. However, the indicators reflecting the pro-poor character of CDPs or provision of basic amenities and land to the slum dwellers are quite complicated.
* While the component of the BSUP may be achievable, it is quite ambiguous how the component of security of tenure would be addressed. Also, the proposed scheme for affordable housing through partnership and the scheme for interest subsidy for urban housing which would be dovetailed into the Rajiv Awas Yojana would extend support under JNNURM to states that are willing to assign property rights to people living in slum areas. However, it is to be seen how property rights would be assigned to people occupying slums in prime locations in the metropolitan cities.
* A major criticism voiced with regard to this policy is that some of the reforms are directed towards full cost recovery, introduction of private participation and making land management flexible which would work against the poor. Further, as already mentioned, repeal of the ULCRA, has led to the fear of capture of prime land by the “land mafia”.
* An analysis of the information regarding the projects and schemes launched under the UIG component in different cities reveal that most of these have been designed to increase the total capacity of the basic urban services – water supply, sanitation and sewerage – at the city level. There is no explicit provision to improve the delivery of the facilities in the deficient areas within the cities or improve the access of the poor to these. Given the emphasis on reform, financial efficiency and cost recovery for each of the facilities and promotion of public-private partnership, it is understandable that those who have affordability will corner much of the benefits from this augmented system. This would further increase the spatial disparity within cities.
* States which have received funds under the UIG component have also received funds under the pro-poor component (BSUP and IHSDP), whereas the laggard states have not received funds under either of them. Also, states that received UIG and BSUP funds were those that had high spending on urban development. However, BSUP and IHSDP spending have no relation to the urban poverty level of the state, which raises a question on the efficacy of the policy for meeting the needs of the urban poor.
* A huge gap has come up between the allocation and the spending, exhibiting wide variability. There has been underutilisation of funds meant for urban development by the state governments. On the other hand, the central government has also not passed many DPRs on technical grounds, and has stopped project instalments midway for some projects because the states/ULBs were not able to meet the reform conditionalities.

**Conclusion**

* Only 58% of the urban population has been covered under JNNURM, the coverage being high in the developed states and metropolitan cities. Of the 5,161 towns/cities, 4,207 are yet to be covered under the programme.
* The concern for the small and medium towns and the urban poor is extensively present in the literature. In practice, however, one finds greater bias on improving the efficiency in the functioning of the overall city economy and meeting the infrastructural deficiencies at the macro-level rather than addressing the issues of distributional inadequacy and improving the access of the poor to these.
* The design of the DPRs is such that even the subsidies built into the IHSDP or BSUP, meant for the urban poor, would substantially go to the non-poor.
* The shift of emphasis from the provision of basic amenities for the poor to integrated multi-storied housing projects inevitably brings in real estate developers and enables them to corner a large part of the slum land that is used for commercial purposes. Unfortunately, the number of slum dwellers that would be rehabilitated through government programmes would go up to a couple of millions, far short of the figure of 24.7 million urban EWS housing shortage as estimated by MoHUPA at the beginning of the Eleventh Five-Year Plan.

**Title**

Branded and Renewed? Policies, Politics and Processes of Urban Development in the Reform Era. Mahadevia, D. (2011, July 30). *Economic 56 & Political Weekly, vol xlvI no 31*, pp. 56-64.

**Abstract**

Hidden behind city branding exercises through large projects are acts of land capture and slum demolitions by a predatory local state and crony capitalism. In the policy arena, meanwhile, the urban, and particularly the metropolitan story has been one of deliberate confusion, and fragmentation of policy and implementation. The promise of rapid city transformation has not been met through the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission, which does something for infrastructure and something for housing but all in an uncoordinated project-by-project manner. Neither the infrastructure agenda nor shelter security for all is advanced. The urban reality instead has been one of gradual improvement, with or without these policy and branding initiatives.

**Discussion**

The new millennium has brought a new approach and structural changes in the way urban development has been pursued in India. This article presents different facets of these changes in policies, politics and processes. This paper identifies five parallel strands in these urban processes – elitist visions of cities, irreconcilable agendas of infrastructure development and poverty alleviation creating a situation of deliberate policy confusion, brutal displacements in the decade of 2000-10 and in the last few years, rehabilitation of those displaced, a predatory state and gradual transformation of the cities, regardless of the above processes.

1. Visions for cities exclude the poor Metropolitan areas are being envisioned as modern, state of the art spaces, with very little space for the urban poor and migrants. Governments are imposing cut-off dates for recognising residents and eligible for basic services.
2. The urban reform agenda is being implemented on two parallel tracks – urban infrastructure implemented by the MoUD and basic services for the urban poor implemented by the MoHUPA. Single-minded pursuit of an infrastructure agenda causes unacknowledged displacements and poverty. Similarly the fact that addressing the needs of the urban poor can lead to improvement in overall living conditions is also not acknowledged.
3. The strong apprehension that JnNURM would lead to exclusion of the poor and capture of urban space by urban elite has come to pass with greater bias on improving the efficiency in the functioning of the overall city economy and meeting the infrastructural deficiencies at the macro-level rather than addressing the issues of distributional inadequacy and improving the access of the poor to these. The poor find space in CDPs as beneficiaries or objects of change and thereby at the mercy of the official stakeholders, experts and the urban local body (ULB) officials.
4. State governments have focused more on the mission cities than the smaller ones, with more proposals coming for UIG than UIDSSMT. However, more of the latter have been approved with a higher proportion of funds being released to UIDSSMT. Cities aspiring to be world class are spending more on road infrastructure while other on water and sanitation. Within BSUP, there are few proposals for slum upgradation and markets for street vendors. Only a few cities have demonstrated the willingness to rehabilitate slum dwellers within the city.
5. Cities’ ability to absorb JnNURM funds is constrained by their and state government capacity to match central government funds. Cities also lack the capability to implement projects, and many were unable to attract private contractors to bid for tenders. Cities also lack the capacity to develop DPRs. Thus, they are unable to meet many reforms and are unable to access central assistance.
6. There are many accounts that the funds available are inadequate to meet the infrastructure deficit. JnNURM II is laying the ground for more private participation. RAY is being implemented in recognition of BSUP’s limited success. However, the question of property rights to slum dwellers remains open.

**Conclusion**

Despite the extremely limited success of JnNURM, Indian cities have been slow to change. Yet, the clamour for tall claims and loud declarations for urban growth can be understood as making space for individual interests to benefit from economic growth. The evidence for this can be seen in innumerable land scams and legislations favouring land speculation. Land grabs have occurred through private corporations acquiring land in the name of economic growth and state-created SEZs. Rampant slum demolition and relocation of several thousand households on the peripheries of cities, while the land has been used for green spaces or temples has been well documented. Despite the vision of rapid urban transformation, cities are improving incrementally, with improvements for the urban poor lagging behind that for the remaining population. This is largely because of the lack of tenure security in non-notified slums and the concentration of the poor in non-metropolitan cities which lack the capacity to provide basic services.

**Title**

Urban Development and Metro Governance. Sivaramakrishnan, K. (2011 , July 30). *Economic & Political Weekly, vol xlvi no 31*, pp. 49-55.

**Abstract**

While the outcomes of the Lok Sabha and the state assembly elections have been well documented and analysed, little is known about the electoral geography in urban areas. In discussing the conflicting interests of local politics and urban development, this article places the definition and understanding of what is “urban” in the context of the 74th constitutional amendment, and also looks at the expectations from and the progress on the reforms agenda of the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission. Further, the article addresses the high economic stakes and challenges involved in metro governance, while arguing that these cannot be dealt with under the general rubric of Union-State- Municipality. International experience is relevant in this regard not for the structural models followed, but because unlike in India, the subject of urban governance in most cities around the world has been a matter of serious debate and action.

**Discussion**

* There are no quantitative criteria for classifying urban and rural areas. Instead, what is used is density, economic importance, employment, etc. Rural areas are notified based on land records and urban areas are those that are not rural.
* Elected representatives are elected every 5 years and seats are reserved for OBCs and women by rotation. However, this makes it difficult for local leadership to grown. Also, the benefits to vulnerable communities have not been estimated. Voter turnout in urban is much lower than that in rural areas. While this could be attributed to electoral constituencies having not been re-drawn to account for increased population, it is also indicative of the lack of interest of residents in urban governance.
* Urban elected representatives have very little authority and state governments are reluctant to devolve any real power. Urban areas are under-represented in almost all state assemblies, largely because, despite high urbanisation, delimitation has used local bodies as the building blocks for drawing boundaries. Local elections often reflect the agenda of the political parties in the state governments, with state political agenda crowding out local political agenda.
* JnNURM was intended to be a performance-linked reform plan but eventually two additional criteria were included: states with higher urban populations and better performance got more funds. ULBs were supposed to be central to the planning of the NURM projects but their involvement has been marginal in reality. They were also supposed to head an accountability platform which would oversee parastatals and other service providers, but this has not been constituted in any city.
* Development of metropolitan areas is being shaped by the idea of “world class cities” but in a manner that violates the spirit and intent of the 74th CAA. State governments have not created DPCs and MPCs, and instead have created administrative agencies overseen by civil servants who are accountable to the state government. There has been negligible debate on instituting an appropriate governance structure incorporating the different political interests. India is yet to learn from international experiences of large metropolitan areas like New York, Seoul, Toronto, London and Sao Paolo, among others.

**Title**

# **Summary, City Development Plan Initiative Investment Program Review and Institutional Development Support, Chennai – 2009, Prepared by Cities Development Alliance**

**Objective**

A review of the City Development Plan in Chennai was conducted in 2009. It was deemed necessary for many reasons: no stakeholder participation, project prioritization and justification was weak, and institutional needs and the informal sector were not adequately addressed. Also, the CDP only considered funding available under the JnNURM and missed many other potential sources.

**Key Discussion Points**

* The Chennai Metropolitan Authority (CMA) must move beyond ad hoc development and replace it with a comprehensive and integrated approach.
* Both formal and informal economic activity must be supported through planning and infrastructure development
* Institutional capacities must be built for successful and sustainable planning, implementation and management.
* Planning must consider the whole CMA area and influences around, and investment must be targeted not just to the CUA and selected growth points within the CMA. Investment seems low in the fringes of the CUA which has the highest growth rate in the area.
* Large investment gaps in the JnNURM are seen in the sectors of water supply, traffic and transportation and sanitation, despite these being the sectors with the highest investments in Chennai so far.
* Other potential sources to tap into for funding to address gaps can include internal accrual of implementing agencies, state governments’ budgetary support, financial institutions and commercial borrowing.
* Capacity building is also necessary for elected representatives, senior officials engaged in planning, implementation and management, staff engaged in delivery of services and NGOs and CBOs involved in participatory governance.

**Conclusions**

* Guidance can be obtained from public participation by engaging a cross section of the society
* A macro level planning framework needs to be formulated
* Socio economic realities must be responded to by means of the CDP.

**Title**

# **HALF TIME OR TIME OUT: Citizens’ Review of the JnNURM**

**Objective**

The Hazards Centre conducted a National Seminar in Delhi in Jun 2008, where concerned groups from 17 cities discussed the progress and developments of the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JnNURM). It was decided at the seminar that a collective report will be prepared on the actual implications of the Mission. A “Citizens’ Review” was also to be performed by as many groups as possible. This was to coincide with the need for a mid-term review to be conducted by the Government, 3 years since the inception of the JnNURM.

**Key Findings and discussion points**

* Of the CDPs from across cities that have information on slums and basic services, it is evident that slum dwellers are a significant proportion of the population (according to census 2001, which underestimates slum populations), and penetration of basic services for the urban poor is very limited across cities. There is no in-depth information on this, however.
* An examination of the CDPs across cities also reveals that water availability is scarce in most cities, and sewerage system coverage is also low.
* It is significant that most CDPs, except perhaps that of Jaipur, provide very little or no information on private investments in the city, and the possibility of PPP in the delivery of services or infrastructure.
* In most cities, budget for BSUP projects is a very small percentage of the budget for UIG projects. The exceptions to this are Varanasi, where the BSUP budget is 121% of the UIG budget, and Allahabad, where the BSUP budget is 80% of the UIG budget in the city.
* Most cities across the board have been ambiguous about reforms that have been implemented in the city
* Comparison of CDPs and submitted DPRs from cities reveals that often there is no link or comparison possible between the projects submitted under the CDP and those for which DPRs have been submitted, indicating a mismatch or change in priorities. Progress reports and specific details about projects are also unavailable in many cities.
* Media reports suggest that as of the year this report was published in 2009, only 10% of the money sanctioned for the JnNURM has been utilized. The most number of projects sanctioned are to do with water supply related works. Evictions seem to be taking place without resettlement, and the participation law has not been put in place.
* Citizens’ reviews suggest that there is very little information and accountability on the mission, and that the role of citizens is selected consultation instead of participatory democracy. City plans have nothing to do with people’s needs and requirements, especially wrt work and livelihoods.
* Norms and benchmarks are favourable to privatization without a space for appeal against decisions taken by bureaucrats and corporations.
* Land use is being changed to favour corporate interests and a new “city” for the poor is created outside the inner city, and the vacated land is being used for commercial purposes.

**Resolutions**

* A clear definition of the “primary participants” must be laid down, who must be prioritized for urban renewal
* Collecting data must be done by the government, and not passed on to consultants.
* The needs of the vulnerable population must be the focus of the scheme, not funding
* Community organizations and urban planners must be allowed to monitor and review progress on the schemes.
* Public participation must be prioritized through the implementation of the 74th Constitutional Amendment of the Constitution, and not in an ad hoc manner.

**Title**

# **Summary of National Consultation on the JnNURM and Rajiv Awas Yojana Delhi People’s Alliance**

**Abstract**

In response to pressure from the people for a National Consultation on the JnNURM and the Rajiv Awas Yojana (RAY), the mission directorate had announced a consultation with the people in January 2011. However, since even after a year since the announcement the consultation had not been held, the Delhi People’s Alliance organized one on their own. The meeting was attended by Joint Secretary of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation Aruna Sundararajan, academicians and representatives of groups from Mission cities across the country.

**Key Discussion Points**

* Ms. Sundararajan emphasized the lack of housing stock, and the lack of proper services and maintenance in existing housing. The poor in reality, occupy a very small percentage of urban land (In Mumbai, for instance, 60% of the population lives on 5-6% of the city’s land). Around 157 cities have been selected for the implementation of RAY, which aims to address the urban poor housing issues, but states do not seem to be willing. However, the private sector has stepped in to build houses for street vendors, etc. at Rs. 2-2.5 lakhs.
* RAY does not take about Right to Shelter, only about “Slum free cities”, and only addresses slums. There is no mention of informal sector workers, migrants, the homeless, etc. There is also no inclusiveness: of tenants, those without ID cards, etc.
* No assessment of the capability of private players has been taken up, to address the problems faced by the poor in the recommended PPP model. Private parties, operating with profit motive, have increases costs while quality, access and employment have taken a backseat.
* The lack of public participation at the planning stage of RAY, despite the guidelines recommending it, was emphasized on by all the people attending the consultation.
* In Mumbai, the problem of a 1995 cut-off date was highlighted: only 35-40% of hutments ended up being eligible for schemes.
* In Bhubaneshwar, people are protesting against the tenements provided, since they are unable to keep their livestock there. Roadside vendors are demanding legal identity and legal space near the roads for their livelihoods
* In Delhi, some measures such as permanent and temporary night shelters have been recently provided for the poor, but there have not been permanent solutions for the homelessness problem, with over 1.5 lakh people continuing to live on the streets.
* There needs to be an understanding of what is informal, illegal and eligible. These distinctions must be challenged under RAY.
* Multi-storeyed tenements as alternative housing do not allow incremental building.
* Until resettlement is carried out properly, there should be no further demolitions.
* There is money available under RAY for information dissemination and consultation, and the money must be used to hold consultations. As of now, there is acute lack of information and accountability.
* Director of the Ministry of urban Development Prem Narayan pointed to some of the problems pointed out by Grant Thornton in its appraisal of the JnNURM: lack of holistic approach in CDP preparation, ambiguities in the role of the ULBs and parastatal bodies.
* The need for making municipalities stronger and for implementing land reforms was stressed upon.
* The privatization of transport and solid waste management in Delhi and Hyderabad respectively, has been detrimental to the people. There has been a lack of public involvement in these decisions.

**Resolutions**

* All work on RAY must cease until a comprehensive social audit of the Basic Services for the Urban Poor (BSUP) component of the JnNURM, assures that RAY is an improvement over the JnNURM
* Similarly, the second phase of JnNURM must not be launched. The assessment of the JnNURM I by Grant Thornton must be made public
* Social audits must be conducted of the Mission as public hearings held in the open, and not with select individuals and groups.
* The attendees of the consultation do not agree with Grant Thornton’s findings or the expert committee’s recommendations which underestimate the failings of the mission, and do not recommend enough.
* The Ministry of Finance and the Planning Commission must scrutinize spending under the Mission so far, and not release further funds until detailed audits are conducted and made public. A grievance window for the people when consultations do not take place.
* More independent reviews of the Mission in various cities will be conducted.