

## Inclusive Development of Urban Infrastructure in India

*A. K. Gupta\* and A. K. Singh\*\**

### ABSTRACT

*Inclusive urban planning and development is gaining momentum in the context of economic liberalization, globalization and new policy regime. The 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan has emphasized on inclusive policies, programmes and schemes for mainstreaming and empowering weaker sections of the society particularly urban poor, marginalized and women. Government of India under the JnNURM and its omnibus schemes has also provided massive investment for urban infrastructure development and delivery of municipal services. Many pro-poor policies and programmes have been initiated by the Central and state governments besides the provision of urban reforms for strengthening urban local governments to improve their functioning and thus bettering basic services to the urban poor. The present paper purports to assess the impact of inclusive urban infrastructure development on the status of urban poor and excluded communities. The paper is based on a major research study conducted under the auspices of Indian Council for Social Sciences Research, New Delhi, in selected cities of West Bengal and Uttar Pradesh.*

### Introduction

Urbanization is considered as positive indicator for overall development of the nation, however, India's urban development is un planned and un sustainable which creates several problems. According to an estimate, the urban population of the country is likely to increase by 590 million, constituting about 40 per cent of total population by the year 2030. In the post-reform era, there has been increasing recognition that the urban development policy framework be inclusive of the people residing in the slums and informal settlements. This has led to be a more enabling approach to the delivery of basic services accessible to the poor, through a more effective mobilization of community resources and skills to complement public resource allocations. The implementation of various Central Government schemes provided a wide range of services to the urban poor including slum dwellers. However, implementation of these programmes suffered from

---

\* Additional Director, Regional Centre for Urban and Environmental Studies, Lucknow.

\*\* Assistant Director, Regional Centre for Urban and Environmental Studies, Lucknow.

narrowly sectoral and fragmented approach; low quality of inputs with marginal impacts; wider dispersal of limited resources over a large area, rather than focusing a concentration of integrated area intensive efforts, inadequate participation of community in the planning and designing of innovative solutions; and multiplicity of agencies after working at cross purposes leading to a dissipation of efforts.

The concept of inclusive city is derived from the idea that the city belongs to all its inhabitants. The Human Development Report (UNDP, 2000) characterizes human rights into seven core freedoms: freedom from discrimination for equality; freedom from want for a decent standard of living; freedom for the realization of one's human potential; freedom from fear with no threats to personal security; freedom from injustice; freedom of participation; expression and association; and freedom from decent work without exploitation. These human rights have to be realized within the society and the quality of urban governance is imperative to ensure the realization of these rights. Inclusive urban governance reduces inequality and social tension; incorporates the knowledge, productivity, social and physical capital of the poor and disadvantaged in the city development. It also increases local ownership of development processes and programmes.

Exclusion, as a result of physical, social or economic barriers, prevents certain groups from participating fully in urban life and services, and failure of local authorities to integrate such groups in their decision making is often a function of inertia along with bureaucratic and unresponsive forms of government. Ethnicity, gender and religion are factors that contribute towards exclusion, along with self exclusion of the urban elites who live in their own little universe in isolation and away from the rest of the city. Development induced displacement also causes exclusion and marginalization of population to the greater extent even in the cities. The infrastructure development projects and redevelopment of urban centres cause displacement and eviction of slum dwellers while urban centres attract migration of persons from rural areas due to their magnetic economic potential. The migrated persons coming from rural and semi-urban areas do not find proper place to stay and live in unhygienic environment due to their low level of purchasing power and affordability. Thus, they are forced to live in vulnerable and unhygienic environment. This causes marginalization, vulnerability, isolation and exclusion of a significant proportion of urban population.

The argument for inclusive development includes (i) there is consensus that investment in infrastructure is an essential ingredients for growth, (ii) if infrastructure is to contribute to inclusive growth, policy will have to focus on certain types of infrastructure, (iii) the focus of investment on infrastructure targeted towards inclusive development will have to be complimented by

policies which improve utilization of the infrastructure by disadvantaged growth. Inclusive growth is necessary for sustainable development and equitable distribution of wealth and prosperity. The experiences of last half a century of planned development in the country show that the benefits of economic growth have not percolated to the grassroots level. It is therefore, the decision makers have now felt that economic growth in the country has to be inclusive in order to make it sustainable. If policies that bring about economic growth do not benefit the people in a wide and inclusive manner, they will not be sustainable. Equally, inclusive growth is essential to grow the market size, which alone will sustain growth momentum and also will help build supply side with competitive cost. Above all, inclusive growth is the only just and equitable way that any society can grow.

In tune with Approach Paper for the 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan which adopted “Inclusive Growth” as the key term for the country, the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Govt. of India initiated an agenda for developing “Inclusive cities”. This agency is being supported by the NSUP project. The project envisages to provide technical support in this regard which will cover the areas of: (i) inclusive urban and regional planning systems; (ii) inclusive urban infrastructure; (iii) integration of informal sector into the formal urban economies; (iv) affordable land and housing to the poor; (v) inclusive city development process for developing infrastructure and services; (vi) inclusive social development and convergence of programmes; (vii) financial inclusion of urban poor through access to credit, microfinance, etc.; and (viii) capacity building and skill development of urban poor to cater the needs of emerging markets.

The 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan emphasized on inclusive growth and development of the cities. In order to achieve the targeted goals, Government of India has introduced the new policies and programmes such as National Policy on Urban Street Vendors, National Housing Policy, and National Urban Livelihood Mission. . Government has launched Rajeev Awas Yojana for the inclusive and in-situ development of slums in the cities for providing affordable housing to urban poor. In the year 2005, the Government of India launched JnNURM and its omnibus schemes of UIDSSMT and IHSDP with massive central assistance for improving urban infrastructure and governance in cities and towns. These schemes are inclusive in nature and emphasize on strengthening urban local governments through resource mobilization, improving the delivery of public services and developing urban infrastructure, besides development and empowering the urban poor. These schemes are reforms oriented which aim to strengthening the urban local governments and achieving inclusive urban development over a period of time (Singh, 2014).

However, inclusive urban development in India is not an easy task. The growing urban population, mushrooming of slum pockets, migration of people from rural and semi-urban areas due to socio-economic factors, and limited scope of economic opportunities in rural and semi-urban areas, there is increasing stress on urban infrastructure and services. Though policies, programmes and schemes initiated by Central and State Governments as well as international donor agencies are aiming at achieving inclusive growth and development, the path of inclusive growth is tardy. The 12<sup>th</sup> Plan has focused on inclusive governance. In view of the Eleventh Plan Vision of Inclusive Growth, and Faster Inclusive Growth by XII Plan, it is imperative to study the status of inclusive urban development and suggesting the policy package for addressing the emerging issues and challenges of inclusive urban development in the country.

### **Objectives and Methods**

The paper has been prepared with the following main objectives:

- To assess the impact of urban inclusive policies, programmes and schemes on the status of urban poor and excluded communities in selected states of India;
- To examine the challenges, problems and constraints in achieving inclusive urban development and empowering poor;
- To suggest policy measures and road map for inclusive growth and development of urban India.

The present paper is based on a major research study conducted under auspices of Indian Council for Social Science Research, New Delhi. The study is empirical in nature and based mainly on primary data collected through field survey in Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, covering the cities of Lucknow, Moradabad, Varanasi, Asansole, Durgapur and Siliguri . The study has covered urban slum dwellers, urban poor who have been benefited under various inclusive programmes and schemes. We selected 900 urban poor including slum dwellers and 200 concerned officials in all the selected cities. The field survey was conducted with the help of structured interview schedules.

### **Inclusive Urban Development**

The Human Development Report (UNDP, 2000) characterizes human rights into seven core freedoms: freedom from discrimination-for equality; freedom from want-for a decent standard of living; freedom for the realization of one's human potential; freedom from fear-with no threats to personal security;

freedom from injustice; freedom of participation; expression and association; and freedom from decent work-without exploitation. These human rights have to be realized within the society and the quality of urban governance is imperative to ensure the realization of these rights. Inclusive urban governance reduces inequality and social tension; incorporates the knowledge, productivity, social and physical capital of the poor and disadvantaged in the city development. It also increases local ownership of development processes and programmes (Verma and Gill, 2008).

Exclusion, as a result of physical, social or economic barriers, prevent certain groups from participating fully in urban life and services, and failure of local authorities to integrate such groups in their decision making is often a function of inertia along with bureaucratic and unresponsive forms of government. Ethnicity, gender and religion are also factors that contribute towards exclusion, along with self exclusion of the urban elite who live in their own little universe cut off from the rest of the city (Verma and Gill, 2008). Development induced displacement also causes exclusion and marginalization of population to the greater extent even in the cities. The infrastructure development projects and redevelopment of urban centres cause displacement and eviction of slum dwellers while urban centres attract migration of persons from rural areas due to their magnetic economic potential. The migrated persons coming from rural and semi-urban areas do not find proper place to stay and live in hygienic environment due to their low level of purchasing power and affordability. Thus, they are forced to live in vulnerable and unhygienic environment. This causes marginalization, vulnerability, isolation and exclusion of a significant proportion of urban population.

The argument for inclusive development include (i) there is consensus that investment in infrastructure is an essential ingredients for growth, (ii) if infrastructure is to contribute to inclusive growth, policy will have to focus on certain types of infrastructure, (iii) the focus of investment on infrastructure targeted towards inclusive development will have to be complimented by policies which improve utilization of the infrastructure by disadvantaged growth (Rauniyar, 2010).

The concept of inclusiveness involves four attributes:

- Opportunity:** Is the economy generating more and varied ways for people to earn a living and increase their incomes over time?
- Capability:** Is the economy providing the means for people to create or enhance their capabilities in order to exploit available opportunities?

**Access:** Is the economy providing the means to bring opportunities and capabilities together?

**Security:** Is the economy providing the means for people to protect themselves against a temporary or permanent loss of livelihood?

Consistent with this, 'inclusive growth' is a process, in which, economic growth, measured by a sustained expansion in GDP, contributes to an enlargement of the scale and scope of all four dimensions. India's recent growth performance has been spectacular; the country remains one of the fastest growing economies in the world. But these achievements have created new challenges. The India Development Policy Review, 2006 titled "Inclusive Growth and Service Delivery: Building on India's Success" focuses on two major challenges facing the country today: improving the delivery of core public services, and maintaining rapid growth while spreading the benefits of this growth more widely.

It is essential for India's rapidly growing economy to improve the delivery of core public services such as healthcare, education, power and water supply to all its citizens. This means empowering its people to demand better services through reforms that create more effective systems of public sector accountability. Options include decentralizing to local governments, producing regular and reliable information for citizens, undertaking internal reforms of public sector agencies, or creating public-private partnerships. But ultimately, implementation is everything. Maintaining rapid growth will require more, and more effective, investments in infrastructure to create more jobs for low and semi-skilled workers. Growth should more equally be shared by all, as many parts of the country remain poor. Promoting inclusive growth includes revamping labor regulations, improving agricultural technology and infrastructure, helping lagging states and regions catch up, and empowering the poor through proactive policies that help them to take part in the market on fair and equitable terms.

### **Inclusive Infrastructure Development**

Every infrastructure project entails physical development, as well as development of financial mechanisms and management structures to ensure quality service delivery. Few infrastructure projects are implemented perfectly; most are not even perfectly conceived. But experience shows that the better conceived and developed a project is, the greater the likelihood that the project will have successful outcomes. While each infrastructure project has unique challenges, inputs, and outputs, most can benefit from the standardized approaches. Experience clearly demonstrates that applying principles shown below leads to better development outcomes.

1. **Sustainability:** The sustainability of municipal services has physical, financial, and social dimensions. Infrastructure must be maintained in good working condition over the long term, and operated in safe working conditions. The services provided should not only contribute to public health, but also improve the environment and preserve natural resources. And tariffs have to avoid creating unacceptable financial risks for the institutions that deliver the services, while still ensuring affordability for users.
2. **Social Inclusion:** Service providers should pay special attention to providing public services to segments of society that are normally excluded, such as the poor, migrants, lower castes, or tribal people, because they systematically have greater difficulty accessing regular services. Infrastructure should be planned to serve all, and to accommodate diverse situations of income, education, and use.
3. **City-Wide Expansion Consistent with Urban Growth:** Infrastructure investment should reflect current development patterns and future goals. City-wide provision of services requires that new infrastructure be developed as cities grow, while simultaneously addressing gaps in already established areas. A comprehensive approach must accommodate slum communities, high density development, economic activities, and the urban periphery, while preserving traditional urban neighborhoods.
4. **Transparency:** Without regular data collection and disclosure, it is difficult to monitor and then improve upon institutional performance. Internally, managers can make good decisions only if they are presented with good information. External support (from government or donors or investors) can be effective when the performance of services is clearly understood. Only when this information is disclosed and communicated effectively can citizens fairly hold leaders accountable.
5. **User Participation:** Stakeholders should help define service requirements and have a voice in prioritizing infrastructure projects that will deliver these services. The best way to understand and plan for these needs and desires is to consult with diverse groups of residents, business leaders, local government leaders, civic organizations, and technical experts. Participation contributes to better-conceived projects and facilitates resolution of the inevitable conflicts that arise in every complex infrastructure project.
6. **Market Orientation:** To be commercially viable or “bankable,” the public service has to sustain itself financially over the long term. This

means that costs should be covered by tariffs and explicit subsidies, and that revenue, costs, and management practices are predictable and transparent to investors. When services are not commercially viable, a blend of financial resources from government grants, tariffs, and/or general revenues can achieve the same service objectives. In this way, grants and donor funding can leverage rather than crowd out long-term private investment.

7. **Institutional Capacity:** Effective organizations with well-defined areas of responsibility are needed to provide city-wide, sustainable, and inclusive public services. These organizations must: (1) establish clear plans and rules for service provision; (2) regulate and monitor service quality; (3) coordinate infrastructure project development (either directly or indirectly through the private sector); and (4) deliver services efficiently and equitably. Within this mandate, institutions must be managed professionally, open to public scrutiny, and accountable to their customers.
8. **Local Empowerment:** The 74th Constitution Amendment Act's (1992) decentralization goal is for local self-governments (also known as urban local bodies [ULBs]) to gain the fiscal powers and functional responsibility needed to provide effective public services. Strengthening the authority of elected leaders builds public accountability for service provision and urban management at the local level, where everyday issues can be addressed more adequately.
9. **Public-Private Collaboration:** The roles of the private and public sectors are changing in India to encourage greater efficiencies and better services. Development activities can be allocated to the partner who is best positioned and skilled to address the specific infrastructure service challenge. Local government may directly implement a project or act as facilitator for private sector delivery. The public sector can improve development outcomes by concentrating on core public roles, such as environmental monitoring and social advocacy, and by creating the conditions that allow others to deliver services.
10. **Clear Policy Signals:** The central and state governments' policy framework sends signals to local governments that affect behaviour and create incentives to provide quality local public services. Critical factors include providing the means for local governments to work with the private sector, having a clear division of labour among levels of government to prevent fragmentation, and structuring the fiscal framework to support local fiscal autonomy.



While India has experienced rapid socio-economic changes and urban growth during the last several decades, urban infrastructure has not kept pace. Urban infrastructure development has been uneven and incapable of serving all citizens. Infrastructure investment and service expansion are required to reach the goal of making Indian cities productive and healthy places to live and work. This goal can only be accomplished through a continual process of improving the planning, managing, financing, and governing of cities which are complex, with diverse and challenging issues, compounded by dense populations. It is necessary to consider how multiple sectors interrelate and affect one another. Special consideration has to be taken so that policy in one sector does not contradict policy in another. Overlapping policies can cause bottlenecks and can undermine development processes. Unfortunately, there are times when government policy acts as a disincentive for development. In contrast, good policy establishes incentives for improving services.

The key municipal areas requiring policy reform have been articulated in the Model Municipal Law (2003) prepared by the Ministry of Urban Development. The far-ranging content in the Model Municipal Law evolved during many years of work across the country to improve local service conditions. Before the Model Municipal Law, urban policy had not been very conducive to improving infrastructure services because it discouraged private sector investment, professional urban management practices, and even expansion of the customer and fiscal bases – all of which are now considered essential aspects to developing quality services. Policies set the parameters or enabling conditions for delivering infrastructure services. They define how various government agencies, infrastructure services (development, operations, and maintenance), and civil society, including the private sector, community groups, and urban residents, all interact with one another. Ideally, the collective sum of these interactions should be effective, efficient, and sustainable services for all residents. One policy objective may seek to protect water resources so that they are safe to use now and sustainable for future generations. Policy would need to balance environmental and public health concerns with economic development imperatives, issues that are often perceived to be at odds with one another. However, these potentially conflicting perspectives are not necessarily contradictory if policy makers have a long-term and holistic development perspective in mind.

Another policy challenge is enforcement. It is very difficult, for example, to prevent encroachment on vacant or underutilized land when cities are growing rapidly and people need places to live and work. There is probably not much value in maintaining vacant land in the middle of a city unless it has a dedicated purpose and active management, like a public park, or

provides a natural buffer for an environmentally sensitive area, like a river. Illegal encroachment can be confronted through policies that encourage, not discourage, development based on market demands (all population segments). It is recognized in India today that policy should encourage private sector activity to supplement government's limited capacity, and even to lead in many aspects of development. In contrast, restrictive regulations and enforcement efforts should be limited to the most sensitive areas, like safety and environmental protection.

While city populations are growing, and new financial resources and innovative business opportunities have expanded, government capacity to manage urban spaces remains limited. It is limited for a variety of reasons, including fragmented institutions where management authority is spread out over many agencies at the local, state, and central levels. This causes inefficiency and, at times, confusion. The democratic institutions at the city level are still very underdeveloped: Limited accountability and transparency undermine effective governance and management. The professional capacity of staff and the organizational setup of urban local bodies (ULBs) also need updating to effectively confront the challenges that cities face today.

Private sector collaboration can help improve government performance, particularly in fulfilling its development mandate. With an economy many avenues for private sector participation exist in the country. Information technology solutions can improve government efficiency and transparency, service outsourcing can enhance technical skills, and private sector financing brings many new resources to projects, to name a few examples. The benefits of public-private partnerships are not limited to resources and capacity. Collaboration also generates a better understanding of the needs and demands of urban residents, many of whom are normally excluded from the formal sector. By including marginalized segments of society like slum dwellers, migrants, and lower castes into policy frameworks, cities can develop in a more comprehensive way. By providing socio-economic opportunities to everyone, cities will be more productive places to live. It is necessary to evolve a framework that is firmly rooted in the Indian context and subscribes to the basic tenets of the Indian Constitution. There are five fundamental aspects that underpin the 'governance assessment framework':

*'Governance' by itself is a neutral term while 'Good Governance' implies positive attributes and values associated with the quality of governance. Most measurement frameworks tend to measure how good the quality of governance is without actually deconstructing governance into its various elements. Hence, most frameworks apply generic principles in assessing quality of governance while the content of governance remains largely unexamined. The fundamental limitation of such an approach is that it does not lead to actionable diagnostics that can be identified and related to specific*

*country institutions. The quality of governance has been the focus of governments and multi lateral / donor agencies across the world. This has led to many of them defining qualitative standards of governance in the form of characteristics or principles that 'governance' ought to reflect for it to be good or ideal. Some of the basic governance principles or attributes include Accountability – both horizontal and vertical, Transparency, Equity, Performance (effectiveness and efficiency), Participation /voice, Rule of Law, Strategic vision, Lack of arbitrariness, Ethics and integrity, Predictability.*

Globalization, economic liberalization and privatization in the Indian economy, polity and society have also affected the governance in India. The efforts for decentralization resulted into the enforcement of 74<sup>th</sup> Constitution Amendment Act in 1992. The Act envisaged decentralization of powers, functions and finances on one hand and created opportunity for the weaker sections of society for their enhanced role in democratic decentralized governance. In 2005, Government of India also introduced Model Municipal Act which envisaged the integration of municipal laws for the municipal corporation and municipalities. The Act also incorporated the provisions of community participation law and public disclosure law in order to ensure inclusive urban development and making the governance more accountable and transparent. During 2005, Government of India introduced JNNURM for the selected cities with a huge financial investment for the infrastructure development and improving the governance in cities. The Mission was launched in 65 selected cities however, the subsidiary schemes of the Mission – UIDSSMT and IHSDP were also launched in other cities for infrastructure development and improving services for urban poor including creation of housing. The Mission aimed at strengthening of the urban local governments and parastatal agencies besides improving the governance. The JNNURM was launched in December, 2005 for a period of 7 years with an outlay of Rs. 66085 crores. The objectives of the scheme included empowerment of urban local bodies, planned and holistic development of cities and making them inclusive. The scheme mandated preparation of City Development Plans and a set of urban reforms at state and municipal levels.

Reforms aimed at decentralization, equity, transparency, efficiency, accountability, participation, sustainability and relate to – land and buildings, citizen centricity, finance, poverty, governance and administration. The reforms have long-term impact on the urban local governments. However, a large number of states and urban local governments failed to achieve the desired targets in implementing these reforms. The physical and financial progress under JnNURM has been shown in Table 1. JnNURM renewed the focus on urban renewal and gave impetus to many urban reforms. Central allocation of Rs. 66085 crore led to overall commitment of investment of Rs. 123711 crore under the scheme.

**Table 1**  
**Physical and Financial Progress under JnNURM**

<i>Particulars</i>	<i>UIG</i>	<i>UIDSSMT</i>	<i>BSUP</i>	<i>IHSDP</i>	<i>Total</i>
7 Years Allocation (In Rs. Crore)	31500	11400	16357	6828	66085
Number of Projects Sanctioned	559	808	528	1078	2973
Total Cost of Project (In Rs. Crore)	67275	14039	30416	11981	123711
Total ACA Committed (In Rs. Crore)	30971	11372	15092	7704	65139
Total ACA Released (In Rs. Crore)	18479	8469	8642	4905	40495
Per Cent of ACA Released to ACA Sanctioned	60	74	57	64	62
Number of DU Approved in Lakh (BSUP and HISDP)	—	—	10.3	5.7	16.0
Number of Projects Completed (UIG and UIDSSMT)	127	142	—	—	269
Number of Dwelling Units Completed (In Lakh) (BSUP and IHSDP)	—	—	4.4	1.8	6.2

*Source:* 12th Five Year Plan, 2013.

Urban water supply, sanitation and storm water drainage were recorded priority under the 11<sup>th</sup> Plan. At present, a large number of projects are under various stages of implementation. JnNURM has led to a significant step in investment in urban sector. However, urban sector continues to suffer from low level of service delivery, structural problems, grossly inadequate availability of resources and lack of capacity at different levels of government (12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, 2013). Under JnNURM, 546 projects for infrastructure and governance were sanctioned and most of the projects were reported from the states of Maharashtra, Gujarat West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh. The cost of sanctioned projects was also reported significantly high in these states.

There have been marked variations in the number of sanctioned dwelling units and completed dwelling units for the urban poor under the housing schemes across the states in India. The proportion of completed dwelling units against sanctioned units has been reported significantly high in Tripura (81 per cent), Karnataka (78 per cent), Andhra Pradesh (71 per cent), Gujarat (68 per cent), Haryana (60 per cent), Kerala (60 per cent) and West Bengal (58 per cent). It was found low in the states of Himachal Pradesh (3 per cent), Bihar (6 per cent), Jharkhand (6 per cent) and Arunachal Pradesh (8 per cent). Rajiv Awas Yojana was launched by Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India to make the cities slum free. The scheme envisaged for improving the housing conditions in tenable slums and creation of social and civic infrastructure for the slum dwellers. In the first stage of scheme, 55 projects with the financial investment of Rs. 2479 crores were sanctioned in 16 states. Most of the projects were found sanctioned in the state of Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Orissa, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh and

Haryana. The Central share released under these projects was reported to Rs. 1165 crores. For making India slum free, a pilot phase Rajiv Awas Yojana was launched in 2011. The scheme has a progressive architecture which includes in-situ rehabilitation of slums and legislation to provide property rights to slum dwellers mainly in favour of women. Under the Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme, 2.1 lakh dry latrines have been converted into sanitary toilets and about 1.55 lakh new toilets have been sanctioned. The Twelfth Five year Plan has proposed new centrally sponsored scheme of National Urban Livelihood Mission having two additional components viz. scheme for support to street vendors, and scheme for assistance to the states for provision of shelters. The NULM will be launched in phased manner in a mission mode approach.

Per capita annual spending by Central Government under JNNURM and UIDSSMT was reported to be Rs. 165.15 at the national level. This was found more pronouncing in Sikkim followed by Nagaland, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Andhra Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Maharashtra and Tripura. However, annual per capita spending on pro-poor schemes was reported only 52.30 at the national level and it was found more pronouncing in Nagaland, Sikkim, Mizoram, Meghalaya, West Bengal and Tripura.

Swaran Jayanti Shahri Rojgar Yojana has been designed to enable urban poor to get gainful employment. Under the scheme, 4036 towns have been covered and an assistance of Rs. 4814 crore has been released. Since 1997, about 27.38 lakh persons have been imparted training under the scheme (Table 2).

**Table 2**  
**Performance of SJSRY in India**

1. Total number of towns covered under SJSRY	4036
2. Central fund allocation for 2012-2013, to States/UTs (Rs. in crores)	814.59
3. Central funds released during 2012-2013, to States/UTs (Rs. in crores) (as on 14-03- 2013)	675.62
<b>Cumulative details (since 1997-98)</b>	
4. Total Central funds released to the State/UT under SJSRY since 1997-1998 (including opening balance) (Rs. in crore)	4814.39
5. Total Central funds spent by the State/UT under SJSRY (Rs. in crore)	4358.76
6. Total Central funds unspent available with the State/UT under SJSRY (Rs. in crore)	455.63
7. Total number of urban poor assisted to set up Micro-enterprises	12,76,257
8. Total number of Women Self-help groups formed	1,37,419
9. Total number of women beneficiaries assisted under Women Self-help Groups for setting up of Micro-enterprises	6,29,605
10. Total number of urban poor imparted skill training	27,37,983
11. Total number of Thrift & Credit Societies formed	6,27,373
12. Total number of mandays of work generated under wage employment (in Lakhs)	843.63

Source: Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India, New Delhi, 2013.

Physical and financial performance under Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme is shown in Table 3. Under the scheme, about 4 lakh units were sanctioned and out of the sanctioned units, 2.52 lakh units were sanctioned for convergence of dry toilets and 1.56 lakh units were construction units. The total central share sanctioned was recorded Rs. 340 crores however, only 318 crores were released to the states. Out of total sanctioned units, a large number of units were reported in the state of Uttar Pradesh followed by Maharashtra, Chhattisgarh, Tripura and West Bengal.

**Table 3**  
**Performance of Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme in India**

Sl. No.	Name of the State	No. of Units Sanctioned	Units Sanctioned for		Total Central share (Rs. in crores)	
			Conversion	Construction	Sanctioned	Released
1	Uttar Pradesh	2,38,253	2,38,253	0	202.58	202.58
2	Bihar	12,131	3,545	8,586	9.25	9.25
3	MP	14,281	0	14,281	10.81	10.81
4	West Bengal	14,549	0	14,549	11.09	11.09
5	Uttarakhand	1,613	1,613	0	1.23	1.23
6	Nagaland	5,480	499	4,981	5.18	5.18
7	Kerala	8,239	0	8,239	6.28	2.53
8	Maharashtra	39,663	0	39,663	30.5	28.86
9	J&K	5,897	5,624	273	5.54	5.54
10	Manipur	7,117	0	7,117	6.78	6.78
11	Tripura	25,039	2,429	22,610	23.85	23.85
12	Rajasthan	1,039	0	1,039	0.79	0.79
13	Odisha	4,690	0	4,690	3.58	3.58
14	Jharkhand	3,891	0	3,891	2.96	0.74
15	Chhattisgarh	26,018	0	26,018	19.83	4.96
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4,07,900</b>	<b>2,51,963</b>	<b>1,55,937</b>	<b>340.25</b>	<b>317.77</b>

Source: Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India, New Delhi, 2013.

National Urban Development Mission is likely to be launched by Government of India in 500 selected cities in India while Swaksh Bharat Mission, National Urban Livelihood Mission, Housing for All, and a scheme for developing 100 Smart Cities in India have already introduced by Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India. During the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, Comprehensive Capacity Building Programme has been introduced for capacity building of the Municipal Personnel in most of the states.

### Research Findings

- Most of the surveyed officials reported that there is inadequacy of municipal services such as sweeping of streets and roads in slum areas,

provision of drinking water facilities and collection of garbage. The officials were found dissatisfied with the arrangements made for water supply and sewerage services in the slum areas.

- Most of the officials reported that the arrangements for welfare of street vendors are inadequate. There are no schemes for welfare and rehabilitation of street vendors and hawkers and the proper demarcation of zones for street vending and hawking has also been ensured. The financial inclusion of urban poor as per view perception of officials has been found unsatisfactory. There is no proper convergence of social sector programmes and schemes.
- Most of the beneficiaries were found living in their own houses. Less than half of the respondents reported that they have been benefited by the housing schemes. This was found more pronouncing in case of JNNURM and IHSDP. The proportion of beneficiaries availing benefits under the housing schemes was reported high in Asansole followed by Durgapur and Siligudi.
- The main family occupation of respondents was reported to be government service, private service and street vending/hawking. The average annual family income has been reported to be less than Rs. 40,000 in majority of the cases.
- A large segment of the respondents reported that their area is affected by water logging, sewer overflow and sewer chocking. However, they were also found dissatisfied with the provision of civic services. They reported that the cleaning of streets and roads is occasionally done and similarly the collection of garbage from the slum areas is on alternate days and occasionally.
- The satisfaction with the sanitation services in terms of cleaning of public toilets, collection of garbage, transportation of garbage, maintenance of sewerage, cleaning of drainage and sweeping of roads and streets has been found to be very low.
- The participation of urban poor and marginalized has been reported significantly high in case of SJSRY followed by JNNURM and rehabilitation of street vendors. However, only a small proportion of respondents reported that they are members of SHGs. More than half of the respondents reported that they have availed skill training for livelihood development.
- Majority of the respondents reported that there is no initiation of new programmes for infrastructure development in slum areas. They were of the view that the selection of beneficiaries under government programmes

and schemes is also not transparent and proper. They further reported that there are no serious efforts for improving basic services to urban poor. Similarly, most of the respondents were of the view that the employment opportunities for urban poor are not adequate. However, about 2/3<sup>rd</sup> respondents were found satisfied with the government interventions for livelihood development for the poor.

### **Suggestions**

- Effective implementation of governance reforms is imperative to ensure inclusive growth and development. The governance of public services needs further improvement in delivery mechanism.
- In order to give displaced people their due rights, it is necessary to frame a policy that address proper compensation, resettlement and rehabilitation and also give project affected persons a permanent stake in project benefits.
- Corporate social responsibility should be further encouraged within the suitable framework of governance of pro-poor programmes and welfare oriented initiatives along with proactive approach of government.
- Inclusive development requires multi-pronged approaches and strategies as it has several dimensions. 'People first' in governance of development programmes, and schemes and hence, policy formulation is imperative in the present context.
- More social and economic opportunities need to be created for identifying and mainstreaming the disadvantaged sections of society and also their empowerment.
- Capacity of socially excluded communities need be improved through training, capacity building and by providing opportunities to acquire hands-on-skills. The issues of capacity building may be well addressed under National Skill Development Mission.
- The access to developmental programmes and schemes meant for disadvantaged and weaker communities can be increased through a change in societal mindset, political will and bureaucratic commitment towards social inclusion.
- Structural rigidities and inequalities must be removed effectively and infrastructural bottlenecks need to be addressed properly to pass the benefits of economic prosperity to people at the bottom at the pyramid.
- Gender budgeting needs to be further promoted for gender mainstreaming, addressing the gender concerns and issues. Women's due



share should be ensured in mega schemes and must be oriented towards inclusiveness.

- Micro-finance infrastructure to be developed and promoted through adopting a suitable policy perspective, delivery mechanism and proactive approach of financial institutions including Micro Finance Institutions (MFIs). The access of banking services needs to be further improved in order to ensure financial inclusion.
- The issue of corruption in governance of the development programmes, schemes and projects may be effectively addressed through e-governance technology adoption besides adhering to strict norms of transparency and accountability.
- Public Private Partnership should not be confined only to partnership of government and private sector but it should also include business houses, civil society, and community-based-organizations.
- Skills are essential to improve productivity, incomes, and access to employment opportunities. Thus, poverty reduction strategy should focus on vocational education and training since vast majority people living in poverty cannot afford and have access to training opportunities, which are commercially managed. International Labour Organization has invested in the field of employment intensive infrastructure programmes. It has now widely recognized that these programmes are effective in bringing much needed income to poor families and their communities.
- Financial investment in jobs and employment may create additional opportunities to poor youth. The labour intensive projects should respect standards, promote gender equality and encourage enterprise development through contracting systems. The entrepreneurship development may promote income generating enterprises and livelihood development. This will also promote self-employment among educated unemployed youth. Interestingly, it is impossible to build an enterprise without access to credit. Micro-finance activities should be promoted, strengthened and encouraged along with entrepreneurship for enabling poor to borrow for productive purposes.
- The state government should setup Urban Poverty and Slum Improvement Task Force. This task force may be allowed to give direction and control of the functioning of Urban Poverty Alleviation programme including JnNURM and IHSDP. The state government may also set up a separate Mission for the effective functioning of JnNURM, IHSDP and UIDSSMT.

- Micro insurance should be promoted with the view of providing social security to the urban poor. Social insurance system needs to be supplemented with social assistance programme to provide for needs of those unable to contribute regularly. Support to various forms of micro insurance schemes and local mutual health organizations by the government and international agencies are imperative to supplement the development and promotion of micro finance activities.
- There is an imperative need to bridge the gap between infrastructure and services. Improving financial and environmental sustainability, promoting public-private partnership, mobilizing resources, institutional building, supporting behavioral change toward sanitation practices, and affordability of sanitation services are the key issues that need to be addressed.

### *References*

- Government of India (2013), 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, Planning Commission, New Delhi.
- Rauniyar G. and Kanbur R. (2010), *Inclusive Growth and Inclusive Development: A Review and Synthesis of Asian Development Bank Literature*, ADB, Manilay, December.
- United Nations Development Programme (2000), *Women's Political Participation and Good Governance: 21st Century Challenges*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.
- Verma S. & Gill H. S. (2008), *Polyinclusive Strategies For The Development of Cities*, paper presented for 24 EGOS Colloquium Upsetting Organisations, July 10-12, at Vrije University, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- Singh, A. K. (2014), *Inclusive Urban Development: A Study of Pro-Poor Initiatives in Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal*, Project Report, ICSSR, New Delhi.