URBAN POVERTY IN INDIA AND POST-MDG FRAMEWORK

DARSHINI MAHADEVIA

ऑक्सफैम इंडिया

OXFAM

India

ABSTRACT

Post-2015, when the deadline of the United Nation's Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) end, the world has to give itself a new development agenda to address continuing conditions of poverty and inequality. Some countries have missed their targets and some have met theirs. The goals and targets set were limited. There was no rural-urban differentiation in either identifying goals and targets or benchmarks for the targets. For example, reduction in slum living was made to be important only in case of urban areas and not for the rural areas. Hence, while the world moves on to the post-MDG framework, there is a need to set up a new agenda post-2015, which should aim at more process oriented and transformative outcomes. There is also need to take on board existing inequalities, particularly among the different communities in a country and also between rural and urban areas. Even urban areas have become highly unequal and the dimensions and dynamics of urban inequalities should reflect on the post-MDG urban agenda. This paper presents the facts on urban inequalities in the context of the targets 10 and 11 of the Goal 7 of the MDGs and reflects on the processes through which the agenda of these targets can be met in the future. The context is India, which is a socially diverse country, wherein, some social groups, namely, the Dalits, the Tribals, the Muslims and women, have lagged behind in all the MDG indicators (Dubochet 2013). These groups have also lagged behind in the targets 10 and 11 of the Goal 7 in the urban context and are experiencing higher incidence of poverty than the general urban population. The paper suggests that shelter security should be the basis for transformative and equitable post-MDG agenda in urban India. The paper also gives the rationale for this suggestion and shows that urban policies and programmes have not adequately addressed the question of shelter security in the country. Lastly, the paper suggests that the post-MDG framework should be built on the 'Right to the City' agenda for India.

The author: Darshini Mahadevia

Darshini Mahadevia is Professor and Dean at the Faculty of Planning and Public Policy. Since 2009, she coordinates the Centre for Urban Equity, which also functions as a National Resource Centre for the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India. She holds a PhD from Centre for Studies in Regional Development, School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

Professor Mahadevia has authored numerous books and articles on urban development policies, including housing policy, urban poverty and human and gender development. She has collaborated with many universities and has been a visiting fellow in several universities including the University of California, McGill University in Montreal; Tsinghua University in Beijing; and the Tianjin University of Business and Economics. She is also Member of the Advisory Board of Global Research Network on Human Settlements (HS-Net), 2011-13, of the UN Habitat.

Published by: **Oxfam India**

CONTENTS

1. CONTEXT

Post-2015, when the deadline of the United Nation's Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) end, the world has to give itself a new development agenda to address continuing conditions of poverty and inequality. Some countries have missed their targets and some have met theirs. However, the goals and targets set were limited. There was no rural-urban differentiation in either identifying goals and targets, neither any benchmarks set. For example, reduction in slum living was given importance only in the case of urban areas and not rural areas. Hence, it would be prudent to take these limitations into account while the world moves on to the post-MDG framework—and the new agenda should aim at more process oriented and transformative outcomes. There is also need to take on board existing inequalities, particularly among the different communities in India, as also between rural and urban areas. It is also important to bear in mind that urban areas have become highly unequal and this should reflect on the post-MDG urban agenda.

This paper presents facts on urban inequalities in the context of certain targets and reflects on the processes through which the agenda of these targets can be met in the future. It focuses on the targets that pertain to improving access to safe drinking water and sanitation, and improving the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by 2020. In technical terms, these issues have been categorised under targets 10 and 11 of the Goal 7 of the MDGs.

According to UN Habitat's State of the World Cities, 2012 (UNHABITAT 2012: 127), 32.7 per cent of developing countries' population lives in slums. This is equivalent to 863 million people. UNHABITAT projects 1.5 billion population to be living in the slums in the developing countries by 2020[1]. The 100 million people target therefore works out to be only about 7 per cent of the projected slum population.

While urbanization is the future of this world, much of it is to happen in Central and South Asia and Africa, wherein informality and slum formation is the paradigm of urbanization. Among the Asian countries, South Asia still has low level of urbanization; about 32.4 per cent of the population live in urban areas (UNHABITAT 2012: 126), and 35 per cent of them live in slums (about 200 million) (UNHABITAT 2012: 127). Besides, the MDG Goal 7, Target 11, will also not cover all the slum dwellers of this region. In India, of the total urban population of 377 million in 2011[2], 93 million people lived in slums (National Building Organisation 2010: 22), which was 24.7 per cent of the total urban population or 19.8 million households. But, with increase in level of urbanization, the challenge of slums will only increase. These staggering numbers indicate that there will be a significant agenda remaining post-2015, in many countries, including India.

This paper focuses on India, with very large social diversity in population and social groups—dalits, muslims, tribals and women—left behind the national averages in social indicators (Dubochet 2013) inspite of forces of change and high economic growth in the decade of 2000-2010. They have lagged behind in all the MDG

---

[1] Source: http://ww2.unhabitat.org/programmes/guo/documents/Table4.pdf, (accessed on November 26, 2012).
[2] Population Census, 2011, from Population Census website.

indicators, including in the targets 10 and 11 of the Goal 7 in the urban context and are experiencing higher incidence of poverty than general urban population.

The paper suggests that shelter security should form the basis for transformative and equitable post-MDG agenda in urban India. The paper also gives the rationale for this suggestion and shows that urban policies and programmes have not adequately addressed the question of shelter security in the country. The contents of this paper are a discussion of poverty in urban India with disaggregated perspective of vulnerable social groups in section 2, followed by a disaggregated picture of urban India with regard to living conditions of urban population in section 3. The disaggregation is followed by identification of different vulnerable groups, namely, the Below Poverty Line (BPL) households who form the bottom 30 per cent of the urban population, the Scheduled Castes (SCs), the Scheduled Tribes (STs), the Other Backward Castes (OBCs) and the Muslims[3]. An additional dimension of vulnerability has been considered for this paper, which includes population living in the non-metros, who, according to a recent study by Mahadevia and Sarkar (2012), are worse off than the population living in metros.

The analysis here is constrained by availability of data. The author has reprocessed the 2008-09 housing data for analysis presented in section 3. Section 4 establishes linkages of Goal 7 with social development indicators, in particular with education and health and gender equity. Section 5 attempts to analyse whether the existing urban housing programmes in India would be able to address the aspects covered under Targets 10 and 11 of Goal 7 for urban poor in general and the other vulnerable groups in particular. The last section presents the post-MDG framework for Oxfam and other development organisations' work in India, indicating whether the current approach to MDGs should remain or should there be new development goals set up to address the issues of poverty and vulnerability in a comprehensive manner.

---

[3] Muslims have been added to the category of vulnerable population as per the findings of the Sachar Committee. For discussion on MDGs and Muslims of India see Fazal (2013).

2. POVERTY IN URBAN INDIA

In 2011, 377 million or 31.7 per cent of the country's population lived in urban areas[4]. By any account, this would be considered low level[5] of urbanization. Further, even the urbanization rate[6] of India of 2.81 per cent per annum during 2001-11 period is low given that the country experienced high economic growth in the same period. Generally, economic growth leads to migration and therefore urbanization. However, natural population increase contributed between 51 per cent and 65 per cent of the urban population growth during 1961-2001 period (Sivaramakrishnan et al 2005: 13), a trend that did not change in 2001-11. **Urban poverty therefore is intrinsic to the urban development paradigm and not because of poor migrants coming into the city, an argument often given by the most developed states such as Gujarat and Maharashtra.** In contrast, in China urbanization is driven by migration inspite of limitations imposed by the *Hukou* system—a household registration record to control the movement of people from rural to urban areas.

Hostile urban policy is among the reasons that often work as a deterrent for people to migrate to cities**.** It results in their lack of access to secure shelter and basic services. Consequently, a section of low-income rural migrants tend to live as seasonal or temporary migrants, who do not settle down and become part of the cities. Hence, these are potential urban residents who are not absorbed within the urban system, even with the latent demand for rural to urban mobility to come out of poverty. It is only the better-off among the rural population that is able to migrate, as per the analyses of the National Sample Survey data done by Kundu and Sarangi (2007). Hence, migration has not been an important mechanism of escaping poverty in the rural areas of India. Despite this, a significant proportion of urban population continues to live below the poverty line (BPL).

The poverty line in India represents people who are unable to meet the minimum calorie requirement. It is lower than the World Bank's poverty line of US$1.25 per capita per day. In urban India, 20.8 per cent or 78.4 million people[7] lived below the poverty line in 2009-10, according to the Planning Commission (Planning Commission 2012). This group is represented as a Head Count Ratio (HCR), which indicates the proportion of the population living below the poverty line.

Urban poor comprises heterogeneous groups, with varied characteristics and there are equally varied causal factors at play. Some urban households remain poor because they do not have access to employment and some others fall below the poverty line when urban economy is restructured. Urban economy restructuring is very strongly tied to the global economy whose fluctuations, many a times unforeseen, affect the urban populations. Some remain poor because they do not have secure shelter and some fall below the poverty line if their shelter is demolished due to an eviction drive in a city, which is now becoming a regular feature of at least the metropolitan cities in India.

---

[4] As per the population census of India. Source: http://www.censusindia.gov.in/2011-prov-results/paper2/data_files/india/paper2_at_a_glance.pdf (accessed on February 28, 2013).
[5] Urbanization level refers to per cent population living in urban areas within a country.
[6] Rate of urban population growth rate.
[7] This estimate is based on the Poverty Line defined as Monthly Per Capita Expenditure (MPCE) of Rs. 859.6 for urban India as a whole (Planning Commission 2012).

Some urban households remain poor because they do not have access to education opportunities and children of some households discontinue education because their shelters have been demolished or they have been thrown to the city's periphery in a resettlement site. Those who manage to migrate live in abysmal conditions, at low wages, with no possibility of accessing urban citizenship or social protection, consequently finding it hard to come out of poverty (Mahadevia 2013). Some urban households fall below the poverty line also because of ill health and very high costs of primary healthcare in the cities resulting from lack of public healthcare facilities. Besides, dense living, poor water and sanitation facilities and very high air pollution levels lead to vector-borne, water borne and air-borne diseases. Thus, policy responses need to take on board these diverse causes of vulnerability and poverty.

The poverty incidence though is not uniform across different social groups. The Scheduled Tribes (ST), which form 3.3 per cent of the urban population, that is 12.4 million people, had an HCR of 28.6 per cent (see: Table 1) in 2009-10[8], which is higher than the average for all urban population. And, STs comprise about 8 per cent of the national population. Clearly, their proportion in the urban areas is much lower, indicating that this social group is even excluded from the process of urbanization.

This is not the case with the Scheduled Castes (SCs), which form 14.4 per cent of the urban population, very close to the national proportion. The SCs have been part of the industrialization process in India, migrating to the cities to work in the early industries. The total population of the SCs in urban India is 54.3 million. They had a much higher HCR of 32.8 per cent in 2009-10, compared to the overall urban population. Incidence of poverty among the SCs is higher than that of the STs in the urban areas. This might be on account of the small sample of the STs in the database.

Muslims, who comprise 13.2 per cent of the total population in the urban areas—49.8 million people—have the highest incidence of poverty among the social groups presented in Table 1. A little less than 35 per cent of the Muslims in cities live below the poverty line. This social differentiation in poverty incidence has been observed in all the three years of data presented in the Table 1.

Even the rate of change of HCR is uneven across different social groups. While in the entire urban area, the average rate of decline of HCR in the past five years (2004-05 to 2009-10) is 3.9 per cent per annum, it is the lowest (3.9 per cent) for the Muslims. The SCs experienced the same rate of HCR decline as the whole urban population in this period.

Poverty incidences vary across different social groups because of the different average monthly per capita Expenditure (MPCE). For 2009-10, it was 70 per cent of the average urban for the SCs, 73 per cent for the Muslims and 89 per cent for the STs.

TABLE 1: INCIDENCE OF POVERTY AND AVERAGE PER CAPITA EXPENDITURE, URBA

Poverty	ST	SC	Muslims	All Urban
HCR (1993-94)	50.2	48.3	45.0	32.8
HCR (2004-05)	34.2	40.9	40.6	25.8
HCR (2009-10)	28.6	32.8	34.3	20.8
MPCE (2004-05)	736.9	643.7	658.9	895.6
MPCE (2009-10)	919.8	724.8	757.1	1029.9
Rate of decline in HCR (2004-05 to 2009-10)	-3.3	-3.9	-3.1	-3.9
CAGR MPCE (1993-94 to 2004-05)	1.8	1.4	1.5	1.9
CAGR MPCE (2004-05 to 2009-10)	5.0	2.5	3.0	3.0

HCR = Head Count Ratio, MPCE = Monthly Per Capita Expenditure
CAGR = Compound Annual Growth Rate
Source: Thorat and Dubey (2012).

---

[8] 2009-10 is the latest consumption estimate data from which the HCRs have been calculated.

3. GOAL 7 TARGETS' ACHIEVEMENTS BY SOCIAL GROUPS

This section details the targets of Goal 7 to be achieved by 2015, examines the situation in the early 1990s, the period when the MDGs were framed, and presents data on overall progress in the urban areas with regard to the targets. Simultaneously, progress in the achievements of the targets has been decomposed by the vulnerable social groups, whose list has been presented in the earlier section. Gender disaggregated data is not available and hence in the following section, linkage of Goal 7 targets and gender have been drawn.

The targets for Goal 7, discussed in this paper are:

i)   Halving the proportion of households without access to safe drinking water, from 34 per cent in 1990 to 17 per cent in 2015 (Central Statistical Organisation 2011: 21).

ii)   Halving the proportion of households without access to sanitation facilities, from 76 per cent in 1990 to 38 per cent in 2015. The India Country Report on MDGs achievements, 2011 (Central Statistical Organisation 2011: 21), states that this target would be missed. In 2015, 43 per cent of the households are expected to be without access to sanitation. The report states that the target for urban population without sanitation was 12.14 per cent but what would be achieved is 11.64 per cent (Central Statistical Organisation 2011: 22).

iii) Target 11 is significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum population globally, which is only 8.6 per cent of the slum population. In real terms, this would mean bringing out about 8.6 per cent of the slum households into improved housing. There is no target set for the country.

3.1 TARGET 10

Water Supply

The water supply target was to reduce by half the proportion of households that do not have access to safe drinking water. Tap water is the measure for safe drinking water. In the past half decade, many urban households, particularly in the higher expenditure classes, have begun to drink bottled water. These households are also included to calculate the total proportion of households having access to safe drinking water. In 2008-09, 77 per cent of the total urban households had access to safe drinking water (Table 2), up from 70.5 per cent in 1993 (Mahadevia and Sarkar 2012: Table A5.2). In 1993 therefore, 29.5 per cent urban households did not have access to safe drinking water, which reduced to 23 per cent in 2008-09. This proportion should have been halved to 14.75 per cent by 2008-09. However, there remains a possibility of improvement by 2015.

Social differentiation also exists with regard to no access to safe drinking water. The BPL households—those in the bottom 30 per cent of the consumption expenditure class—are among the highest proportion

(37 per cent) among all the social classes of households that lack access to safe drinking water. Muslims follow—at 31 per cent. All other social groups had higher access than the urban average. Also, a very large proportion, 53 per cent of all urban, 68.7 per cent among the BPL households and 68.1 per cent and 66.5 per cent of SC and ST households respectively shared the drinking water source. Thus, although, there is progress in safe drinking water coverage, there exist lacunae among certain social groups. Those below the poverty line and the Muslims face higher deprivation than the general urban population.

In Table 2, a differentiation between metro and non-metro cities is made. This is because, as Mahadevia and Sarkar (2012) have observed, the progress with regard to achievements in various urban services has been faster in the metros (cities with more than a million people) than in the non-metros, where 70 per cent of the urban population lives. Hence, for monitoring the progress of the MDGs in urban areas, it becomes essential to make this differentiation. In 1993, 34 per cent of the households in the non-metros did not have access to safe drinking water (Mahadevia and Sarkar 2012: Table A5.2). This came down to 26.8 per cent in 2008-09 (Table 2), which is still high. Compared to that, just 15 per cent of the metro households did not have access to safe drinking water in 1993, which marginally reduced to 12.3 per cent in 2008-09. Thus, progress in the metros has stagnated whereas it is slow in the non-metros and this can be ascribed to the inability of the metro cities to reach out to the population living in the slums and squatter settlements and also fresh migrants to the cities.

Sanitation

Target 10 also includes indicator on sanitation coverage. Sanitation comprises access to toilets, bath and drainage facilities, and garbage collection by the local authorities. It appears that the MDGs are monitoring only the target of access to toilets, which is not enough, particularly in the urban context. Given the population density in urban areas, the sewerage generated in toilets and baths have to be transported away for disposal and this requires sewerage networks. Hence, the sanitation target has to be divided into different sub-targets for monitoring of the MDGs.

In 2008-09, 11.3 per cent urban population did not have access to toilets (Table 2). This proportion was 30.6 per cent in 1993 (Mahadevia and Sarkar 2012: Table A5.16). If the proportion had to be halved by 2015, this target has been achieved. But, there are two groups that still lag behind in access to toilets; Muslim households (59.1 per cent did not have access) and BPL households (54.2 per cent did not have access; Table 2). The proportion of households without access to toilets among the SCs and the STs is nearly double that of the total urban population.

TABLE 2: WATER AND SANITATION INDICATORS BY SOCIAL GROUPS, URBAN INDIA, 2008-09 (% HOUSEHOLDS)

Indicator	ST	SC	OBC	Muslims	BPL HHs	Non-metro	Metro	All Urban
As % of total urban HHs	3.3	14.4	37.8	13.2	29.7	74.0	26.0	100.0
Drinking water								
% using bottled water for drinking	3.0	1.1	2.6	1.2	1.3	2.5	3.2	2.7
% using tap water for drinking	68.5	69.8	71.6	67.9	61.8	70.7	84.5	74.3
% not having access to safe drinking water	**28.5**	**29.1**	**25.8**	**30.9**	**36.9**	**26.8**	**12.3**	**23.0**
% households sharing water source	66.5	68.1	58.1	56.6	68.7	55.5	45.7	53.0

Indicator	ST	SC	OBC	Muslims	BPL HHs	Non-metro	Metro	All Urban
% With water supply within premises	67.5	57.3	71.7	71.6	55.5	71.3	83.6	74.5
Sanitation								
% with no access to bath	**27.6**	**37.1**	**23.6**	**27.2**	**40.5**	**21.7**	**20.8**	**21.5**
% with attached bath	53.7	48.1	55.2	55.0	40.1	56.9	73.1	61.2
% HHs with no access to toilet	**21.1**	**22.7**	**14.6**	**59.1**	**54.2**	**14.4**	**2.5**	**11.3**
% HHs with access to individual toilet among those with access	57.0	54.1	64.5	10.9	27.5	67.9	59.5	65.5
% HHs with access to septic tank/ flush toilet	82.7	84.1	86.2	80.8	77.6	84.2	94.4	87.1
% HHs with no access to drainage	**21.5**	**22.3**	**17.6**	**15.2**	**26.2**	**19.0**	**2.9**	**14.8**
% HHs with access to underground & covered drainage	51.2	44.1	52.2	48.6	33.9	48.4	82.7	58.5
% HHs reporting garbage collection by the local government	47.4	54.1	61.2	59.1	50.9	56.7	77.2	62.0

Source: Calculated by the author from individual household schedule of National Sample Survey, 2008-09.
Note: BPL is bottom 30 per cent.

Besides, it is just not enough to have access to any type of toilet. The standards of hygiene are poor in shared toilets compared to household level toilets. Among the households with access to toilets, on the whole, 35.5 per cent households share a toilet in 2008-09 (Table 2). This proportion in 1993 was 41.4 per cent (Mahadevia and Sarkar 2012: Table A5.18). The improvement here is marginal. Among the Muslims, sharing is to the extent of 89 per cent and in the case of BPL households, it is 72.5 per cent. The focus of policies for extension of toilets should be on Muslim neighbourhoods and slums. Sharing toilets is a phenomenon found in the non-metros as well. While in the metros, there is lack of space to construct individual toilets; in non-metros households do not earn enough to construct individual toilets.

The second component of sanitation is access to drainage, more specifically, closed drains. If toilets are not connected to a drainage network, problems of hygiene and sanitation arise at the local level. Nearly 15 per cent households were not connected to any drainage network in 2008-09 (Table 2), which is an improvement from 26.8 per cent in 1993 (Mahadevia and Sarkar 2012: Table 5.12). This means that the proportion of households with no access to drainage has halved in the period and likely to be further improved by 2015.

However, in the non-metros, this figure remains at 19 per cent, among the BPL households at 26 per cent and among the SC and ST households at a little more than 20 per cent. There is therefore considerable progress to be achieved in the non-metros and in specific, the vulnerable social groups. Even if a drainage network is available, it is not covered or it is underground, and these pose severe health hazard. About 40 per cent of the households connected to any drainage had open drains in 2008-09, which is an improvement from 70 per cent in 1993 (Mahadevia and Sarkar 2012: Table 5.14). In the non-metros, 51.6 per cent were still

connected to open drains. This proportion among the BPL households was 76 per cent, among the Muslim households, 51.4 per cent, and among the SC households, 56 per cent. On this aspect too, there is scope for further improvement in the non-metros, more so in the BPL, SC and Muslim households.

The third aspect of sanitation is access to bathing facility. As of 2008-09, a little more than a fifth of the urban households did not have access to a bath, indicating that they were either bathing in the open or in a corner in the house itself. This figure is half of what it used to be in 1993 (Mahadevia and Sarkar 2012: Table A5.10). In the non-metros, however, there is space to create a separate bath unit. But, with regard to this facility as well, the vulnerable groups lag behind—40.5 per cent of BPL households, 37.1 per cent SCs, and 27 per cent ST and Muslim households did not have access to a bath.

Another component of sanitation in urban areas is collection of garbage, which, if ignored can lead to the outbreak of various vector and water borne diseases. Uncollected garbage decays and spreads foul smell; if it is wet it seeps underground and in case water supply lines are old and corroded over time, it mixes with the water supply leading to water-borne diseases. Only 62 per cent of the urban households reported garbage collection by the local government (Table 2). The situation was better for the metros, where 77 per cent reported collection as against 57 per cent in the non-metros. Among the BPL households, only 51 per cent reported collection while among the ST households only 47 per cent reported the same. In 1993, only 14 per cent of the households had reported garbage collection by the local authority (Mahadevia and Sarkar 2012: A5.20). So, there is significant improvement in this aspect.

However, it is crucial that attention is paid to different components of sanitation separately than discuss sanitation coverage in abstraction.

3.2 TARGET 11

Target 11 focuses on improving the lives of slum dwellers. As mentioned earlier, 93 million people (19.8 million households) live in slums (National Building Organisation 2010: 22), which is 24.7 per cent of the total urban population. According to another estimate, by the National Sample Survey Organisation for 2008-09, 10.8 per cent of the urban population, which is 40.7 million people, live in slums and squatter settlements (Table 3). In 2001, this proportion was 26.3 per cent (National Building Organisation 2010: 20) or 75.3 million people (16 million households). In 1993, as per the NSSO's 49th Round, 15.3 per cent of the urban households were living in slums, which is an estimated 35.1 million population[9]. Both the estimates show that the proportion of slum dwelling population and households declined in both 2001-11 period and 1993 to 2008-09 periods. But, the total number of households living in slums has increased. As per the NBO estimates, 19.5 million additional population has begun to live in slums in the 2001-11 period. NSSO data pegs the increase at 5.6 million.

The target of improving living conditions of the slum dwellers has to be seen in the context of incremental housing and gradual improvement in different components of housing. This would mean, this target has to be sub-divided into different programme components, tenure regularisation, extension of basic services in the slums, improvement in housing conditions, such as quality of structure and per capita living space that indicates crowding. It is important to bear this in mind since post-MDGs, monitoring of the living conditions of the urban poor would require disaggregated indicators, which would include not just quantity but also quality of housing and basic services.

---

[9] Estimated by the author by projecting 1991 urban population and applying the NSS proportion of households living in slums.

Housing, as per John FC Turner, is a bundle of services, alluding to incremental improvement made by the slum dwellers in the cities of the developing countries. The paradigm of urban development in the developing countries is informality (Roy 2009) and the urban poor tend to live in the informal housing in the developing countries, including in India. The informality debate is addressed in two ways in shelter policy: (i) formalising the informal sector, by giving land titles to the slum dwellers, as propounded by Hernando de Soto and (ii) ensuring 'no eviction' guarantee at the minimum and ensuring an array of tenure status, from just 'no eviction guarantee' to 'de facto tenure', which is to enhance perception of security to 'de jure tenure' or legal title to land (Payne 2000, Mahadevia 2010, 2011).

It is quite obvious that the urban poor do not get access to any legal space in cities. Instead they begin life in cities by squatting on a vacant land, which is either government land or where squatting is initiated by a private land owner[10]. They may also share a house with their relatives and friends and pay rent. Squatter settlements are allowed because they either enjoy political patronage, or are accepted by the local authority for lack of other housing options. However, such informal settlements expand, thus attracting the local politician's attention. In a bid to expand votebank, electoral cards or voter identity cards are made available to them. The bigger the settlement the higher is its value as a votebank and therefore, lesser the chances of eviction. And, even though the housing is illegal, their identity cards carry a photograph and residential address. The ID card helps them get a ration card, which carries the names of all the members of the household.

Political leaders, time and again, take up the cudgels to legalise slum dwellers' settlements. In 1990 for instance, the then Prime Minister of India, Mr. V P Singh, ordered ration cards to be given to all the dwellers of unauthorized slums in Delhi (Batra 2005). In 1989 Singh initiated a comprehensive slum survey to register and legalize all slum dwellers through issuance of tokens (they came to be known as VP Singh tokens) with an address proof. In essence, these tokens extend permanent citizenship to the slum dwellers. Since 1976 though, we do not find any pro-active and extensive exercise of granting citizenship rights to informal settlements in any other Indian city. In 1976, on account of the first UN Habitat Conference in Vancouver, all cities in India were instructed to carry out a slum survey, based on which ID cards were issued to them[11].

Typically, unless a settlement comes in the way of an infrastructure project or is not of any major interest to the land developers, it survives and gets access to basic services. Local governments, if financially sound, which has been the case in the cities of Gujarat, extend basic services such as water supply, sewerage and storm water drains, roads and street lights. Individual households can get electricity connection by themselves. Each such household gets electricity bill, which again carries the address. There is thus a sense of security among these households. This is called de facto tenure security status.

Finally, slum settlements get legal status by acquiring land pattas[12] from the local government. However, this is possible only for slums on government land and where there is a legislation to give pattas[13]. Rights are also obtained by the slum dwellers through their own struggles, as in the case of 2004-05 slum demolitions

---

[10] If the land is to be acquired for public purpose under the city's Master/ Development Plan and in the period of ULCRA as excess land to be notified for acquisition, the land owners sell-off the land parcels in the informal market and there by invite squatting.
[11] Many slum dwellers in Ahmedabad still possess such card. These were presented to the Sabarmati Rehabilitation Monitoring Committee by the Sabarmati Riverfront slum dwellers to prove their eligibility for a rehabilitation unit under the project.
[12] Patta is a right to the land parcel.
[13] For detailed discussion on land pattas and tenure levels, see Mahadevia (2010).

in Mumbai[14], or activities of Housing Rights activists, as in the case of demolitions in Ahmedabad[15], or in the case of infrastructure project funding agency's conditionality, rehabilitation is offered to the project affected person (PAP). Various identity proofs are utilised for establishing eligibility as a PAP.

Most cities have a concept of cut-off date, which is announced from time to time for coverage under different subsidised government programmes. The cut-off dates are largely used for subsidised housing schemes for which eligible households have to be identified. A cut-off date means that the households that can prove their residency in a city before such a date would be considered eligible for the benefits under the scheme. Different cities have different cut-off dates. Those unable to obtain residency proof within the cut-off date period, lose out on accessing subsidised shelter and other welfare programmes.

TABLE 3: HOUSING INDICATORS BY SOCIAL GROUPS, URBAN INDIA, 2008-09 (% HOUSEHOLDS)

Indicator	ST	SC	OBC	Muslims	BPL HHs	Non-metro	Metro	All Urban
Housing availability								
% HHs with no dwelling unit	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
% living in slums	14.3	18.9	7.1	13.0	14.0	7.1	16.6	9.6
% living in squatter settlements	1.2	1.7	1.5	1.1	2.2	1.4	0.8	1.2
Housing structure								
% living in katcha houses	5.0	4.4	2.5	2.2	5.6	2.5	1.0	2.1
% living in pucca houses	83.5	85.1	90.0	90.9	80.5	89.7	97.1	91.7
Congestion/ Crowding								
Average per capita living space (sq m)	10.1	8.0	10.1	8.6	7.0	11.1	11.7	11.2
% HHs with married couple not having a separate room	52.9	52.1	59.0	55.6	54.3	62.0	54.2	59.9
% HHs with separate kitchen	52.2	46.2	61.8	53.2	44.5	63.6	59.8	62.6

Source: Calculated by the author from individual household schedule of National Sample Survey, 2008-09.
Note: BPL is bottom 30 per cent.

Then there is a group that systematically misses out on acquiring any urban residency. This group, called seasonal migrants, comes to the city for a few months, works and goes back to their native places. There are also temporary migrants who move places with their employers, such as those working in construction firms. These two groups are unable to find any foothold in the city and hence are left out of all social protection programmes. Their children do not go to urban schools. They do not hold urban ration cards. They tend to live in squatter settlements with no hope of obtaining any slum residence. The statistics presented in this paper do not cover them. Their estimates are also not known. Hence, this large section of urban migrants is left out of the measurement and monitoring of the MDGs.

---

[14] For details see Mahadevia and Narayanan (2008).
[15] A public hearing on Demolitions in Ahmedabad was held by the Our Inclusive Ahmedabad in December 2009, whose cognizance was taken by the Gujarat High Court while giving a judgment on Sabarmati Riverfront Development affected households. Report of this is available at: http://www.spcept.ac.in/cue.aspx.

The proportion of homeless population in urban India is very small. As per the 12th Five Year Plan Housing Shortage Estimation Committee, the total homeless households in 2012 are 0.53 million (NBO 2012:4). This is because, the households coming to urban areas, no matter how poor they are, can squat and erect a temporary shelter to live. Hence, homelessness does not appear to be an issue. But the quality of the houses they erect is a problem. The data in Table 3 is for all the urban households and not just slum households. The data is from the NSSO's 65th Round conducted in 2008-09. Although the NSSO data gives under-enumeration of slum households in urban India, it can be used for analysing the characteristics of slum households.

On the whole in urban areas, as per NSSO data, 91.7 per cent households live in pucca houses (Table 3). This is an improvement from 73.8 per cent in 1993 (49th Round of NSSO). Among the BPL households, the figure was 80.5 per cent in 2008-09. BPL households living in katcha houses is only 5.6 per cent. The others—a significant proportion of BPL households—live in semi-pucca houses. There is a reduction in overall proportion of households living in katcha houses, from 8.3 per cent in 1993 to 2.1 per cent in 2008-09 (Table 3).

The per capita living space in urban areas was 11.2 sq m in 2008-09, up from 6.6 sq m in 1993 (Table 3)[16]. Hence, on the whole, there is significant improvement in living conditions in urban India between 1993 and 2008-09. However, 60 per cent of the households have married couples who do not have a separate room to themselves. Further, the per capita living space among the BPL households is the lowest, at 7.0 sq m. SCs's is 8.0 sq m, and Muslims, 8.6 sq m.

TABLE 4: STATUS OF HOUSING AND SERVICES IN SLUMS, URBAN INDIA

Indicators of Housing and Services	1993*	2002**	2008-09**
House structure - pucca	31	48	57
- semi-pucca	34	35	29
- katcha	35	18	14
% HHs with access to tap water	65	78	78
% HHs with no access to toilets	54	34	15
% HHs without access to drainage	32	30	17
% HHs with garbage collection by local government	52	61	65

Source:
* NSSO (1997).
** NSSO (2010).

Within slums, there has been significant improvement in housing conditions from 1993 to 2008-09, as per NSSO data (Table 4). The proportion of slum households living in katcha housing units declined from 35 per cent in 1993 to 14 per cent in 2008-09, and hence the proportion of the households living in pucca houses increased from 31 per cent in 1993 to 57 per cent in 2008-09. This improvement has largely been undertaken by the slum dwellers themselves as there have been no major slum development programmes

---

[16] Calculated from the data of the 49th Round of NSS.

implemented in India since 1990. The other indicators of slum housing have also improved in this period as shown by the data in Table 4. These data are, however, not available for disaggregated social groups.

TABLE 5: POPULATION IN SLUMS, SELECT CITIES*

City	Slum Population	SC population in Slums	% population in slums to total population	% SC population in slums to total SC population	% Other population in slums to total other population	Concentration Index of SCs
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Mumbai	6,475,440	385,626	54.1	65.7	53.4	1.2
Kolkata	1,465,309	92,812	32.0	33.8	31.9	1.1
Thane	351,065	23,722	27.8	40.8	27.0	1.5
Surat	508,485	30,112	20.9	34.4	19.6	1.6
Pune	492,179	125,127	20.2	43.5	17.0	2.2
Chennai	819,873	269,301	18.9	44.9	14.7	2.4
Delhi	1,851,231	483,640	18.7	31.0	16.4	1.7
Hyderabad	626,849	89,860	17.2	33.4	15.8	1.9
Jaipur	368,570	90,607	15.9	31.0	13.3	1.9
Kanpur	367,980	84,255	14.4	29.8	12.5	2.1
Vadodara	186,020	20,765	14.2	24.1	13.0	1.7
Ahmedabad	473,662	95,633	13.5	22.5	12.1	1.7
Bangalore	430,501	139,920	10.0	29.3	7.5	2.9

Refers to Municipal Corporation Jurisdiction.

Note: Concentration Index of SCs is calculated by dividing value in column (e) with value in column (d) in the same row.

Source: Data from Census of India (2001).

As per Census, SCs are concentrated in slums in cities (Table 5). Census does not give housing data separately for religious groups and therefore we are unable to do the same for Muslim households. Muslims, as we know already, suffer from poor access to services and shelter conditions. The 2001 census data had given information on SC households living in slums (Table 5). In all the metros the concentration index value for the SCs is more than 1. Higher the value, larger is the proportion of SCs in the slums, compared to the total proportion of SCs in the city.

4. SHELTER SECURITY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT LINKS

The targets of Goal 7 are all linked to the notion of shelter security. Shelter security consists of two aspects, land tenure security or land tenure, and access to water supply and sanitation at the minimum.

Land tenure is defined as the mode in which land is held or owned (Payne 2000) and "rights that individuals and communities have with regard to land, namely the right to occupy, to use, to development, to inherit and to transfer". It is a bundle of rights, with some people enjoying full rights while others only of occupancy, with a minimum guarantee of 'no eviction without appropriate rehabilitation'. Mahadevia (2010 and 2011) calls the full rights as '*de jure*' rights and the occupancy rights as '*de facto*' rights, obtained through various processes discussed in the previous section. The post-MDG framework should start discussing about the rights based on the most fundamental of all rights in the urban areas—'the right to shelter security'.

Primary of the two aspects of shelter security is land tenure security. It is important because it guarantees protection by the state against forced evictions, protects vulnerable households from falling in poverty and brings out households from poverty. Tenure security is "directly linked to urban citizenship, as certainty of tenure can solidify the right of slum dwellers to exist in the city, organise, make claims on public resources, and co-manage settlement improvements with NGOs and public authorities" (Mahadevia 2011: 5).

Durrant-Lasserve and Selod (2007:9) argue that *de facto* tenure "has potential positive impacts on home improvement, children's education, labour-market participation in general and of women in particular, women's empowerment, and small business revenues" (Mahadevia 2011: 5). In South Asian cities, home-based work is important for the poor households on account of increased sub-contracting in the manufacturing sector (as argued by Mahadevia and Sarkar 2012 for India) and for cultural reasons. Hence, tenure security is important for micro and tiny enterprises as well as home-based work and emanating incomes from this sector. In fact, tenure security would enhance household incomes causing bottom-up economic growth and poverty reduction. Tenure security can be one of the important strategies of inclusive growth. It further leads to households investing in permanent housing and water and sanitation provisions. The local governments also tend to extend water and sanitation networks to slums with *de facto* tenure, which have additional benefits.

Legal or *de jure* tenure security has additional benefits. It leads to access to formal mortgage credit and hence increase in small business investments. It can lead to private sector investments in housing and land markets, which can lead to efficient land use systems. However, there is also a counter argument to extending legal land rights. Durrant-Lasserve and Selod (2007) and Mahadevia (2010, 2011) argue that legal land rights can also lead to reducing access to informal land markets, further marginalising the poor and in particular the recent migrants among them who tend to gain a foothold in the urban space through squatting in informal housing.

Theoretically, argues Mahadevia (2011), tenure security is also important for social protection. Barrientos (2010) also argued that social protection offers a framework that fulfils the development agenda in developing countries "because it (i) helps protect basic levels of consumption among those in poverty or in danger of falling into poverty; (ii) facilitates investment in human and other productive assets which alone can provide escape from persistent and intergenerational poverty and (iii) strengthens the agency of those in poverty" (Barrientos 2010: 2, stated in Mahadevia 2011: 5).

There is a view point that the post-MDG framework should focus on transformative agenda. The transformative element refers to the need to pursue policies that relate to power imbalances in society that encourage, create and sustain vulnerabilities (Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler 2004). "Extending even *de facto* tenure, and certainly extending *de jure* tenure, does play a role of reducing power imbalances in urban contexts." (Mahadevia 2011: 5).

Tenure security can be achieved through: (i) shifting the slum dwellers to formal housing, or (ii) extending *de facto* or *de jure land* security. The former has not been very successful (see Mahadevia and Gogoi 2010 for Hyderabad and Mahadevia, Datey and Mishra 2013 for Bhopal). Instead, if *de facto* tenure security is extended through a slum-upgrade programme, it is possible to improve living conditions in the slums. One such programme in Ahmedabad, called Slum Networking Programme (SNP), has been quite successful.

The SNP was a partnership programme between the local government, the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC), a non-governmental organisation (NGO) named Saath, the community and the private sector. Part of the programme funds for the slum came from the private sector, part from the community and rest from AMC. The programme was meant for extending water supply and sanitation network in the slum, paving of roads and introducing waste management system. The AMC also extended a ten-year 'no eviction' guarantee to the slum. It is now more than 10 years since the completion of the project and the slum still stands. On account of the SNP and presence of the NGO, the slum dwellers also perceived a higher sense of tenure security. Mahadevia (2010 and 2011) has termed it *de facto* tenure security. Subsequently, they invested in their dwelling units.

Mahadevia (2011) classifies tenure security into three categories: strong *de facto* tenure, weak *de facto* tenure and insecure tenure, based on field observations in six slums in a ward in Ahmedabad. The findings suggest that the housing conditions, access to basic services, education status, and income and employment improved with improvement in level of tenure security (Table 6). For example, 54 per cent of households in the insecure tenure category lived in *katcha*, or temporary houses, while the proportion in strong *de facto* tenure slums was 32 per cent. Overall, 42 per cent of slum households surveyed lived in katcha housing, indicating a great need to improve housing conditions. Conversely, 42 per cent of households with strong *de facto* tenure and just 24 per cent with insecure tenure had a pucca house.

The availability of basic services also improves with improved tenure status; 90 per cent of households with strong *de facto* tenure had an individual water supply from the AMC, with only 4 per cent depending on common public taps. Conversely, among households in the insecure tenure category, only 19 per cent had individual water taps provided by the AMC, with 52 per cent depending on common public taps. Among the households with access to toilets, 94 per cent of those in the strong *de facto* tenure category and 69 per cent in the insecure tenure category had an individual household toilet.

TABLE 6: OUTCOME INDICATORS BY LEVEL OF TENURE SECURITY, AHMEDABAD

| Indicators | Tenure | | | |
Living conditions	Strong de facto	Weak de facto	Insecure	Average
Housing quality – % katcha houses	32	39	54	42
Housing quality - % pucca houses	42	39	24	35
% households with individual water supply from the AMC	90	29	19	45
% households depending on public taps for water supply	4	18	52	26
% households not having access to a toilet	0	5	2	2
% households having individual toilet for the household	94	86	69	82
% households using community toilets	1	1	18	7
Human development				
% males literate	81	84	72	78
% females literate	58	59	55	57
% male children going to school	72	89	81	81
% female children going to school	69	85	77	79
Economic status				
Average per capita income per month (Rs.)	908	895	744	842
Work participation rate – male	54	50	52	52
Work participation rate – female	27	19	33	27
% males employed as casual labourers	51	58	82	64
% females employed as casual labour	34	41	41	39
% females in private services	53	34	48	47
% households saving	33	17	23	24
Average savings per month (Rs)	231	196	122	198

Source: Mahadevia (2011).

Literacy level too is high in slums with high *de facto* tenure security as compared to slums in the insecure category. The same for quality of employment, which is depicted by the proportion of males and females employed as casual labour. Hence, highly secure slums have higher per capita income and hence higher savings per month as compared to insecure slums.

Conversely, evidences suggest that slum demolitions have reverse impact on social indicators. A survey of slums in Mumbai six months after demolitions in 2004-05 showed that (Narayanan et al 2008):

1. Just 70 per cent of male children (age 6–14) and 60 per cent of female children were going to school.

2. About 19 per cent of males and 37 per cent of females in the 26–59 age group and 65 per cent of males aged 15–25 years were unemployed.

3. One-third of households stated that they had lost work for a period ranging from two to three months and just 8 per cent stated that the demolitions had no impact on their livelihoods.

4. Of those who had stopped working, 67 per cent said it was because of uncertainties caused by the loss of their house and another 20 per cent said it was on account of injuries caused during the demolitions.

5. More than half the working population (60 per cent) had to change their employment after the demolitions as many had moved to squatting on new locations.

6. Nearly 90 per cent of households stated some asset loss.

7. One-third of households lost their livelihood-related equipment and assets.

8. All had moved to temporary shelter from semi-temporary or permanent shelter and were without access to water, sanitation and electricity.

9. Nearly all students had lost schooling days post-demolition and subsequently 22 per cent stopped going to school.

10. Children and the elderly had suffered various degree of trauma in the wake of the demolitions.

11. Some people had died, either due to shock or injuries suffered resisting bulldozers deployed for the demolitions. (Mahadevia and Narayanan 2008).

In Ahmedabad, a study by Shah et al (2009) of those dumped on the city's periphery after their houses had been demolished for various infrastructure projects, found that:

1. The households had lost access to water supply and sanitation, which was available before demolitions.

2. Two thousand households were forced to use 35 dry toilets, and to squat on land which had no drainage facilities.

3. Defecation in the open had increased from 36 per cent before demolition to 60 per cent.

4. The percentage of children going to school had dropped from 87 per cent to 41 per cent. Reasons for dropping out of school were given as no school in the vicinity and the inability to afford transport costs.

5. There was no public healthcare centre and hence half the people had started visiting private practitioners, incurring higher expenditure and sometimes risking their lives by going to quacks.

6. Food expenditure had increased by 20 per cent on account of lack of access to public distribution and fair-price shops; and, in all, poverty was recreated.

The data available indicates that education and health suffer when people are dumped in locations where these services are not available after demolition. Thus, the first casualty of an eviction process is children dropping out of schools). Coming on footpaths without shelter also leads to various adverse health impacts on the weak members of the households such as the children and the elderly. It increases the household's efforts to collect water, impacting on women's time. Women living on footpaths face other difficulties such as defecating and taking bath in the open; they become subject to sexual harassment too. In all, women's living conditions deteriorate. Hence, shelter rights movements find women in the forefront, as we found in the case of Mahila Milans supported by Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centres (SPARC) and Mahila Housing Trust (MHT) of Self Employed Women's Association (SEWA).

Outcome of *de facto* tenure is extension of basic services, especially water and sanitation, to the slums. Sanitation comprises services such as water supply, sewerage networks and garbage management. Each of them collectively and independently impact social development, in particular concerns of education and health and an overarching concern of gender equity. First of all, safe water and sanitation are public

goods as they have very large positive externalities. Lack of safe water and sanitation cause outbreaks of epidemics and Indian cities are affected by this every year. The impact of epidemics on the poor is much larger than on the non-poor for many reasons; firstly epidemics break out in areas where the poor live, their access to safe water and sanitation is far lower than non-poor and they easily succumb to epidemics because of their poor nutritional status. Thus, lack of safe water and sanitation cause health disorders and keep mortality rates high in general, and among the poor in particular.

Lack of storm water drains lead to water logging every monsoon and outbreak of vector diseases such as malaria, dengue, leptospirosis etcetera. The poor tend to stay on lands unfit for habitation such as low-lying areas, where, water inundation is higher and are the worst-affected due to floods, that precede epidemic outbreaks. Lack of drains worsens the situation. Lack of solid waste management leads to outbreaks of numerous diseases and causes clogging of drains that lead to water logging and subsequent problems. Clearly, safe water and sanitation for all urban residents is the key to improving urban health situation, an experience which all developed countries went through before curative medicines were even invented. The epidemiological studies on water supply and sanitation access and disease burden are very few to illustrate the points made.

While access to water supply and sanitation is important for all urban residents, for the poor, it becomes a question of survival. Access to water at their doorstep increases their productive working hours; and for the poor women, by 1.5 to 2 hours. This increases their household incomes, an important determinant of whether a family remains above the poverty line or below the poverty line. Access to water and sanitation has a positive impact on overall health, including reduction in skin diseases. This is crucial since a decline in disease burden reduces household expenditure on health and that itself has positive impact on the income. It is well known that higher incidence of morbidity pushes low-income households below the poverty line.

There are scanty evidences of impacts of provision of water and sanitation within a slum on health and education. Findings from the SNP study establish these links. The point is extension of water and sanitation along with increased tenure security had positive impact on social indicators (Joshi 2002):

1. Total immunisation of children had increased from 62 per cent to 80 per cent (p. 282).

2. There was an increase in institutional delivery from 69 per cent to 81 per cent (p.283).

3. The literacy rate increased from 30 per cent to 34 per cent (p. 285).

4. The proportion of households in the lowest income bracket of per capita income of Rs. 1,000 per month reduced from 57 per cent to 30 per cent and the proportion in the highest per capita income range of Rs. 4,000 per month increased from 2 per cent to 8 per cent (p. 287).

5. There was a decrease in unskilled and casual employment from 17 per cent to 8 per cent (p. 289).

6. There was an increase in assets such as refrigerators, motorised two-wheelers, sewing machines and the use of liquid petroleum gas for cooking (p. 290).

7. There was an increase in dwelling unit size and access to basic services.

The education situation too improves once the basic services are in place. With improvement in family income, a household has more more money to send children, including girls, to school. Also, the girl child can attend school since she does not have to stay back to fill up water.

Data from unpublished studies undertaken by MHT[17] of SEWA demonstrates that there is considerable improvement in the health status of the household members after having adequate access to water and sanitation. There is improvement in hygiene and reduction in water borne and skin diseases. For example, MHT's study in early 2000 indicates that the incidence of illnesses before provision of water and sanitation was 19 per cent, which reduced to 7 per cent after provision of these services; the percentage of residents taking bath increased from 58 per cent to 100 per cent and the healthcare expenditure reduced by 56.5 per cent. In particular, women reported that they had more time in the mornings to assist their children to prepare for the school and 94 per cent stated enhancement of their social status. Lastly, 90 per cent of the households initiated incremental house upgradation after the provision of water supply and sanitation.

Many social benefits emerged as a result of water supply and sanitation. It led to harmonious relationships in the neighbourhood, given that the potential for local conflicts over water and use of common toilets are high. The study in Patna (Rogers and Satija, 2012), found that deficient infrastructure emerged as a critical reason for conflicts between local residents. The availability of services in the settlements increase the prospects of marriage of the young men as families hesitate to give their daughters in families that do not have access to basic facilities. Lastly, when water supply and sanitation are provided in the slums, the households are incentivised to invest in housing.

There is a very strong gender dimension to safe water and sanitation. Women bear the maximum brunt in the absence of such facilities. They are forced to spend time and energy collecting water for the household use, giving up on income generating opportunities and leisure time. There are severe health consequences of such work on women. In the absence of sanitation they have to go out in the dark for defecation, increasing risks of sexual violence. They are unable to go out in the day time for defecation, which also results in adverse health consequences. Higher morbidity rates within families because of lack of these services force them to spend time on caring for the sick, thereby increasing their burden.

All participatory surveys involving women indicate that the first demand of poor women is a toilet, in both rural (Chattopadhyay and Duflo, 2004) and urban areas[18]. Open defecation is a matter of great humiliation and shame for the women in particular, who are sometimes physically abused by other residents. Their time is saved in filling water, which they use for productive activities, as studies of SNP in Ahmedabad show (Joshi 2002). Water and sanitation policy for the urban poor is the most important gendered policy in the urban context.

The responsibility of the government therefore is to ensure that all urban residents of India have access to essential basic water supply and sanitation services at a cost that is affordable both to the household and to the country. This means that the government universalises access to safe water and sanitation, using affordable technologies and at costs affordable to the poorest of the households. For this, the government must integrate the financing of the water supply and sanitation with the overall financing system in a way that brings in partial financial sustainability and partial subsidy.

The discussion in this section indicates that all the three targets of Goal 7 are important for improving not just living conditions but also social development. Hence, post MDGs, achievement of the other goals on education and health in the urban areas will require focus on shelter security. Shelter security benefits the women the most and hence, the three targets of Goal 7 are important for gender equity. In short, shelter security, that includes land tenure rights and access to water and sanitation, is the foundation of overall social development and gender equity in the post-MDG period.

---

[17] Data in this paragraph are extracted by the author from the unpublished studies of the MHT.
[18] Surmised by the author based on own field work experience in many slums in Ahmedabad and discussions with the MHT members.

5. THE URBAN HOUSING PROGRAMMES AND THEIR EVALUATION

Since independence, there has been a plethora of approaches to deal with slums and their development in urban India. Initially, urban authorities and planners were in a denial mode with regard to slums and the slum development approach was called 'slum clearance' scheme. The slums could not be cleared but gradually, the number of people living in slums expanded and by the first Habitat Conference in Vancouver in 1976, most large cities in India had a substantial population living in slums. With World Bank's help, slum improvement and upgrading schemes were taken up in some cities. Subsequently, the Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom also began funding slum improvement and upgrading projects in states such as Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh and West Bengal. There have been notable successes of some of these projects.

The Government of Madhya Pradesh (MP) introduced Tenure Regularization Scheme, called the MP Patta Act, in 1984, which saw improvement in living conditions in slums where 30-year-lease rights were given. Cities in Gujarat, Ahmedabad and Vadodara, introduced SNP, which proved successful. The two most recent urban housing programmes for the poor introduced in India are the Basic Services for the Urban Poor (BSUP) under the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) and the Rajiv Avas Yojana (RAY). The latter is slated to replace the former.

The different shelter programmes introduced in India, either for the whole country or in specific cities are listed in the timeline below. It indicates at best a fragmented approach to shelter security in the urban areas. The assessment of these fragmented efforts, however, is not the focus of this paper.

Timeline: Shelter Programmes in Urban India

- **British period:** Rent Control Act to protect poor from evictions or speculative rents by land owners

- **1950s to 1980s:** Slum clearance

- **Upto 1961:** Subsidised Industrial Housing

- **1970 onwards:** Subsidised Housing to Economically Weaker Section (EWS) and Low Income Groups (LIG) through Housing Boards and Slum Clearance Boards with funding from Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUDCO)

- **1970s:** Environmental Improvement of Urban Slums (EIUS)

- **1980s:** Urban Basic Services, which then became Urban Basic Services for the Poor (UBSP) in the late 1980s

- **1984:** Enactment of Tenure Regularisation Act, for example the Madhya Pradesh Patta Act. The newly introduced Rajiv Awas Yojana (RAY) insists on enactment of similar legislation in all the states; some have done so, others are in the process

- **1977-1990**: Slum Upgradation and Sites and Services in select cities under the World Bank influence; for example Madras Urban Development Programme (MUDP), Bombay Urban Development Programme (BUDP)

- **1990 onwards:** Extension of basic services for the poor funded by DFID in some states such as West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh

- **2000:** Valmiki Ambedkar Awas Yojana (VAMBAY). This ended with the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM)

- **2006:** Basic Services to the Urban Poor (BSUP) under JNNURM, wherein public housing is constructed by the housing agencies of the state

- **2009:** Affordable Housing Policy, which includes a component of cash subsidy and interest subsidy to attract private sector in supplying housing to the urban poor

- **2011:** RAY, in-situ, participatory approach for slum development. It also includes three pro-poor reforms, namely property rights legislation and tenure security legislation[19]; reservation of 20-25 per cent of land or developed area in the private housing for small units; and allocation of 20-25 per cent municipal budget for the urban poor.

JNNURM was introduced in 2005 December with two components, (i) Urban Infrastructure and Governance (UIG) for city-wide infrastructure development and upgradation, and (ii) BSUP for upgrading slums and increasing the supply of new housing for the poor. In fact, there was no clarity on the BSUP component of JNNURM for long. Subsequently, it was decided to allocate 40 per cent of the JNNURM funds to the urban poor.

JNNURM is for only mission cities; initially 63 were identified as mission cities and then the list was expanded to 65. These included metropolitan cities, state capitals and particular heritage cities and towns such as Bodh Gaya in Gaya district. The national government was criticised for promoting inequitable development by focusing on only a few cities, which led to the national government expanding JNNURM to include two additional components, Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme for Small and Medium Towns (UIDSSMT) and Integrated Housing and Sanitation Development Programme (IHSDP) for the non-mission cities. Eventually, all cities and towns were brought under the ambit of JNNURM. Among the four components of the JNNURM, the BSUP and IHSDP are directly relevant for meeting Target 11 of the MDGs. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation (MoHUPA) is the national nodal agency for the BSUP and IHSDP programmes.

RAY has replaced the BSUP component of JNNURM. Looking at certain inadequacies posed by the BSUP (discussed later), the MoHUPA changed its approach to urban housing for the poor from construction of dwelling units to in-situ redevelopment under a new programme, RAY, launched in 2011, although it was supposed to be accomplished within 100 days of the UPA-II government formed in May 2009. RAY "envisages a 'Slum-free India' with inclusive and equitable cities in which every citizen has access to basic civic and social services and decent shelter"[20]. It propounds a multi-pronged approach, by encouraging in-situ development of a slum, either upgradation or redevelopment; minimizing relocations, which are

---

[19] The state government is free to enact either of the two as the definition of tenure security is wide.
[20] From RAY guidelines, source: http://mhupa.gov.in/ray/02-RAY-Guidelines.pdf, (accessed on November 30, 2012).

to be limited to slums that cannot be developed on site on account of hazardous conditions or land use reservation; and community participation at the centre of the whole exercise. However, prior to submitting a project proposal for funding, a city has to submit a 'Slum-free City Plan of Action' for which guidelines are available.

Preparation of a slum-free city plan of action requires a massive database of the entire list of slums in a city, mapping them on a Geographic Information System (GIS) base and socioeconomic details of each household living in each of the slums. The task is onerous. Besides database, states and cities also have to accomplish reforms—bringing a property right legislation (as propounded by De Soto), ensure reservation of 20-25 per cent land in the city, and reserve 20-25 per cent in the city's budget for the poor.

TABLE 7: PROGRESS OF VARIOUS URBAN PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAMMES, INDIA

	BSUP*	IHSDP*	BSUP + IHSDP	RAY**
No. of houses sanctioned	1,010,789	563,807	1,574,596	NA
No. of houses completed	453,410	188,771	642,181	None
No. of houses occupied	277,523	140,137	417,660	None
No. of houses under construction	224,146	126,552	350,698	None

Note: Status as on September 2012 for BSUP and IHSDP.
Source:
* http://mhupa.gov.in/W_new/DMU_REPORT_JNNURM.pdf, (accessed on November 30, 2012)
** http://mhupa.gov.in/W_new/DMU_REPORT_RAY.pdf, (accessed on November, 30, 2012).

The beginning of the 11th Five Year Plan had put urban housing shortage at 24.7 million houses. BSUP and IHSDP together were supposed to take care of part of the housing shortage. However, as per the latest available data on the MoHUPA website (September 30th, 2012), 1.01 million BSUP units and 0.56 million IHSDP units were sanctioned (Table 7), which is a total of 1.57 million new housing units sanctioned for the urban poor. This number is just 6.35 per cent of the total urban housing shortage in the beginning of the 11th Five Year Plan. However, only 44.9 per cent and 33.5 per cent of the total units of the BSUP and IHSDP were constructed and hence the actual housing shortage addressed by the construction of new dwelling units is 2.6 per cent of 24.7 million. Thus, evidently, JNNURM's BSUP and IHSDP has not made much of a dent on the housing shortage in the urban areas. If the 75.26 million slum dwellers (in 1991) are projected to 2005-06 then the total figure comes to 83.68 million people or 17.8 million slum households. In that case, the BSUP plus IHSDP units constructed have reached only 3.6 per cent of the slum households. Hence, JNNURM has not done much in terms of addressing the question of improving living conditions of slum dwellers.

Even the outcome of the constructed units is not positive. One major criticism of BSUP and IHSDP has been that only 65 per cent of the new units constructed under BSUP and IHSDP have been occupied. This is because a number of BSUP units constructed have been on the city's periphery, as in the case of Hyderabad (Mahadevia and Gogoi 2010), New Delhi etc. Slum dwellers do not prefer to shift to locations outside the city. Ahmedabad has cleverly used the BSUP funds to relocate the dwellers at the outskirts (Mahadevia 2012). The BSUP units there have remained unoccupied. IHSDP has been implemented as in-situ reconstruction of dwelling units by giving out construction materials to the dwellers, as in the case of Andhra Pradesh (Mahadevia and Gogoi 2010) and hence have a higher success rate than the BSUP.

The Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) Report on JNNURM brought out certain irregularities in the implementation of the BSUP and IHSDP projects. The CAG report states that ineligible beneficiaries had derived benefit of the BSUP; the state or the city government had not made land available for the implementation of the approved cases; in some instances the land identified for the projects were already occupied by others; and the funds were diverted for purposes not admissible under the JNNURM[21].

The CAG report also notes that in some instances the projects were completed but supporting infrastructure such as access roads, drainage connections, etc. was not in place. This led to non-occupancy[22]. Clearly, the progress in implementation of the BSUP projects was slow and there were many flaws in the ones that were implemented.

Progress on RAY too has been dismal. States and cities are struggling to prepare the database for the slum-free city plan of action. Some of them have contracted out the task of data collection to one or two agencies and they have further contracted out the work of preparation of a slum-free city plan of action, while others are in the process of doing so. The guidelines for preparation of a slum free city plan of action are complicated. Since the programme had not taken off, states were asked to submit individual detailed project proposals as pilot projects. Only eight pilot projects have been approved[23] and many pilots are similar to the BSUP.

The states are resisting giving property rights to the slum dwellers. A better approach would have been to ensure tenure security rather than asking the cities to give property rights to the slum dwellers in De Soto approach. In particular, the state and city authorities are averse to low-income migrants and do not want to extend even tenure security or at the minimum 'no eviction' guarantee to them. In other words, there is resistance to extend 'urban citizenship' to the low income migrants, and hence, they may get excluded from even RAY. The variable levels of citizenship rights and their attainment in the urban areas in India have been discussed at length earlier. The complex issues around citizenship surface when programmes like RAY have to be implemented. In absence of any policy framework rooted in reality and developed through wider consultative processes, housing for the urban poor cannot be resolved.

Looking at the real situation, many cities have now begun to extend basic services to all the slum settlements, irrespective of their tenure status. We have found this situation in many cities in Gujarat. After extension of basic services, the cities have started giving property tax bills to the slum households. This, in fact, has increased the perception of tenure security among them, as they now have a proof of residence in the property tax bill, which carries their name and address along with a property tax number. This is a positive way of approaching the challenge of slums, and a far better approach than the BSUP approach. The RAY approach should have been incremental housing, which in reality does not seem to be happening as the cities are unable to get out of the traditional mindsets on slum development.

---

[21] The CAG report information is from the Executive summary of the CAG Report, source: http://saiindia.gov.in/english/home/Our_Products/Audit_Report/Government_Wise/union_audit/recent_reports/union_performance/2012_2013/Commercial/Report_15/Exe_Summ.pdf, (accessed on November 30, 2012).
[22] Source: http://saiindia.gov.in/english/home/Our_Products/Audit_Report/Government_Wise/union_audit/recent_reports/union_performance/2012_2013/Commercial/Report_15/Chap_6.pdf (accessed on November 30, 2012).
[23] Source: http://mhupa.gov.in/W_new/DMU_REPORT_RAY.pdf, (accessed on November 30, 2012).

6. POST-MDG FRAMEWORK

The post-MDG agenda should be process oriented and with transformative outcomes. It should also take on board existing inequalities, particularly among the communities and different sizes of towns and cities in the urban context. In other words, inter and intra urban inequalities have to be addressed in post-MDGs in a country such as India.

This paper has presented the facts on urban inequalities in the context of the targets 10 and 11 of the Goal 7 of the MDGs and reflects on the processes through which the agenda of these targets can be met in the future. It establishes that the STs do not migrate to the urban areas in significant numbers as India's urbanization process is not inclusive. Further, it identifies the SCs, the Muslims and the BPL population in all the cities are lagging behind. Reaching out to these groups would mean identifying them in the urban space. This is feasible as Indian cities are segmented by caste and religion and there are concentrations of the SCs and the Muslims in their segregated enclaves. While such segregation is negative, it also assists in better targeting programmes. Further, the BPL households tend to live in slums with low tenure security and hence they can also be identified and targeted.

Above all, the most important entry point for transformative and equitable post-MDG agenda in the urban context will be shelter security. Shelter security is linked to land tenure security and hence access to land occupancy rights in the cities and halt to forced evictions. Both are linked to a system of urban citizenship. In fact, tenure security and urban citizenship go together. India's urbanization process should be based on the goal of shelter security for all. This is particularly important as the country is urbanizing and there is an expectation of large proportion of rural poor moving into the urban areas in the coming decades.

Access to safe water supply has not been met, as the proportion of households that do not have access reduced from 29.5 per cent in 1993 to 23 per cent in 2008-09. This is because the BPL households and the Muslims households lag behind on this basic service. Also, progress in access to safe drinking water in slums is slow as still 22 per cent households do not have this access. Insecure slums are largely those on public lands, those along the road side and those which are displaced repeatedly (Mahadevia 2010, 2011).

The MoHUPA should form a water and sanitation policy for the poor, which should consider extending water supply and sanitation to all slum and squatter settlements irrespective of their tenure status with an understanding that this is not extension of tenure security. In other words, extension of water and sanitation in all slums and squatter settlements should not be tied to tenure security. This facility could also be a shared facility. Non-metros also lag behind the metros in access to safe drinking water. Post-MDGs, there should be development of small and medium towns. Smaller a town, lesser is its capability to provide safe drinking water.

The concept of access to sanitation should be expanded to include not just access to toilets but access to bath, drainage and garbage collection as well. The target of access to toilets has been achieved on the

whole for urban India, but, again, the Muslim and BPL households fall way behind in achieving this target. As discussed above, the BPL households can be identified through the level of tenure security. The Muslim households in many cities in India tend to be concentrated in a few geographic locations, which have to be identified for targeted intervention. While the target of access to toilets has been achieved, the quality of this service is very poor as still slightly more than one-third of them share a toilet and this proportion among the Muslims and the BPL households is extremely high.

The next priority area of work in the post-MDG context should be to ensure that the proportion of households sharing toilets decline, with focus once again on the BPL and Muslim households. Access to drainage is a problem among the SC, ST and the BPL households; hence the focus should be extending drainage lines among the slums, and in particular slums without security of tenure. An underground drainage network needs to be built and in the worst case, drains need to be at least covered. Access to bath is less of a problem than access to toilets and drainage facilities.

Garbage is ubiquitous in urban areas in India and the problems are much more in non-metros and in low-income neighbourhoods in the metros. While there has been an overall improvement, the problem remains in neighbourhoods where low-income population and vulnerable groups such as SCs and Muslims live.

Houselessness is not an issue in urban India as squatting and informal housing still remain a possible housing solution for the low-income population in urban areas. While the number of households living in slums has increased from 1990s in urban India because of urbanization, the proportion of population living in slums has declined. The quality of housing and crowding, besides that of access to basic services, though remain an important issue.

On the whole, 92 per cent households live in pucca houses, 57 per cent of those in the slums live in pucca housing. Post-MDGs should focus on incremental housing and the first most important agenda in this would be to improve the quality of shelter unit in the slums. This can be easily done by making unsecured credit available for shelter upgradation. Shelter upgrading focus should be for households in slum settlements, targeting BPL households.

Lastly, living conditions in slums have improved from 1993 to 2008-09. But, the number of households living in slums has increased since and it is expected to grow; the improvement in Target 11 should be monitored even in the post-MDG period. The approach here should be two pronged; continuous upgrading of the existing settlements and increase in supply of affordable small lots with basic services to be made available for the low-income households who can then build incremental housing on them.

The largest urban housing programme in post-independent India is BSUP, which has not been very successful. The approach taken under this programme of providing subsidised public housing has not worked very well. On the whole, the funds allocated were so low, that this would not have catered to more than 8 per cent of the overall housing shortage anyway. The units actually constructed are only 2.6 per cent of the total housing shortage and 3.6 per cent of the total slum households at the beginning of the 11th Five Year Plan. Only 65 per cent of the constructed units have been occupied, making very little impact on the agenda of improving living conditions in the slums.

RAY, the recently introduced flagship programme, which has not even taken off, is slowed down for want of massive data for the preparation of slum-free city plan of action. The MoHUPA has sent requests to the cities

to submit at least one DPR for RAY, which largely are the BSUP type—for subsidised public housing and not slum upgrading. Subsidised public housing does not have very wide reach and the most prudent housing programme is to facilitate the slum dwellers to improve their own conditions through guarantee of tenure and credit extension. The national programmes have not been able to put in place these mechanisms and the cities continue to construct subsidised public housing, largely on the urban periphery where the poor do not want to shift. Hence, post-MDG, shelter upgrading in the slum settlements should be the focus of policy. As seen already, there is a higher concentration of the SCs in the slums and hence this approach has the possibility of improving the lives of SC households in the urban areas. The ongoing housing rights movement in Mumbai under the aegis of Ghar Bachao Ghar Banao Andolan (Save shelter, create secure shelter movement) has been asking for thorough implementation of RAY.

This approach has to take care of land tenure security. Currently, RAY mandates property titles. This is a flawed approach as what households require is de facto tenure or high perceived security of tenure. As a study by Mahadevia (2010 and 2011) shows, higher the de facto tenure security better is the access to basic services, quality of housing structure, and quality of employment, and higher is the income and savings. Eventually, households may shift to formal housing. But awarding property rights in the initial stage may lead to gentrification—slightly higher income groups may replace the poorest of the households in the slum settlement. Post-MDGs, while there should be emphasis on access to secure land, it is not necessary in the form of marketable land titles, but, more in the form of guarantee of no eviction or long-term land leases. Further, the shelter policy should also ensure massive supply of small developed lots for the low-income households on which they would construct their own dwelling unit in an incremental way.

Thailand for instance has been able to address the issue of extending credit to slum redevelopment through participatory approach. CODI, Community Organizations Development Institute, set up by the national government as a public institution has provided shelter upgrading funds for the slum settlements. CODI has assisted in setting up Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and supported their network. The support to development of institutions that would take forward community-based upgrading has taken forward the work of upgrading slums in a big way. CODI provided the possibility of upscaling the localised upgrading efforts of individual NGOs and CBOs.

Brazil too has a strong tenure regularization programme in its cities. The civil society organisations (CSOs) and rights organisations mobilised and pressured the national government to enact certain legislation towards this. Besides, the CSOs had also organised to take up long-drawn fights to get land title clearances in the informal settlements. The country designed the National Programme to Support Sustainable Urban Land Regularization, established in 2003 by the Ministry of Cities, which proposed integration of the informal settlement residents into the city and the urban society by implementing the legal, urban and environmental regularization of informal settlements.

The country also set up the National Social Housing System and the National Social Housing Fund for social housing (Osorio 2007). This was done towards fulfilling the agenda of 'Right to the City'. Civil society, social movements and NGOs have been leading the implementation of such policies together with the Federal Government, and consistent with the principles and instruments provided by the Federal Law on Urban Development—the City Statute. Realising the scale and difficulties of addressing the informal settlements' issue in all the cities, the Federal Government created a new Ministry of Cities, whose mandate was to implement the City Statute. This change came about during the first tenure of President Lula, who belongs to the Workers Party of Brazil.

The most important of all for addressing Targets 10 and 11 of the MDGs post 2015 is to move towards an urban policy regime which provides all the residents, permanent as well as temporary urban citizenship, or 'Right to the City'. The 'Right to the City' statute has been adopted by many cities in Brazil. A World Charter on Right to the City was released in July 2004 at the World Urban Forum in Barcelona, emerging from the World Social Forum of the Americas. There is a need to frame such a Charter for South Asia and India.

These policy recommendations would be realised if the CSOs and rights organisations in India play a big role in mobilising the urban poor for their right to the city. Today, except for nascent CBOs, there are very few NGOs engaged in urban mobilisation. Like Brazil, a broad coalition of CSOs, NGOs, social movements etc. has to set up to raise the agenda in national and local debates. There is a need of urban mobilization of communities to protect and enforce 'Rights based agendas'.

The approach has to be multi-pronged. Firstly, the existing turfs have to be protected, which is to stand by communities when their lives and livelihoods are being demolished and support their struggles for self-reservation. The second support can be extended in the form of legal course for land title clearances, which is a long drawn battle. Wherever possible, the national as well the state and local governments should be influenced through mobilizations to enact and fairly implement tenure regularization policies.

Lastly, the coalition should start influencing the local decisions on land allocations in urban space and ensure that the vulnerable groups get access to land. In this, land rights should be transferred to women. Under BSUP and RAY for instance, a woman is the first owner of the house constructed under the programmes.

Besides, there is a need to democratise the urban discourse by mobilising communities and force the local governments to set up participatory processes and institutions of participation. Local communities can then participate in preparation of master plans and budgets and implementation of shelter security programmes. Shelter security is the beginning of the implementation of the Right to City programme.

Those unwilling can be brought on board by carrying out civil society processes persistently. The legal framework is available in India in the form of the 74th Constitutional Amendment, which can be leveraged for the advantage of the poor. CSOs can also mobilise communities for social audits of various infrastructure and development projects. In each such activity there should be adequate representation of vulnerable communities and women.

The post-MDG agenda is large and it should be anchored within the civil society to influence the Indian State, and eventually ensure the legal and institutional framework for Right to the City.

REFERENCES

A. Barrientos (2010), "Social Protection and Poverty, Social Policy and Development," Paper No. 4, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, January, http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/search/973B0F57CA78D834C12576DB003BE255?OpenDocument (accessed 16 June 2010).

B. J. Batra (2005), "Entitlements to Services and Amenities in JJ Clusters, JJ Relocation Colonies and Other Non-Planned Settlements in Delhi: An Overview", a paper under Ensuring Public Accountability Through Community Action, 2005, Institute of Social Studies Trust, New Delhi. Source: http://www.isst-india.org/PDF/Entitlement%20to%20Services.pdf, accessed on July 11, 2011.

Central Statistical Organisation (2011), "Millennium Development Goals – India Country Report, 2011", Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, New Delhi.

R. Chattopadhyaya, E. Duflo (2004), "Women as Policy Makers: Evidence from a Randomized Policy Experiment in India", Econometrica, 72 (5); pp. 1409-43.

S. Devereux, R. Sabates-Wheeler (2004), "Transformative Social Protection", IDS Working Paper, 232, October, www.ids.ac.uk/download.cfm?file=wp232.pdf (accessed 14 March 2010).

L. Dubochet (2013), Making Post-2015 Matter for Socially Excluded Groups in India, Oxfam India Working Paper Series, OIWPS – 19, January.

A. Durrand-Lasserve, H. Selod (2007), "The Formalisation of Urban Land Tenure in Developing Countries", paper presented at the Urban Research Symposium, The World Bank, May 14-16, Wanshington DC. (source: http://selod.ensae.net/doc/039%20Durand-Lasserve%20Selod%202007.pdf accessed on October 16, 2010).

T. Fazal (2013), "Millennium Development Goals and Muslims of India, Oxfam India Working Papers Series", OIWPS – 13, January.

A. Kundu, N. Sarangi (2007): "Migration, Employment Status and Poverty - An Analysis across Urban Centres", Economic & Political Weekly, January 27, pp. 297-306.

D. Mahadevia (2010), "Tenure Security and Urban Social Protection Links: India", IDS Bulletin, 41 (4), pp. 52-62.

D. Mahadevia (2011), "Tenure Security and Urban Social Protection in India", CSP Research Report 05, Centre for Social Protection, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex.

D. Mahadevia (2012), "Decent Work in Ahmedabad: An Integrated Approach", ILO Asia Pacific Working Paper Series, Regional Office for Asia and Pacific, Bangkok. June. Source: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/documents/publication/wcms_181745.pdf

D. Mahadevia (2013), "Social Security for the Urban Poor – A Study in Gujarat", in K. P. Kannan and Jan Breman (eds), The Long Road to Social Security - Assessing the Implementation of National Social Security Initiatives for the Working Poor in India, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, pp. 337-72.

D. Mahadevia, T. Gogoi (2010), "Assessment of Shelter Programmes in Andhra Pradesh", Working Paper 12, Centre for Urban Equity, December. Source: http://www.spcept.ac.in/download/cuewp/cue-wp-012.pdf.

D. Mahadevia, S. Sarkar (2012), "Handbook of Urban Inequalities", Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

D. Mahadevia, A. Datey, A. Mishra (2013), "Foisting Mass Housing on the Poor: Learning from Social Audit of BSUP", Working Paper 19, Centre for Urban Equity, CEPT University, Ahmedabad.

N. Mathur, (2012), "On the Sabarmati Riverfront - Urban Planning as Totalitarian Governance in Ahmedabad", Economic & Political Weekly, 47 (47 & 48), pp. 64-75.

H. Naryanan, D. Mahadevia, R. R. Mathews (2008): "Demolition of Lives and Livelihoods: Mumbai", in Darshini Mahadevia (ed.) Inside the Transforming Urban Asia: Processes, Policies and Public Actions, Concept, New Delhi, pp. 415-450.

National Building Organisation (2010), "Report of the Committee on Slum Statistics/ Census", Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India, New Delhi.

National Building Organisation (2012), "Report of the Technical Group on Urban Housing Shortage (TG-12) (2012-17)", Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India, New Delhi.

National Sample Survey Organisation (1997), "Slums in India (January-June 1993)", NSS 49th Round, Report No. 417, Department of Statistics, Government of India, September.

National Sample Survey Organisation (2010), "Some Characteristics of Urban Slums", 2008-09, NSS 65th Round (July 2008-June 2009), Report No. 534(65/0.21/1), Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, May.

L. M. Osorio (2007), "Positive Policies and Legal Responses to Enhance Security of Tenure in Brazil, a case study prepared for Enhancing Urban Safety and Security: Global Report on Human Settlement 2007". Source: http://www.unhabitat.org/downloads/docs/5403_52284_GRHS.2007.CaseStudy.Tenure.Brazil. pdf, (accessed on November 30, 2012).

G. Payne (2000), "Urban Land Tenure Policy Options: Titles or Rights?", a paper presented at the World Bank Urban Forum, Westfields Marriott, Virginia, USA, 3-5 April. (http://www.worldbank.org/html/fpd/urban/ forum2000/papers/realestate.pdf, accessed 22 March 2009).

Planning Commission (2012), "Press Note on Poverty Estimates", 2009-10, Government of India, March.

D. Rodgers, S. Satija (2012), "Understanding the Tipping Point of Urban Conflict: The Case of Patna, India", Working Paper No. 5, Understanding the Tipping Point of Urban Conflict: Violence, Cities and Poverty Reduction in the Developing World. Available online at: http://www.urbantippingpoint.org/output/ projectpublications/

A. Roy (2009), "Why India Cannot Plan its Cities: Informality, Insurgence and the Idiom of Urbanization," Planning Theory, 8 (1), pp. 76-87.

G. Shah, M. Navdeep, J. Arpita (2009), "The Globalizing State, Public Services and The New Governance of Urban Local Communities In India", a power point presentation at a workshop on 9 October 2009 (see http://indiaurbangovernance.org/index.php?p=workshop_conference, accessed 16 June 2010).

K. C. Sivaramakrishnan, A. Kundu, B. N. Singh (2005), "Handbook of Urbanization in India: An Analysis of Trends and Processes", Oxford University Press, New Delhi and New York.

S. Thorat, A. Dubey (2012): "Has Gowth Been Socially Inclusive During 1993-94 -2009-10?" Economic & Political Weekly, 47 (10), pp. 43-53.

UNHABITAT (2012): "State of the World's Cities, 2012/13 – Prosperity of Cities", UNHABITAT, Nairobi.