

‘How successful are national urban renewal programmes at tackling urban poverty?’

The case of the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission in India

Summary

This dissertation explores the different characteristics of urban poverty and approaches to address it by reviewing secondary literature. Then it analyses a national urban renewal programme, the Jawaharlal Nehru Urban Renewal Mission to see how the mission deals with the issue of urban poverty in context of India. It argues that although any distinction between rural and urban poverty is difficult to make conceptually, some characteristics of urban poverty need to be focused when it comes to policy formulation. By analysing the key features of the Jawaharlal Nehru Urban Renewal Mission with respect to different characteristics of urban poverty, it concludes that the mission has potential to address the needs of urban poor in India to a large extent if implemented properly.

Table of Contents

Summary	1
List of Abbreviations	3
Preface.....	6
1. Introduction	7
1.1 Research objective.....	8
1.2 Methodology	8
1.3 Organisation of the paper	9
2. Understanding urban poverty and ways to address it.....	10
2.1 Different concepts of poverty.....	10
2.2 Understanding urban poverty	11
2.3 Addressing Urban Poverty	14
3. Urbanisation and urban poverty in India	20
3.1 Urbanisation in India.....	20
3.2 Urban Poverty in India	22
3.3 Urban poverty alleviation programmes.....	26
4. The programmatic features of JNNURM	28
4.1 Introduction to the scheme	28
4.2 Strategy of the Mission	28
5. Does JNNURM address the needs of urban poor?	31
5.1 Analysing key features with respect to addressing urban poverty	31
5.2 Implementation challenges.....	35
6. Conclusion	38
Annexure 1: List of mission cities included in JNNURM.....	40
Annexure 2: Sectors and projects eligible for assistance under JNNURM	42
Annexure 3: Reforms under JNNURM	44
Annexure 4: State wise details of sanctioned projects under UIG of JNNURM.....	46
References.....	48

List of Abbreviations

UN:	United Nations
PCI:	Planning Commission of India
WG:	Working Group
JNNURM:	Jawaharlal Nehru Urban Renewal Mission
HCR:	Head Count Ratio
GoI:	Government of India
DFID:	Department for International Development
UNDP:	United Nations Development Programme
CoI:	Census of India
IIHS:	Indian Institute for Human Settlements
GDP:	Gross Domestic Product
HPEC:	High Powered Expert Committee
MoUD:	Ministry of Urban Development
MoHUPA:	Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation
UBS:	Urban Basic Services
SEPUP:	Self-Employment Programme for the Urban Poor
NRY:	Nehru Rozgar Yojna
NSDP:	National Slum Development Programme
SJSRY:	Swarna Jayanti Shahri Rozgar Yojana
VAMBAY:	Valmiki Ambedkar Awas Yojna
AUWSP:	Accelerated Urban Water Supply
UIG:	Urban Infrastructure and Governance
BSUP:	Scheme for Basic Services to the Urban Poor
UIDSSMT:	Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme for Small and Medium Towns
IHSDP:	Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme

RAY:	Rajiv Awas Yojna
ULBs:	Urban Local Bodies
CDP:	City Development Plan
DPR:	Detailed Project Report
EWS:	Economically Weaker Sections
LIG	Low Income Group
DPCs/MPCs	District/Metropolitan Planning Committees

List of Tables

Table 1: Emergence of new urban areas	21
Table 2: Poverty HCR of poor	23
Table 3: Chronology of urban poverty alleviation programme in India	27
Table 4: Salient features of JNNURM.....	29

Preface

The dissertation report is for my fulfilment of MA programme in Poverty and Development at the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex.

The dissertation focuses on the contemporary issue of urbanisation and urban poverty. A review of secondary literature is undertaken to understand the issue of urban poverty and the ways to address it. Then the case of the Jawaharlal Nehru Urban Renewal Mission is applied to gauge the extent to which this national policy successfully engages with the issue of urban poverty in India. The dissertation finds the programme has potential to improve the conditions of the urban poor apart from changing the situation in the urban space. However, the programme grapples with some implementation challenges that are discussed in detail. The study concludes with some suggestions that can improve the efficacy of the programme.

The report received inputs and suggestions of many. I am grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Jaideep Gupte for his guidance and support. I am also thankful to my programme convenor and the teaching staff for their prompt pieces of advice.

Last but not the least; I am thankful to my classmates who provided good insights into my understanding on the subject since last one year of our association.

1. Introduction

It is now well-established that the majority of the world's population live in urban areas. According to the United Nations (UN), by the end of 2008, the world's population became more urban than rural (UN-HABITAT, 2008). India is also becoming a part of this global trend and the share of urban population has increased significantly over the last 60 years. The share of urban population to total population has grown from 17.3 per cent in 1951 to 31.16 per cent in 2011. It is further estimated that the urban population would reach to 600 million (40 per cent of the total population) by the year of 2030. Looking at the current trend, it is projected that it would pose some serious challenges to development in terms of availability and management of resources and providing basic services to urban population and as a result the share of urban poor may increase (Working Group (WG), Planning Commission of India (PCI), 2011).

To address the issues of urban development and alleviate urban poverty, the government of India has taken a major step by launching the Jawaharlal Nehru Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) in the December, 2005. This dissertation will review different approaches to understanding urban poverty and then analyse manner in which the JNNURM speaks to this literature to determine the extent to which the program will be successful in addressing urban poverty issues. The eradication of poverty has been central to development policies in India since independence, right from the first Five Year Plan with the primary focus being on agriculture and rural development. Although the social services such as education and health were provided to urban population, the first few Five Year Plans did not recognise urban poverty as a major concern and much more attention was paid to rural poverty. The change in approach towards urban development can be observed from the Seventh Five Year Plan (1985-1990) onwards with key focus on building infrastructure, slum upgrading and livelihood promotion. The most significant approach in this regard is a recent emphasis of urban renewal through JNNURM and has continued since then (WG, PCI 2011). The focus on rural development in initial Five Year Plans can be justified because of the majority of population living in the rural areas.

The JNNURM can be seen as an important initiative by looking at the present scenario of urban poverty in India. It is interesting to note that the declining rate of urban poverty has been slow as compared to rural poverty over the last few decades. According to the

WG, PCI(2011) the Headcount Ratio (HCR) of urban poverty, which is considered as one of the important methods to measure poverty, has decreased slowly as compared to the HCR of rural poverty. The annual average rate of decline in the HCR of the urban poor has been 2.1 per cent while annual average rate of decline in the HCR of the rural poor has been 2.5 per cent during 1993-94 to 2004-05.

The JNNURM, a seven year programme, was launched to address the needs of urban sector as a result of rapid growth in urban population and by recognising the importance of cities in economic growth and Government of India (GoI) is planning to introduce its second phase (Parliamentary Consultative Committee on Urban Development meets 2012). The key objectives of the mission are to improve infrastructure, establish a link between asset- creation and asset- management, improve governance and provide basic services to urban poor. The mission has four components- urban infrastructure and governance, basic services to the urban poor, urban infrastructure and development scheme for small and medium towns and integrated housing and slum development programme (JNNURM guideline 2006).

Although the allocation of budget has increased in the urban sector, it has remained lower than that in the rural sector¹. Nevertheless, the JNNURM has helped to raise awareness and the concern regarding urban development and management (Sivaramakrishnan, 2010).

1.1 Research objective

The key objective of this dissertation is to see how successful are national urban renewal programmes in reducing urban poverty? This research tries to address this question by using JNNURM as a case and the analytical framework is synthesised from a review of different approaches of understanding and addressing urban poverty suggested by different school of thoughts.

1.2 Methodology

To address these questions, a review of secondary literature is undertaken. This focuses on key aspects related to tackling urban poverty such as planning,

¹ For the current plan period the per capita expenditure on the urban sector is Rupees 1,566.00 while the per capita expenditure on the rural sector is Rupees 7,433.00, significantly higher than urban sector WG, PCI 2011).

economic and social needs of the urban poor, community participation, role of urban local bodies and implementation challenges. The literature review also provides insight into the nature of urban poverty especially in the context of India.

The different aspects of urban poverty are then applied to a case study of JNNURM to gauge the extent to which this national policy successfully engages with the issue of urban poverty. The analysis spans the potential as well as limitations of the policy in terms of addressing urban poverty in India. This paper also explores implementation challenges.

1.3 Organisation of the paper

This paper is structured as follows. The chapter 2 explores the different concepts of urban poverty and presents the views on different approaches to address it. The chapter 3 discusses the extent and nature of urban poverty in India. The chapter 4 presents the case of JNNURM and describes the key features of JNNURM. The chapter 5 analyses the potential as well as limitations of the programme with respect to different concepts of urban poverty and approaches to address it. This chapter will also focus on practical challenges to implementation. In the final chapter, the conclusion will be drawn from the discussion and some recommendations will be made.

2. Understanding urban poverty and ways to address it

2.1 Different concepts of poverty

Before moving on to urban poverty, it is important to highlight the concepts of poverty in general. Current debates in poverty continue to seesaw between the single dimensional versus multidimensional approaches and quantitative versus qualitative advocates (Hasan 2002, Masika *et al.* 1997, Satterthwaite 1997, Wratten 1995). With a focus on income/consumption, the single dimensional approach defines poor as those below a certain income/consumption threshold (Laderchi *et al* 2003, Gunewardena 2004). The multidimensionality broadens the concepts by using various social indicators such as life expectancy, infant mortality, and education to define poverty. Gaining popularity through adoption by UN agencies, it also highlights the structural factors that cause poverty in the first place. The other spectrum of poverty debates are on the qualitative versus quantitative sides.

For the quantitative supporters observable quantitative data (often income/consumption related) gives the best representation of poverty whereas the anthropologist insisting on “voices of the poor” promote the use of participatory methodologies to define poverty (Wratten 1995, Hasan 2002, Chambers 2006). The work of Robert Chambers has been significant in this regard by adding new concepts such as participation; powerlessness; isolation; vulnerability; security; assets; social capital; sustainability and livelihood to the dictionary of poverty alleviation programme (Hasan 2002). Other related concepts such as vulnerability and entitlements have also emerged with this approach. Vulnerability is not synonymous with poverty, but it has two sides; external side, which is exposure to risk and the internal side which is ‘defencelessness’, meaning dealing with adverse situation without damaging loss (Chambers 2006). The concept of entitlement refers to the ways in which individuals or households command resources. This concept presents poverty as being failure to access resources and indicates towards the socio-political causes that determine the failure with respect to accessing resources by the poor (Wratten 1995, Hasan 2002).

While there is still little consensus on approaching poverty, recent years have seen a greater acceptance of the multidimensional and qualitative approaches. The next section will add to this debate by investigating whether there is any distinction between urban poverty and rural poverty?

2.2 Understanding urban poverty

Urban poverty has been low priority in development agenda as compared to rural poverty. Up to 1970s, the general perception was to focus on industrialisation in the urban sector and it was believed that poverty could be addressed in the developing countries from the transition of low-productive agricultural sector to high-productive industrial sector. However, after decades of modernisation policies, it was realised that benefits could not trickle down to rural areas. ‘Urban bias’ was blamed for enduring rural poverty and rather than solving the problem of rural poverty, urban centres were depriving rural areas of infrastructure and resources. This view became prominent until mid-1980s among the development agencies and most of the poverty alleviation programmes were targeted towards the rural areas. This was also justifiable as majority of the population were residing in the rural areas (Hasan 2002, Haan 1997, Wratten 1995, Lipton 1984). However, the rapid growth in urbanisation in the recent years and the increasing number of urban poor has compelled development thinkers and policymakers to re-examine the agenda of poverty alleviation in the urban sector².

As far as any distinction between rural and urban poverty is concerned, it seems ambiguous. As Wratten (1995:20) points out

Conceptualising urban poverty as a separate category from rural poverty is problematic for two reasons. First, the definition of the categories is arbitrary. And second, a dualistic spatial classification may have the undesirable effect of straight-jacketing discussion about the structural causes of poverty and diverting attention from national and international level (rather than city level) solutions.

She argues that it would be difficult to reduce the fact of wide range of human settlement in a simple dualistic categorisation. Moreover, any distinction would

² The share of the US\$1-a-day poor living in urban areas rose from 19 percent to 24 percent over 1993–2002 whereas the urban share of the population as a whole rose from 38 percent to 42 percent over the same period (Ravallion *et al.*, 2007)

undermine the functional linkages of cities, small towns and rural areas and interdependencies such as rural-urban migration and population growth, seasonal labour, markets for food, industrial goods and services, water supply and demand, education and health care facilities, remittance incomes and family support networks.

Whilst acknowledging these problems, she highlights four interrelated characteristics that are closely identified with urban poverty. First, the urban poor are more vulnerable to environmental and health risks. Urban poor often live in overcrowded places characterised by poor living conditions, unhealthy environment and inadequate outreach of basic services such as lack of sanitation facilities and safe water, electricity, absence of waste collection system, electricity supply and rainwater drainage. Such living conditions increase the risk of diseases and infections.

Second, the urban poor are more vulnerable to risk arising from commercial exchange. She points out that the degree of commercialisation is found to be greater in urban areas as compared to rural areas. Urban people are more dependent on market to buy and sell goods and services and to earn money. Urban poor require more money to buy basic items such as water, foods, rent which might be cheaper or free in the rural areas. This increase the pressure to earn more income and in order to do so the only thing they can sell is the labour. Lack of formal education and skill often restricts their choice of work and increase their vulnerability to any change in demand of labour and price of basic goods and services.

Third, the urban context is characterised by social diversity, fragmentation and crime. Cities attract rural migrants and refugees from different ethnicity, culture and linguistic origins and heterogeneity is common. Poor urban neighbourhoods contain a diversity of household types. This diversity may create new tensions and survival strategies among the urban poor. Lifestyles, kinship and neighbourhood support network might be different from those in rural areas. This risk of crime is greater in urban areas and the urban poor suffer the most. The incidences of alcohol and drugs abuse, family breakdown, domestic violence, female depression

are also associated with urban poor, although these are not exclusive to urban areas only. Finally, the urban poor are more likely to suffer from the negative role of state agents and police as they have more contact with them compared to their rural counterparts. Although the policy of state can have a positive impact on the lives of urban poor, many poor people experience the state in a negative way. The activities of urban poor are often regulated by the oppressive bureaucracy without understanding their needs.

In the same line, Satterthwaite (1997) argues that urban poor need more income as the living cost in urban areas is higher than the rural areas and also there is a need to increase the availability and accessibility of basic services to address the issue of urban poverty. Baker and Schuler(2002) also suggest that the poverty in urban areas may require a specific analysis by highlighting the some of the key characteristics such as commoditization (reliance on the cash economy); overcrowded living conditions (slums);environmental hazard (stemming from density and hazardous location of settlements, and exposure to multiple pollutants);social fragmentation (lack of community and inter-household mechanisms for social security, relative to those in rural areas); crime and violence; traffic accidents; and natural disasters. Amato and Zuo (1992) also claim that the urban poverty affects the psychological well-being of poor more than the rural poverty due to lack of social support and living condition. At the same time, it is important to note that these characteristics are not only limited to urban areas. Wratten (1995) mentions that it would be misleading to associate above mentioned characteristics exclusively with urban poverty as these may be found to some degree in rural areas as well and not every town would exhibit all the features.

From the above discussion, it may be concluded that it is difficult to make any conceptual distinction between urban poverty and rural poverty as all the concepts of poverty may be equally applied to poor regardless of the context. All dimensions of poverty such as vulnerability, lack of basic services, and lack of income may be found in urban as well as in rural context, although the extent and the nature may vary. However, it is important to keep some basic characteristics in mind with regard to analysing and addressing urban poverty. As Wratten (1995:26) concludes: 'To get a complete picture of poverty, we need methods of

analysis which examine these similar features as well as the differences. Rural and urban human settlements are linked economic and social systems, and it is unhelpful to restrict our vision to only one part of the system or to use poverty data to set one arbitrarily defined part against another.’

2.3 Addressing Urban Poverty

Considering the different dimensions and characteristics of urban poverty, the question arises what measures might be taken to address the urban poverty? Interestingly, different approaches have been suggested by different school of thoughts based on the interpretation of urban poverty. But the analysis of poverty has been broadly dominated by two opposite views; each suggests different set of policies. On the one hand, poverty is associated with personal failings of individual. On the other hand, it is viewed as a result of unfairly structured political, social and economic system of the society. The former view focuses on the free-market economic policies coupled with social policies in helping the rehabilitation of poor while the another view sees more interventionist role of the state in promoting equity and justice and argues that analysis of poverty requires to consider the structural problem rather than individual problem. The former perspective is associated with the laissez-faire individualism whereas the later perspective is linked to the Marxist theory (Wratten, 1995).

With regard to addressing urban poverty, a number of tools and frameworks have been developed by considering the different definitions and dimensions of poverty. In 1990, the World Bank proposed a three-fold approach to poverty reduction which provided a framework for country-level poverty assessments. This approach had three components- economic growth through intensive use of labour as it is considered the most important asset of poor; investment in health and education so that poor can use their labour more productively and provision of social safety nets for the poorest and vulnerable group (Moser, 1998). This approach was criticised mainly for focusing on monetary approach and not addressing the other aspects of poverty.

In order to address this problem, an asset vulnerability framework was advocated by Moser (1998). Based on the findings of four urban studies in 1980s, she

highlighted the importance of five types of assets in addressing the issue of urban poverty and vulnerability. She categorises these as follows- labour, which is considered the most important asset of the poor; human capital such as health and education which determines the productivity of the poor; productive assets, which is labelled as housing in case of urban poor; household relations, a mechanism of pooling income and sharing consumption and social capital, which may be describe as exchange within communities and between households based on the social relationship. This approach was recognised for its diversified interventions and considering the multi-dimensional nature of urban poverty.

Subsequently, a number of organisations have developed operational framework by including ‘the asset vulnerability framework’ as an integrated approach to poverty reduction. Most prominent among these integrated approaches are the school of livelihood approaches developed by DFID, UNDP, CARE International and Oxfam (Carney *et al.*, 1999) in rural context. Some other authors have also contributed to the asset-vulnerability frame work by categorising and defining different capitals required as an integrated approach to poverty reduction. (Bebbington, 1999; Carney, 1998; Moser, 1998; Portes 1998). The description of these capitals in urban context may be summarised as follows:

Physical: Housing and other physical infrastructure as well as tools and equipment are considered important physical capital. Housing is considered as one of the key factors in avoiding poverty through meeting basic needs for shelter and through generating income as a unit of home based production or renting of rooms. Moser (1998) describes it as a main productive asset of urban poor. Pugh (1997) emphasises the importance of good quality of housing in reducing health shocks faced by the urban poor. Sanderson (2000) also highlights that natural disasters such as floods and landslides have on poor urban groups due to the location of high risk areas. He observes that insecurity of tenure as a major barrier to poorer households willingness to pay for improvements in their quality of housing. Other infrastructures such as adequate water supply, sanitation and solid waste management when combined with hygiene communication are of great importance to the health of people living in urban areas (WELL, 1998).

Human: Health and education are recognised as an important human capital to address urban poverty and vulnerability. Peoples' skill and education determined the return on labour (Pugh (1997)). Thus, access to education as well as quality of education becomes a critical element to address poverty and vulnerability. Health is another important aspect that determines the productivity. In addition to this, these are considered as important assets to enhance the capability of poor households as suggested by Sen (1997). In urban area, health becomes crucial as urban poor are more vulnerable to health shocks due to their location.

Social: Social capital is considered as an intangible asset, defined as the rules, norms, obligations, reciprocity, and trust embedded in social relations, social structures, and societies' institutional arrangements. The extent of social capital in a community influences the capacity of people for accessing basic services and acquiring representation (Etemadi 2000, Satterthwaite 1997). This becomes a vital asset in urban area, which is often characterised by social fragmentation, tension, crime and violence as mentioned above. Moser (1998) finds that having such an asset helps poor households to cope with adverse situation and reduces vulnerability.

Financial: Financial capital means financial resources available to people. This may include savings as well as access to credit either formal or informal. Mitlin *et al* (2011) highlight the importance of financial resources for poor in accessing basic goods and services, smoothing consumption, managing and reducing risk and a source of investment finance for asset accumulation and income generation. The author emphasises the role of community saving as one of the ways to address urban poverty as poor may find it difficult in accessing formal institutions due to strictness and rules and regulations. At the same time, use of informal lenders can be costly.

Natural: Natural capital includes the whole range of environmentally provided assets such as soil, atmosphere, forests, minerals, water and wetlands. In urban context, land for shelter is considered critical productive asset.

From the above discussion, it may be drawn that asset vulnerability framework has provided a conceptual framework and operational approach to analyse urban poverty beyond income or consumption. Adding to Moser's framework, a number of organisations and authors have contributed to develop an analytical framework for researcher and operational method for development practitioner. As Moser (2008:8) puts: 'A review of current asset-based approaches shows there is not a single analytical framework or operational approach, but a range of both. It is useful to distinguish between researchers, who have constructed an analytical framework around assets, and practitioners, who have applied this to operational approaches'. This framework has significantly contributed to the debate of poverty by including other dimensions. As the name shows, asset-based approaches are concerned with assets and assets accretion strategies (Moser, 2008). It is also linked with the concept of capability (Moser 2008, Bebbington 1999). Bebbington (1999:2022) argues 'assets are not simply resources that people use to build livelihoods: they give them the capability to be and act'. Sen (1997) also highlights the importance of assets and argues that it should not be seen merely in terms of productivity but as an instrument to enhance the capability of poor.

However, this framework has its limitations. It is argued that this tends to focus more on the micro detail rather than micro-macro linkages. Also, despite recognising the role of structures and processes in poverty reduction, this does not adequately address the issues of politics, power and authority (Norton and Foster 2001). Considering the limitation some authors have suggested to include the human rights perspective in order to enrich the framework (Ferguson *et al* 2006; Satterthwaite, 1997). Satterthwaite (1997) presents a useful summary of different aspects such as increasing income and assets, upholding human rights and improving housing and basic services of poverty reduction in urban area. He further elaborates the role of employment creation, access to credit, education and vocational trainings in increasing income; the importance of access to justice, the right to vote and have representative governments in upholding human rights and the significance of housing and basic services such as improved water, sanitation, drainage and garbage collection, transport and basic health care.

In addition, Satterthwaite (2000) emphasises the role of institution and legislation in order to address the issue of urban poverty. He emphasises the role of local government in poverty reduction along with national governments and international agencies. He argues that local governments can contribute significantly by influencing the different aspects of poverty reduction such as accessing land for housing, providing basic services, serving and supporting a prosperous economy through attracting investment, generating local revenues, supporting pro-poor economies, promoting justice and establishing a local political system which poor and disadvantaged group can influence. It requires a good macro level policy to enhance the capacity of micro level institutions so that elements of urban poverty reduction policies can be translated at the local level. Thus, coordination between national government and local government becomes crucial and at the same time it is also important to establish a good coordination among the different development agencies and programmes. (Etemadi 2000) highlights the role of civil society organisations to strengthen the local level institutions by encouraging the participation and representation of urban poor in planning and implementation of urban poverty reduction programmes.

Above discussion suggests that addressing urban poverty requires a holistic approach to policy formulation. As Wratten (1995:33) concludes: ‘An integrated strategy, which aims to deal with social, economic, political and environmental problems in a coordinated way, offers more hope’. Considering the different concepts and characteristics of urban poverty, it becomes important to address all the aspects related to it such as income, lack of infrastructure and basic services, vulnerability and entitlements. The importance of income cannot be denied when it comes to addressing urban poverty but the other forms of deprivation faced by the urban poor needs to be addressed adequately. The asset vulnerability framework provides useful insights to formulate and operationalize the policies with respect to urban poverty reduction by encompassing the whole range of assets. At the same time, it also becomes important to view this framework not simply as a tool for enhancing the productivity. Adding rights based perspective to this framework may add another dimension by providing right to assets to urban poor. Moreover, addressing urban poverty requires responsive and accountable institutions to the urban poor not only at macro level but also at micro level.

This theoretical construct is used to interpret the issue of urban poverty in India using the case of JNNURM. As discussed above, a growing trend in urbanisation is noticed globally. Therefore, it is imperative to position India in this observed trend. The next chapter highlights this aspect with key features of urban poverty in India.

3. Urbanisation and urban poverty in India

3.1 Urbanisation in India

It is worthwhile to understand which settlements are described as urban when discussing urbanisation in India. Interestingly, there is no standard definition of urban areas and it varies from country to country (UNDP 2009). Census of India (CoI) defines urban areas on two criteria. First, urban areas comprises of municipality, corporation, cantonment board or notified town area committee (or statutory town). Second, all places satisfying following conditions - a minimum population of 5000, at least 75 per cent male main workers engaged in non-agricultural activities and population density of at least 400 per square kilometre, referred as census town (CoI 2011). Other south Asian countries, Nepal applies only population based criteria while Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka follow civic status criterion to define urban areas (UNDP 2009).

CoI (2011) observes a rapid growth in urban population over the last decade. The level of urbanisation in India increased from 27.7 per cent in 2001 to 31.1 per cent in 2011 – an increase of 3.3 percentage points during 2001-2011 compared to an increase of 2.1 percentage points during 1991-2001.

The growth in urban population can be associated with natural increase, net rural-urban classification and rural-to-urban migration. In case of India, the rapid growth in urban population is attributed to a net rural-urban classification and rural-to-urban migration (Bhagat 2011). Indian Institute for Human Settlements (IIHS 2011), analysed 2011 Census data to report that the rate of natural growth declined from 59.4 per cent in 1991-01 to 44.4 per cent in 2001-11, whereas the rate of net rural to urban migration marginally increased from 21.2 per cent in 1991-01 to 24.1 per cent in 2001-11. However, Kundu (2011) observes emergence of new towns in urban scene as a main factor for the growth in the urban population during the 2001-2011. The author further mentions that number of cities went up by only 2541 in all the 10 decades, whilst during 2001 to 2011 it saw unprecedented growth by 2,774 (Table 1).

Table 1: Emergence of new urban areas

	Census 2001	Census 2011	Increase
Towns	5,161	7,935	2,774
Statutory Towns	3,799	4,041	242
Census Towns	1,362	3,894	2,532

Source: CoI, 2011

With regard to contribution of the rural-urban migration to the urban population, it is difficult to make any claim for paucity of data (Kundu 2011). However, some authors argue that this is one of the key factors for increasing number of the urban population (Reddy and Reddy 2011, Banarjee and Dutta 2011, Ministry of Urban Development 2011, Bhagat 2011). Banarjee and Dutta (2011) observe that the growing urban migration has led to an influx of semi-skilled and unskilled labourers to the cities. This has resulted in a pressure on the available jobs and services with high number of population remaining unemployed or getting absorbed in the informal sector. This casualization of labour might increase the number of urban poor.

Another factor contributing to urban migration is declining share of agriculture in Gross Domestic Product (GDP) forcing the rural population towards cities in search of better opportunities (Patnaik 2010). To quantify, the share of agriculture in GDP declined from 34 per cent in 1983-84 to about 15 per cent in 2009-10 while the share of service sector (including Information Technology) in GDP from escalated from 40 per cent to 57 per cent for the same reference years. The decline in agriculture sector forced the rural population towards cities in search of better opportunity and life but they find it difficult to get a job in service sector as it requires skilled labour force. Thus, they either remain unemployed or get absorbed in casual work (High Powered Expert Committee (HPEC), Ministry of Urban Development (MoUD), India 2011). HPEC estimates the share of agriculture would continue to fall and as a result large number of unskilled or semi-skilled labourers would be forced to migrate towards cities in search of better lives. This may lead to increase in the number of urban poor.

As far as the link between urbanisation and urban poverty is concerned, contrasting views can be observed in the literature. On the one hand, some authors argue that urbanization has not placed any pressure on the numbers of urban poor or the HCR. In fact, urbanization and GDP growth appear to have reduced poverty, though at rates suggesting growth has been far less inclusive (Hashim 2009, Datt and Ravallion 2002). On the other hand, other authors find a close link between the growth of urban population and urban poverty. They argue that as the urban population of a region grows, so does urban poverty. In context of developing countries, like India, rapid urbanisation is also associated with an increase in the number of unplanned communities often referred to as slums, which also pose a challenge to sustainable environment. Slums and urban poverty become a certainty because of resource constraints and the inability of city administrations to deal with the increasing demand for jobs, basic services and infrastructure (Reddy and Reddy 2011, Banarjee and Dutta 2011). It is difficult to draw any conclusion on the basis of above claims. However, it becomes important how poverty is defined and understood. Considering the different concepts of poverty, it would be misleading to rely merely on the HCR.

Clearly, in the last decade there has been significant growth in the urban population of India. This growth is attributed mainly to new number of census towns in urban scene along with rural to urban migration. However, components of the urbanisation need to be analysed carefully. Nevertheless, the growth of urban population may pose some serious challenges to the process of development in terms of increasing demands of jobs, providing basic services and infrastructure while also having important for poverty alleviation efforts.

3.2 Urban Poverty in India

In India, official poverty estimates are released by the PCI based on consumer expenditure surveys conducted by the National Sample Survey Organisation and are measured as HCR- the ratio of the poor to the total population (PCI 2012, Bapat 2009). A poor household is defined as one with expenditure level below a specific poverty line. The latest estimates of poverty, released by PCI (2012) show that the all-India HCR has declined by 7.3 percentage points from 37.2 per cent in 2004-05

to 29.8 per cent in 2009-10, with rural poverty declining by 8.0 percentage points from 41.8 per cent to 33.8 per cent and urban poverty declining by 4.8 percentage points from 25.7 per cent to 20.9 per cent (Table 2). Further WG, PCI (2011) observes that the reduction in poverty has been highly uneven in the country. Concentration of poverty has increased in the poor states such as Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh with the proportion of the urban poor registering an increase from 31.1 per cent in 1973-74 to 42.0 per cent in 2004-05 whereas it has declined in progressive states such as Gujarat, Punjab, Kerala and Tamil Nadu.

Table 2: Poverty HCR of poor

	2004-05	2009-10	Decline in percentage point
All India	37.2%	29.8%	7.3%
Urban	25.7%	20.9%	4.8%
Rural	41.8%	33.8%	8%

Source: PCI, 2012

It is also interesting to note that the number of poor has been increasing in the small and medium towns rather than in large cities. Kundu and Sarangi (2005) observe that the million plus cities and medium category cities/towns (population between 50,000 and 1 million) report poverty levels of around 14 per cent and 20 per cent respectively in 1999-2000. The corresponding figure in small towns (population of 50,000 or less) is as high as 24 per cent, slightly higher than even rural areas. The 1993-94 figures reveal slightly different picture. The metropolitan cities can be noted to have the lowest poverty figures at 23 per cent, much below the figures of 32 per cent in medium cities/towns. The small towns report the highest poverty figures of 36 per cent that are marginally below that in rural areas. Himanshu (2011) argues that despite the growing incidence of urban poverty in small and medium towns, they are ignored by the policymakers leading to poor infrastructure and lack of basic services in these areas.

It is clear that the declining rate of poverty has been slow in the urban areas as compared to rural areas and it could be interpreted that the proportion of urban poor has increased to the total number of poor population; however, the incidence of rural poverty is still high.

Now, a question arises whether these figures reflect the real situation and capture the different conceptual understandings or not? It is important to note that India's poverty line has been always a matter of debate. Although dealing with debate in detail is beyond the scope of this paper, it is worthwhile to discuss some points. PCI is often questioned for underestimating the incidence of poverty by setting the poverty line too low (Patnaik 2010, Bapat 2009). Furthermore, the estimates of poverty are also determined by the way in which poverty is defined and measured. As mentioned earlier, there are different views regarding the concepts of poverty and its multidimensional nature is widely acknowledged. India's poverty line fails to capture the other dimensions of poverty such as access to basic services, rights, vulnerability, entitlements, and capabilities (Bapat 2009). If other dimensions of poverty are considered then this would significantly add more numbers to the list of poor. Also, it does not adequately provide information with respect to the basic characteristics of poor such as who the urban poor are, what they do, and where they live. Lack of such information affects the formulation of policies and programmes aimed at alleviating poverty (WG, PCI 2011).

However, some characteristics are associated with urban poverty in India. Most of the urban poor live in 'slums'- an informal settlements characterised by substandard quality of housing; lack of basic services such as lack of access to sanitation facilities and safe water, absence of waste collection system, electricity supply and rainwater drainage; located in the dangerous areas that are prone to floods, landslides and other natural disasters; overcrowded; insecure tenure; hub of social crime and lack of social capital (Reddy and Reddy 2011, Loughhead *et al.* 2001, UN-HABITAT 2003). However, Gupte (2011) argues that above characteristics are static and do not capture the dynamic components of slum. He observes that people living in slum are highly vulnerable due to insecure or non-existent tenures and constant threats of eviction, and they face high degree of physical insecurity especially in terms of coping with health shocks. At the same time, it is also important to realise the fact that all poor households do not necessarily live in slums. But it is argued that even those who are not considered as poor face several deprivation and slums are areas where it is easiest to see poor people in higher concentrations (Risbud 2009).

Loughhead *et al.* (2001) observe two types of slum in India. First, 'recognised' slum settlements where service provision is permitted and the second, illegal 'non-recognised' squatter settlements, where it is not. However, even in recognised slum, the service provision is patchy, poorly maintained, and severely under-resourced. Recognised status permits poor to make demands on the political system but this does not mean their voices are heard. People in non-reorganised slums represent the vulnerable group among the poor and live in hazardous conditions along polluted canal banks, on pavements, and along railway lines, in constant fear of eviction or relocation.

In addition, the urban poor are vulnerable in terms of income and assets. They are described as daily wage earners; semi and unskilled workers or self-employed in the informal sector in a constant fear of income insecurity as informal sector gives them less productive work, lower wages and partial employment. Lack of skills and illiteracy restrict their choice to get a better opportunity in formal sector (Reddy and Reddy 2011, Patnaik 2010, Unni 2009, Kumar and Gayatri 2006, Loughhead *et al* 2001). Unni (2009) finds that the poor work in enterprises in the informal sector which are mainly unregistered under any authority and not recognised as legal. Among the self-employed, the lack of clarity regarding the employer-employee relationship and a clearly unidentifiable place of work, particularly among woman, add to their denial of legal recognition as enterprises and as a result they are often harassed by local authorities and the police. It also limits their access to formal financial institutions such as banks credit. Lack of income and savings increase the vulnerability of poor due to greater degree of commercialisation for goods and services in slums, which is the only source for poor to meet the household expenditure. Furthermore, lack of assets such as physical, social, financial and human capital exacerbates their vulnerability (Loughhead *et al* 2001).

Moreover, some of the urban poor in India have an ascribed status which is often associated with caste. Poverty among occupational groups such as rickshaw puller, fisherman, lepers, and sweepers is related to their caste and these groups often live in separate settlements. The principle of settlement by group for excluded people can also extend to labels for specific individuals, such as the disabled, deserted

women, sex workers, refugees, street children, the mentally ill, destitute and vagrants. These groups lack political voice and are often harassed by the police and local authorities. These groups and individuals are considered the most vulnerable among the poor (Loughhead *et al* 2001).

The characteristics of urban poor observed by Wratten can be seen in case of India as well. Poor living conditions, financial exclusion, lack of assets, income insecurity, physical insecurity, deprivation of basic services, lack of political voice and vulnerability all these feature can be associated with urban poor India. It also seems that consumption based measurement of poverty fails to capture these dimensions. Hence, it becomes important to consider above characteristics of urban poverty in India when it comes to policy formulation.

3.3 Urban poverty alleviation programmes

As mentioned, the focus on urban development attained prominence from Seventh Five Year Plan (1985-90) onwards (Table 3). Two programmes were launched initially; the Urban Basic Services (UBS) and the Self Employment Programme for the Urban Poor (SEPUP). The Eighth Five Year Plan (1992-97) reinforced the need of employment programme by replacing SEPUP with a new employment programme called Nehru Rozgar Yojna (NRY) and broadened the scope of UBS. At the beginning of the Tenth Year Plan (2002-2007), various schemes – the National Slum Development Programme (NSDP), Swarna Jayanti Shahri Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY), Valmiki Ambedkar Awas Yojna (VAMBAY), a programme of building of night shelters, Accelerated Urban Water Supply (AUWSP) and Low-Cost Sanitation - were in place to provide a range of services to the urban poor including the slum-dwellers. Many of the schemes here included identification of the urban poor, formation of community groups, self-help thrift and credit activities, training for livelihood, credit and subsidy for economic activities, housing and sanitation, environmental improvement, community assets, wage employment, and convergence of services (Mathur 2009).

Table 3: Chronology of urban poverty alleviation programme in India

1958	Urban Community Development
1972	Environmental Improvement of Urban Slums
1981	Low Cost Sanitation for Liberation of Scavengers
1986	Urban Basic Services
1986	Self-Employment Programme for the Urban Poor
1989	Nehru Rozgar Yojna
1990	Urban Basic Services for the Poor
1995	Prime Minister's Integrated Urban Poverty eradication Programme
1996	National Slum Development Programme
1997	Swarna Jayanti Sahari Rozgar Yojna
2005	Urban Infrastructure and Governance, Basic Services to Urban Poor, Urban Infrastructure and Development Scheme for Small and Medium Towns and Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme under JNNURM
2010	Rajiv Awas Yojna / JNNURM

Source: Mathur (2009) and Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation (MoHUPA), GoI.

Majority of programmes, launched before 2000 are criticised for inadequately addressing the issue of urban poverty. The factors such as overlapping objectives and strategies; ineffective targeting, particularly in employment-related programmes, frequent changes in the operational framework, lack of community involvement and lack of proper planning are often associated with the criticism (HPEC 2011, Mathur 2009, Amis 1997). However, JNNURM is seen as a major shift in the approach towards the urban development and in the way urban poverty should be understood and responded (Mathur 2009, Sivaramakrishnan 2010). The following section highlights the key features of JNNURM.

4. The programmatic features of JNNURM

4.1 Introduction to the scheme

The key aim of the mission is to improve and expand economic and social infrastructure of the cities as well as providing affordable housing and basic services to the urban poor. In order to make Indian cities economically productive, efficient and inclusive, the mission promotes several city and state level reforms by funding the projects conditional on reforms. It funds specific projects for urban infrastructure and basic urban services in 65 cities (up from 63 initially) of India through two schemes, the Scheme for Urban Infrastructure and Governance (UIG) and the Scheme for Basic Services to the Urban Poor (BSUP). The other two schemes, the Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme for Small and Medium Towns (UIDSSMT) and the Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (IHSDP) cover non-Mission cities and towns with the aim of integrated provision of basic entitlements and services to all including the urban poor (JNNURM guideline 2006).

UIG and UIDSSMT are being administered by the MoUD, India while BSUP and IHSDP are being implemented by the MoHUPA, India (MoHUPA). In addition, recently Rajiv Awas Yojna (RAY) is launched to accelerate the pace of construction of housing for the urban poor under JNNURM. The existing schemes of Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns, Mega City, Urban Reform Incentive Fund, AUWSP, NSDP and VAMBAY) were subsumed into the mission (JNNURM guideline 2006).

4.2 Strategy of the Mission

In the programmatic frame of JNNURM, the Government of India enters into partnership with state governments and Urban Local Bodies (ULBs). First, the ULB has to prepare a perspective plan or a City Development Plan (CDP), which is followed by a Detailed Project Report (DPR) in line with the priorities laid out in the CDP. Next, the state government and the ULB of a Mission city are required to sign a memorandum of agreement with the GoI, where both the state government and the ULB commit to a set of reforms and they all agree to share in the funding of the project. Finally, the state government and the ULB are expected to make specified parallel financial contributions along with the GoI. For large cities with

population of more than 4 million, a 35 per cent grant is made by the GoI, 15 per cent by the state government, and 50 per cent by the ULB. In the case of cities with population between 1 and 4 million, 50 per cent is provided by the GoI, 20 per cent by the state government, and 30 per cent by the ULB. For all other cities, the GoI provides 80 per cent of the grant, while the state government and the ULB contribute 10 per cent each. Cities in north-eastern states and Jammu and Kashmir receive 90 per cent grant from the GoI and 10 per cent from the state government (Overview, JNNURM no date). Annexure-1 presents the list of mission cities.

There are two programmatic focus areas – sectors of assistance and institutional reforms. The Table 4 below lists the components of each focus area (more details in Annexure-2 and Annexure-3).

Table 4: Salient features of JNNURM

Sectors of assistance	Institutional reforms
UIG <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Core civic amenities in old, inner and outer city areas – streets and drainage system 2. Water supply and sanitation 3. Sewerage and solid waste management 4. Urban transport systems 	Mandatory reforms <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State level <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Enactment of supportive laws – rent control, taxes, community participation, public disclosure b. Implementation of the recommendations of 74th constitutional amendment – elections of ULB, devolution of powers 2. ULB level <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Accounting and property tax reforms b. Recovering User Charges c. E-Governance set up
BSUP <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Integrated slum development and rehabilitation 2. Projects on water supply, sewerage, drainage, community toilets, and baths 3. Houses for the poor 4. Civic amenities - community halls, child care centres 5. Convergence of health, education and social security schemes for the urban poor 	Optional reforms <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State level <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Introduction of Property Title Certification system 2. ULB level <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Computerised process of registration of land and property b. Revision of building bye-laws to streamline approval process c. Bye-laws for rain-water harvesting and water recycling d. Administrative reforms and mechanisms for public-private partnerships

Source: (Overview, JNNURM no date)

Now it would be interesting to analyse the extent to which JNNURM addresses the issue of urban poverty in India based on the literature reviewed in the previous sections.

5. Does JNNURM address the needs of urban poor?

Undoubtedly, JNNURM reflects a significant shift in public policy towards the issue of urban development and addressing the needs of poor. It has generated a lot of hope among citizenry and development thinkers. It is considered to be a comprehensive package to make the urban centres more productive, efficient and inclusive. It is interesting to analyse the features of the mission with respect to the different characteristics of urban poverty and also in relation to the approaches to address it as discussed above.

5.1 Analysing key features with respect to addressing urban poverty

Security of Tenure

One of the key features of the mission is to provide security of tenure and housing at affordable price to urban poor, slum dwellers, Economically Weaker Sections (EWS) and Low Income Group (LIG). As per MoHUPA (2007), EWS and LIG households are defined as families having monthly household income of less than Rs. 3,300 and Rs. 7,300 respectively. According to JNNURM all slum dwellers must be provided with security of tenure. Local governments are expected to provide tenure to slum dwellers on site or at sites near the (within the radius of 1 to 2 kilometre) existing settlements so that their livelihoods are not affected. Only those slums that are non-tenable may be relocated; that is those that are located either on infrastructure pathways, land sites marked for major development projects in the city or where sites are near areas which can pose health risks such as large drains, land fill sites. City governments are required to report to JNNURM, numbers of slum settlements (notified and non-notified) who are granted security of tenure annually (Provision of Basic services to Urban Poor, JNNURM no date).

This is important as lack of security of tenure is considered as a major factor contributing to poverty and vulnerability in the context of urban area. This is also true in the context of India where urban poor face several problems due to lack of security of tenure as discussed earlier. Housing is considered as one of important physical assets required to address poverty. Also, it is recognised as an economic asset as poor can generate their income through home based production. Further, legal housing made available to urban poor would enhance their status as citizens

of the cities, who are able to make demand. Thus it could lead to their political empowerment as well.

Basic Public Services

Further, JNNURM aims to provide basic services to the urban poor such as water supply, sanitation, power, roads and transport. This would help to improve the quality of life of urban poor communities. To highlight, the mission considers the other dimensions of urban poverty by focusing on these services. These services are also considered as important physical capital required in addressing poverty and vulnerability of urban poor. Investing in upgrading slums and urban poor settlements and providing them with basic municipal services at a level that is equitable with that supplied to the rest of the city would help build sustainable and inclusive cities. As far as other social services such as health and education, which directly contribute towards building human capital, are concerned the mission does not directly focus on these.

However, JNNURM encourages the convergence of other existing universal programmes related to health, education and social security. In order to make these services available to urban poor, a mandatory reform for ULBs has been proposed by the mission. According to the mandatory reform at ULB level, it is expected that poor communities in urban areas will have improved access to social services such as education, health and other social programmes of the government which in turn would help reduce poverty. Also, JNNURM funds for the project on construction and improvement of drains and storm water drains, environmental improvement of slums and solid waste management which may reduce the risk of diseases and the vulnerability of urban poor in terms of health shocks as it is well-known that poor and unhygienic condition contribute to number of diseases. It may be said that the mission acknowledges the importance of basic services for poor as a way to reduce the poverty and vulnerability.

Role of Institutions

Next, the approach of the mission is to make institutions more effective, efficient and responsive to the needs of poor. As discussed earlier, several authors observe that the role of institutions at micro as well as macro level becomes important at tackling urban poverty. The mission highlights the role of institutions through

several state and ULB level reforms. It may be noted that one of the thrust area of the mission is to bring the reform in urban governance. State level reforms such as implementation of the 74th Constitutional Amendment Act, which empowers ULBs to contribute in the development of urban areas, elections to ULBs and transfer of 12th schedule functions to ULBs, formation of District/Metropolitan Planning Committees (DPCs/MPCs), assigning city planning functions to ULBs could be considered as major a step in the direction of decentralised system. Enactment of Public Disclosure Law, a reform for state governments and reforms for municipal finances such as introduction of accrual-based double-entry system, preparation of annual balance sheets may increase the accountability of these institutions towards urban poor. JNNURM also promotes downward accountability of ULBs towards residents. For example, e-governance practised in many ULBs allows citizen grievances to be recorded and tracked (Mehta and Mehta 2010).

Community Participation

The paradigm shift from supply-driven to demand-based changed the development focus by placing community in the centre rather than imposing agenda from the top. The mission promotes community participation right from the planning to the formulation of city development plans, expecting the plan to be based on priorities of the community. To strengthen the participation of the community in the development process, enactment of Community Participation Law as a mandatory reform for state governments has been proposed by the mission. Also, the mission encourages civil society organisations to make the process more inclusive and effective. This clearly creates a space for the poor to participate and make their demands in the development process.

Income Security

In terms of addressing the vulnerability of the urban poor that arises due to income security, the mission does not say anything directly as projects related to wage employment and creation of fresh employment opportunities are not eligible under it (overview, JNNURM no date). As secondary literature suggests, making urban poor secured in terms of income is essential to address urban poverty. However, it may be argued that building infrastructure such as roads, highways and houses would lead to job creation. It is important to note that this may create temporary

jobs and would not address the issue of vulnerability of urban poor that arises due to casual nature of jobs. Therefore, greater role of other existing schemes such as SJSRY which focuses on aspects related to employment and skill enhancement comes to fore so that the poor can make use of opportunities provided by the market. Thus the convergence of this programme with JNNURM becomes crucial.

Social Issues

The mission does not seem to address the issue of social fragmentation and crime, one of the characteristics of urban poverty. The importance of social capital such as social network, intra-household relation and neighbourhood in addressing the poverty and vulnerability in urban context was noted in secondary literature. This could be measured as one of the limitations of the mission. However, the mission attempts to change the intra-household relationship between men and women by giving preferential treatment to women. The mission states: title of land should preferably be in the name of the wife and alternatively jointly in the names of husband and wife. In exceptional cases, title in the name of male beneficiary is permitted (JNNURM Directorate, MoHUPA no date). However, Khosla (2009) argues that the mission does not address the needs of women adequately and gender based approach has been overlooked in the city development plan and detailed projects reports.

It seems that JNNURM has attempted to address some of the important characteristics of urban poverty by laying impetus on prominent issue such as lack of housing and basic services. It also emphasises the role of institutions at micro as well as macro level to ensure the effectiveness of these services. Although it does not directly cover some of the social services such as education and health, it proposes several reforms for state governments and ULBs to make these services available to urban poor through convergence with other programmes. The mission also acknowledges the bottom up approach to development and focuses on the participation of the poor in the projects. Nonetheless, it does not adequately address the issue of vulnerability of urban poor arising due to income insecurity and the issues related to social relations, social structures, and societies' institutional arrangements. Despite some limitations, the mission intends to include the urban

poor in the mainstream of cities development and allow them to live as legitimate citizens.

At the same time it is also important to highlight some practical challenges to its implementation. While the objectives and aims of the mission are no doubt noble, it is the implementation that underlines if it is effective or not. Some concerns related to implementation are discussed below.

5.2 Implementation challenges

Land Availability

One of the components of JNNURM is to build infrastructure which requires suitable land in urban area. Projects of waste management (development of land fill sites), water supply (laying of pipe lines), sewerage (laying of sewer lines), re-allocation of industries from inner city area to the conforming zones, housing for urban poor and resettlement of slums require large chunk of land. It is well-known fact the land is a scarce commodity in urban areas (Singh, 2007). Unavailability of government and municipal land at the appropriate site and huge fund required for the acquisition of private land may affect the progress of these projects. Also, it might be difficult for state governments and ULBs to provide security of tenure to urban poor particularly to slum dwellers and they may be forced to relocate from the inner city area thus affecting their livelihoods.

Identification of beneficiary

The mission pronounces providing houses to urban poor at affordable prices. The targeting and identification of urban poor is challenging task for the ULBs. In case of slum dwellers, the targeting and identification appears relatively easy but as discussed, not all poor people live in slums and they may be scattered across the city thereby making identification difficult. Also, in context of India, several groups such as fisherman, sweepers, beggars, disabled, deserted women, sex workers, refugees, street children, the mentally ill, destitute and vagrants have ascribed status and they are considered the most vulnerable among the poor. It is likely that these groups find it difficult to afford houses even at the low cost as proposed by the mission. This may lead to their exclusion from benefits of the mission.

Low Capacity of ULBs

As already mentioned, for central assistance a city development plan and detailed project reports need to be prepared at ULBs level. The role of ULBs becomes important in this regard. It is important to note that the formulation of a comprehensive plan requires uses of several planning tools such as Geographic Information System mapping. It is observed that the planning process has been poor due to lack of capacity at ULBs level and lack of community participation in different states of India (HPEC 2011). It is interesting to note that most of the reforms proposed by the JNNURM owe their origin to 74th Constitutional Amendment which empowers the local government. The supreme law of the land puts local government in the state list. Thus the political and administrative will of the state governments become crucial to make a suitable environment for the ULBs to implement such reforms (Singh 2007). It is observed that planning and implementation has been more successful in some of the progressive states such as Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Gujarat, Maharashtra, and Tamil Nadu, where governance reforms have been implemented and supplementary funds have been provided by the state government and local government (HPEC 2011). Further, Mahadevia (2011) observes that the CDP preparation in many cities has been arbitrary and undemocratically completed by experts, many of whom had no prior knowledge of the city or cities and certainly no stake.

Issue of Convergence

The mission focuses on the importance of convergence with other programmes as an integrated approach to address the need of urban poor. As mentioned, the programmes related to health, education, employment does not come under the JNNURM directly. Providing these services to the urban poor requires a convergence of various departments at state as well as municipal level. However, MoHUPA(2008) identifies that the efforts of convergence are few and not very effective both at state and municipal levels. Different departments have differing focus and priority areas, with poor coordination between them. Administrative convergence is also poor. In fact, the attitude of government officials often reflects

a resistance on their part to the concept of convergence. In such a situation, it could be difficult for poor to access all the services required to address poverty and vulnerability in a holistic manner.

Inter-State Variation

The performance of the JNNURM varies across the states and union territories. Some of the states and union territories such as Maharashtra, Delhi, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal and Gujarat have done quite well relatively. These states account 391 numbers of sanctioned projects out of 552 under UIG of the JNNURM (Annex 4) as on 6 August 2012. Maharashtra tops with 80 sanctioned projects while Chhattisgarh has only one. This clearly reflects that some of the states have failed to introduce the state and ULB level reforms which are mandatory for central assistance under JNNURM. Also, the focus of JNNURM is primarily on two components, UIG and BSUP for 65 Mission Cities as 75 per cent of the assistance is committed to 65 mission cities under UIG and BSUP; 25 per cent is for the rest 640 towns under IHSDP and UIDSSMT (IIHS 2011). This uncovers that the small towns and medium towns are not in the priority of the JNNURM which possibly hinders the efforts of urban poverty alleviation as the number of urban poor has been increasing in these centre as discussed in section 3.

Overall, JNNURM has the potential to address the needs of urban poor if implemented properly. The components under the mission cover the different aspects that could be considered as a major shift in policy to address the urban poverty in India. Considering the multi-dimensional nature of urban poverty in India and diverse ways to address it, it may be argued that JNNURM engages with them to a large extent, although, there are some limitations. It is crucial to minimise the practical challenges to implementation which would help the mission to achieve the desired outcome.

6. Conclusion

To sum up, this dissertation has tried to explore the different concepts of urban poverty and various approaches to address it by reviewing available secondary literature. Then the case of JNNURM was analysed to see how it engages with different approaches.

It is understood that poverty has many dimensions and would be misleading to ignore the different aspects of it when it comes to policy formulation. As far as the difference between urban and rural poverty is concerned, it is difficult to make any distinction because different concepts of poverty may be equally applied in both the areas. However, there are some characteristics that need to be recognised when formulating any policy in response to the needs of the urban poor. The study reinstates that the urban poor are vulnerable for several reasons such as insecure incomes, lack of assets, lack of security of tenure, deprivation of basic services and poor living conditions. Therefore, addressing urban poverty requires a policy that recognises the importance of different aspects essential to address the needs of urban poor; addressing income as well as physical insecurity, ensuring rights, building assets and emphasising the role of responsive institutions.

Launch of JNNURM is considered as a major shift in policy towards addressing the needs of urban centres in India. Analysis of the mission reveals that it encompasses all schemes for building infrastructure and providing basic services to the urban poor. At the same time it highlights the importance of several reforms at state as well as ULB level. It encourages participation of urban poor in the planning and implementation of the projects. Undoubtedly, projects related to housing for poor, providing security of tenure to the urban poor, water supply and solid waste management will improve the living condition of urban poor significantly. The study notices that the mission does not capture the projects related to health, education and employment generation directly, but it encourages the convergence of such programmes through several reforms. On inadequacy, it seems lacking on attacking the structural causes of urban poverty. Besides, there are some practical challenges to implementation. The study makes certain suggestions that could support making the mission more effective.

First, looking at the important role of ULBs, the state governments should ensure that ULBs discharge their responsibilities in accordance with 74th Constitutional

Amendment. In order to do so the central government will have to encourage the state governments to create a suitable environment so that ULBs can perform up to the expectations.

Second, it is vital to focus on building capacities of ULBs, since inadequate capacity is considered as one of the major obstacles for the successful implementation of JNNURM. In accordance with the 74th constitutional amendment, the service delivery capacity of the ULBs needs to be improved.

Third, community participation in the process of planning and implementation of CDP and DPR need to be encouraged so that the urban poor can make their demands. Special attention needs to be given to the most vulnerable groups so that they can also enjoy their rights as a citizen of city. ULBs may join hands with civil society organisation to mobilise the urban poor in order to make the process more inclusive. Enactment of Community Participation Law in its true spirit should be ensured by the state governments.

Fourth, considering the importance of convergence with other programmes and departments, clear policy directions and guidelines can be issued at the central as well as state level. Officials of other departments and programmes should be encouraged to participate in the process of planning right from the beginning. Finally, looking at the increasing number of the urban poor in small and medium towns, more focus should to be given to these areas in the second phase of the JNNURM.

These suggestions if embraced might help in better implementation of the programme. However, the feasibility of such suggestions needs to be checked in the context of the prevailing local conditions.

Annexure 1: List of mission cities included in JNNURM

Sl. No.	City/Urban Agglomeration	Name of the State
a)	Mega Cities/UAs	
1.	Delhi	Delhi
2.	Greater Mumbai	Maharashtra
3.	Ahmedabad	Gujarat
4.	Bangalore	Karnataka
5.	Chennai	Tamil Nadu
6.	Kolkata	West Bengal
7.	Hyderabad	Andhra Pradesh
b)	Million- Plus Cities/UAs	
1.	Patna	Bihar
2.	Faridabad	Haryana
3.	Bhopal	Madhya Pradesh
4.	Ludhiana	Punjab
5.	Jaipur	Rajasthan
6.	Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh
7.	Madurai	Tamil Nadu
8.	Nashik	Maharashtra
9.	Pune	Maharashtra
10.	Cochin	Kerala
11.	Varanasi	Uttar Pradesh
12.	Agra	Uttar Pradesh
13.	Amritsar	Punjab
14.	Visakhapatnam	Andhra Pradesh
15.	Vadodara	Gujarat
16.	Surat	Gujarat
17.	Kanpur	Uttar Pradesh
18.	Nagpur	Maharashtra
19.	Coimbatore	Tamil Nadu
20.	Meerut	Uttar Pradesh
21.	Jabalpur	Madhya Pradesh
22.	Jamshedpur	Jharkhand
23.	Asansol	West Bengal
24.	Allahabad	Uttar Pradesh
25.	Vijayawada	Andhra Pradesh
26.	Rajkot	Gujarat
27.	Dhanbad	Jharkhand
28.	Indore	Madhya Pradesh
c).	Identified Cities/UAs with less than one million population	
1.	Guwahati	Assam
2.	Itanagar	Arunachal Pradesh
3.	Jammu	Jammu & Kashmir

4.	Raipur	Chhattisgarh
5.	Panaji	Goa
6.	Shimla	Himachal Pradesh
7.	Ranchi	Jharkhand
8.	Thiruvananthapuram	Kerala
9.	Imphal	Manipur
10.	Shillong	Meghalaya
11.	Aizawal	Mizoram
12.	Kohima	Nagaland
13.	Bhubaneswar	Orissa
14.	Gangtok	Sikkim
15.	Agartala	Tripura
16.	Dehradun	Uttaranchal
17.	Bodh Gaya	Bihar
18.	Ujjain	Madhya Pradesh
19.	Puri	Orissa
20.	Ajmer-Pushkar	Rajasthan
21.	Nainital	Uttaranchal
22.	Mysore	Karnataka
23.	Pondicherry	Pondicherry
24.	Chandigarh	Punjab & Haryana
25.	Srinagar	Jammu & Kashmir
26.	Mathura	Uttar Pradesh
27.	Hardwar	Uttaranchal
28.	Nanded	Maharashtra
29.	Porbunder	Gujarat
30.	Tirupati	Andhra Pradesh

Annexure 2: Sectors and projects eligible for assistance under JNNURM

Sectors and Projects Eligible for Assistance under the Sub-Mission Directorate for Urban Infrastructure and Governance

1. Urban renewal, that is, redevelopment of inner (old) city areas [including widening of narrow streets, shifting of industrial and commercial establishments from non-conforming (inner-city) areas to conforming (outer city) areas to reduce congestion, replacement of old and worn out pipes by new and higher capacity ones, renewal of the sewerage, drainage, and solid waste disposal system etc.] ;
2. Water supply (including desalination plants) and sanitation.
3. Sewerage and solid waste management.
4. Construction and improvement of drains and storm water drains.
5. Urban transportation including roads, highways, expressways, MRTS, and metro projects.
6. Parking lots and spaces on Public-Private Partnership (PPP) basis.
7. Development of heritage areas
8. Prevention and rehabilitation of soil erosion and landslides only in cases of special category states where such problems are common; and
9. Preservation of water bodies.

NOTE: Land cost will not be financed except for acquisition of private land for schemes and projects in the North Eastern States and hilly States, namely Himachal Pradesh, Uttaranchal and Jammu and Kashmir (Overview, JNNURM, Government of India)

Sectors and Projects Eligible for Assistance under the Sub-Mission Directorate for Basic Services to the Urban Poor

The sectors and projects eligible for JNNURM assistance in eligible cities would be as follows:

1. Integrated development of slums, housing and development of infrastructure projects in slums in the identified cities;
2. Projects involving development, improvement, and maintenance of basic services to the urban poor.
3. Slum improvement and rehabilitation of projects.

4. Projects on water supply, sewerage, drainage, community toilets, and baths etc.
5. Projects for providing houses at affordable cost for slum dwellers, urban poor, Economically Weaker Sections (EWS) and Lower Income Group (LIG) categories.
6. Construction and improvement of drains and storm water drains.
7. Environmental improvement of slums and solid waste management.
8. Street lighting.
9. Civic amenities like community halls, child care centres etc.
10. Operation and Maintenance of assets created under this component.
11. Convergence of health, education and social security schemes for the urban poor

Projects pertaining to power, telecom, health, education, wage employment programme and staff components, creation of fresh employment opportunities are not eligible for JNNURM assistance (Overview, JNNURM, Government of India).

Annexure 3: Reforms under JNNURM

A. Mandatory Reforms for State Governments:

1. Implementation of the 74th Constitutional Amendment
 - a. Elections to ULBs and transfer of 12th Schedule functions to ULBs
 - b. Formation of District/Metropolitan Planning Committees (DPCs/MPCs)
2. Assigning City Planning Functions to ULBs
3. Reform in Rent Control
4. Rationalisation of stamp duty to not more than 5 per cent
5. Repeal of ULCRA
6. Enactment of Community Participation Law
7. Enactment of Public Disclosure Law

B. Mandatory Reforms for ULBs:

1. Reforms for Municipal Finances:
 - a. Accounting Reforms
 - i. Introduction of accrual-based double-entry system
 - ii. Preparation of annual balance sheets
 - b. Property Tax Reforms
 - i. Introduction of Self-Assessment system
 - ii. More than 85 per cent properties to be brought under tax record
 - iii. More than 90 per cent tax collection
 - c. Recovering User Charges
 - i. 100 per cent collection of operations and maintenance expenses for water supply and solid waste management
 - d. E-Governance set up
 - e. Internal earmarking of funds for services to the urban poor
 - f. Provision of basic services to the urban poor

C. Optional Reforms for State Governments:

1. Introduction of Property Title Certification system in ULBs Earmarking 20-25 per cent of developed land for LIG/EWS categories
2. Simplification of framework for conversion of land from agricultural to Non-agricultural purposes

D. Optional Reforms for ULBs:

1. Computerised process of registration of land and property

2. Revision of building bye-laws to streamline approval process
3. Bye-laws for rain-water harvesting
4. Bye-laws for reuse of recycled water
5. Administrative reforms
 - a. HRD policy covering recruitment, training, transfers, and promotions
6. Structural reforms
 - a. Building municipal cadre
7. Encouraging public private partnerships (PPPs)

Note: ULCRA is Urban Land Ceiling and Regulation Act; LIG is low income groups; EWS is economically weaker sections; and HRD is human resource development.

Source: MoUD, Government of India.

Annexure 4: State wise details of sanctioned projects under UIG of JNNURM

As on 6-08-12, Amount Rs in Lakhs

Sl.No.	Name of State	Total Originall Allocation	Additional Allocation	Total Allocation (Original +	Number of projects	Cost of sanctioned projects	ACA admissible	ACA released
1	Andhra	171845.00	40000.00	211845.00	52	4,98,831.01	2,11,384.08	1,60,681.37
2	Arunachal Pradesh	740.00	10000.00	10740.00	3	18,048.20	16,243.38	12,565.15
3	Assam	17320.00	10000.00	27320.00	2	31,610.71	28,449.64	24,813.27
4	Bihar	44241.00	15000.00	59241.00	8	71,181.41	39,475.73	9,858.94
5	Chandigarh	17087.00	10000.00	27087.00	3	19,119.60	15,297.68	2,684.64
6	Chattisgarh	14803.00	10000.00	24803.00	1	30,364.00	24,291.20	21,862.08
7	Delhi	272318.00	10000.00	282318.00	23	6,89,456.00	2,41,308.90	88,745.73
8	Goa	2094.00	10000.00	12094.00	2	7,484.08	5,987.26	1,496.82
9	Gujarat	207881.00	50000.00	257881.00	72	5,60,470.06	2,47,507.15	1,86,784.98
10	Haryana	22332.00	10000.00	32332.00	4	69,909.02	34,954.51	25,290.42
11	Himachal	3066.00	10000.00	13066.00	5	16,373.68	12,599.75	3,472.84
12	Jammu &	33836.00	15000.00	48836.00	5	55,184.03	48,775.63	22,226.63
13	Jharkhand	64120.00	30000.00	94120.00	5	79,485.72	49,936.58	18,688.73
14	Karnataka	137459.00	15000.00	152459.00	47	3,69,213.80	1,45,345.76	95,875.62
15	Kerala	47476.00	20000.00	67476.00	11	99,789.00	64,554.60	23,031.03
16	Madhya	97850.00	35000.00	132850.00	23	2,45,921.54	1,25,920.25	75,502.77
17	Maharashtra	505555.00	45000.00	550555.00	80	11,58,214.73	5,15,797.42	4,11,008.31
18	Manipur	5287.00	10000.00	15287.00	3	15,395.66	13,856.10	5,542.45

19	Meghalaya	5668.00	10000.00	15668.00	2	21,795.72	19,616.15	12,750.50
20	Mizoram	4822.00	10000.00	14822.00	4	12,772.16	11,494.94	3,630.57
21	Nagaland	1628.00	10000.00	11628.00	3	11,594.13	10,434.72	3,517.90
22	Orissa	17235.00	15000.00	32235.00	5	81,197.66	63,712.53	22,927.57
23	Punjab	50775.00	20000.00	70775.00	6	72,539.00	36,269.50	16,483.31
24	Puducherry	10680.00	10000.00	20680.00	2	25,306.00	20,244.80	7,502.20
25	Rajasthan	59869.00	15000.00	74869.00	13	1,22,773.11	76,555.00	43,261.74
26	Sikkim	613.00	10000.00	10613.00	2	9,653.67	8,688.30	6,185.58
27	Tamil Nadu	195066.00	30000.00	225066.00	48	5,30,128.28	2,12,676.48	1,44,944.11
28	Tripura	4018.00	10000.00	14018.00	2	18,047.00	16,043.40	6,417.36
29	Uttar	211941.00	65000.00	276941.00	33	5,36,361.94	2,69,660.51	2,04,768.04
30	Uttarakhand	20534.00	20000.00	40534.00	14	40,256.22	31,809.10	21,020.71
31	West Bengal	301840.00	20000.00	321840.00	69	6,85,702.36	2,50,938.34	1,14,848.76
	Total	2549999.00	600000.00	3149999.00	552	62,04,179.50	28,69,829.38	17,98,390.13

Source: www.jnnurm.nic.in

References

- Amato, P. R. and Zuo, J. (1992) 'Rural Poverty, urban poverty, and psychological well-being' *The Sociological Quarterly*, 33(2), pp.229-240.
- Amis, P. (1997) 'Indian urban poverty: Where are the levers for its affective alleviation', *IDS Bulletin*, 28(2), pp. 94-105.
- Baker, J. and Schuler, N. (2004) *Analyzing urban poverty: A summary of methods and approaches*. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Banerjee, A. and Dutta, C. (2011) 'Status of urban poor in selected cities of India under JNNURM', *Nagarlok*, 43(2), pp. 29-60.
- Bapat, M. (2009) *Poverty lines and lives of the poor: Underestimation of urban poverty - the case of India*. London: International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Bebbington, A. (1999) 'Capitals and capabilities: A framework for analyzing peasant viability, rural livelihoods and poverty', *World Development*, 27(12), pp. 2021-2044.
- Bhagat, R. B. (2011) 'Emerging pattern of urbanisation in India', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 46(34), pp. 10-12.
- Carney, D., Drinkwater, M., Rusinow, T., Neeffjes, K., Wanmali, S. and Singh, N. (1999) *Livelihoods approaches compared: A brief comparison of livelihoods approaches of the UK DFID, CARE, Oxfam and UNDP*. United Kingdom: Department for international Development.
- Census of India, Registrar General and Census Commissioner (2011) *Rural urban distribution of population*. New Delhi: Ministry of Home Affairs.
- Chambers, R. (2006) 'Vulnerability, Coping and Policy', *IDS Bulletin*, 37(4), pp. 33-40.
- Etemadi, F.U. (2000) 'Civil society participation in city governance in Cebu City', *Environment & Urbanization*, 12(1), pp.57-72.
- Ferguson, C., Moser, C.O.N. and Norton, A. (2006) *Contesting Rights: Citizenship, Power and Assets*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution.

Government of India, Jawahar Lal Nehru National Renewal Urban Mission (2006) *Modified Guidelines for projects of Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission on urban infrastructure and governance*. [Online]. Available from: < <http://jnnurm.nic.in/>> (Accessed: 15 July 2012)

Government of India, Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban renewal Mission (no date), *Overview*. New Delhi: Government of India. [Online] Available from : <<http://jnnurm.nic.in/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/PMSpeechOverviewE.pdf>> (Accessed: 20 July 2012)

Government of India, Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban renewal Mission (no date), *Basic services to urban poor*. New Delhi: Government of India. [Online] Available from: <http://jnnurm.nic.in/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Mandatory_Primer_6-PBSUP.pdf> (Accessed: 15 August 2012).

Government of India, Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation (2007) *National Urban housing and habitat policy*. New Delhi: Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation.

Government of India, Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation (no date). *JNNURM Directorate*. New Delhi: Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation. [Online] Available from: <<http://mhupa.gov.in/PQAS/jnnurm.pdf>> (Accessed: 22 August 2012).

Government of India, Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation (2008) *National workshop on health and urban poverty*. New Delhi: Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation.

Gunewardena, D. (2004) *Poverty Measurement: Meanings, Methods and Requirements*. Centre for Poverty Analysis: Colombo.

Gupte, J. (2012) 'Linking urban vulnerability, extralegal security, and civil violence: The case of the urban dispossessed in Mumbai', in Desai, R. and Sanyal, R. (ed.) *Urbanizing citizenship: Contested spaces in Indian cities*. New Delhi: Sage publications. pp. 190-211.

Haan, A. (1997) 'Rural-urban migration and poverty: The case of India', *IDS Bulletin*, 28(2), pp. 35-47.

- Hasan, S. (2002) *Literature review of poverty and urban development indicators*. Homeless International: Coventry.
- Hashim, S. R. (2009) 'Economic Development and Urban Poverty', in Ministry of Housing and urban poverty Alleviation, Government of India and United nations Development Programme , *India urban poverty report 2009*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-27.
- High Powered Expert Committee, Government of India (HPEC, 2011) *Report on Indian infrastructure and services*, New Delhi: Ministry of Urban Development.
- Himanshu(2011) *Urban Poverty in India by Size-Class of Towns: Level, Trends and Characteristics*. New Delhi: Centre de Sciences Humaines.
- Indian Institute for Human Settlements (IIHS, 2011) *Urban India 2011: Evidence*. New Delhi: IIHS.
- Khosla, R. (2009) *Addressing gender concerns in India's urban renewal mission*. New Delhi: UNDP-India.
- Kumar, T. M. V. and Gayatri (2006) 'Urban poverty: Issues, policies and actions', in Asthana, M. D. and Ali, S. (ed.) *Urban poverty in India*. New Delhi: Uppal Publishing House, pp. 42-64.
- Kundu, A. (2011) 'Politics and economics of urban growth', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 46(20), pp. 10-12.
- Kundu, A. and Sarangi, N. (2005) 'Issue of urban exclusion', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(33), pp. 3642-3646.
- Laderchi, C. R., Saith, R. and Stewart, F. (2003) 'Does it Matter that we do not agree on the Definition of Poverty? A Comparison of Four Approaches' *Oxford Development Studies*, 31(3), pp. 243-274.
- Lipton, M. (1984) 'Urban bias revisited', *Journal of Development Studies*, 20(3), pp. 139-166.
- Loughhead, S., Mittal, O., Wood, G. (2001). Urban poverty and vulnerability in India: DFID's experiences from a social policy perspective. [Online] Available from

<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/dpuprojects/drivers_urb_change/urb_society/pdf_liveli_vulnera/DFID> (Accessed: 15 July 2012).

Mahadevia, D. (2011) 'Branded or renewed? Policies, politics and processes of urban development in the reform era' *Economic and Political Weekly*, 46(31), pp.31-64.

Masika, R., Haan, A. and Baden, S. (1997) *Urbanisation and urban Poverty: A gender analysis*. Brighton : Institute of Development Studies.

Mathur, O. P. (2009) *Slum free cities: A new deal for the urban poor*. New Delhi: National Institute of Public Finance and Policy.

Mehta, D. and Mehta, M. (2010) '[A glass half full? Urban development \(1990s to 2010\)](#)' *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45(28), pp.20-23.

Ministry of Urban Development (2012), *Parliamentary Consultative Committee on Urban Development meets on JNNURM phase II*. New Delhi [Online] Available from:<
<http://pib.nic.in/newsite/erelease.aspx?relid=80474>> (Accessed: 1 September 2012)

Mitlin, D., Satterthwaite, D. and Bartlett, S. (2011) *Capital, capacities and collaboration: the multiple roles of community savings in addressing urban poverty*. London: International Institute for Environment and Development.

Moser, C. O.N. (1998) 'The Asset Vulnerability Framework: Reassessing Urban Poverty Reduction Strategies', *World Development*, 26 (1) pp. 1-19.

Moser, C. O.N. (2008) *Asset based approaches to poverty reduction in a globalised context: An introduction to asset accumulation policy and summary of workshop findings*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution.

Norton, A. and M. Foster (2001) *The potential of using sustainable livelihoods approaches in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers: a discussion paper for DFID*. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Patnaik, U. (2010) 'Trends in urban poverty under economic reforms: 1993-94 to 2004-05' *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45(4), pp.42-53.

Planning Commission of India (2012) *Press Note on Poverty Estimates, 2009-10*. New Delhi: Press Information Bureau, Government of India.

Planning Commission of India, Steering Committee on Urbanization (2011a) *Report of the working group on urban poverty, slums, and service delivery system*. New Delhi: Government of India.

Portes, A. (1998) 'Social capital: its origins and applications in modern sociology'. *American Review of Sociology*, 24(1), pp.1-24.

Pugh, C. (1997) 'Poverty and progress? Reflections on housing and urban policies in developing countries, 1976-96', *Urban Studies*, 34(10), pp.1547-1595.

Ravallion, M and Datt, G. (2002) 'Why has economic growth been more pro-poor in some states of India than others?', *Journal of Development Economics*, 68, pp. 381-400.

Ravallion, M., Chen, S., Sangraula, P. (1997) 'New evidence on the urbanization of global poverty', *Population and Development Review*, 33(4), 667-701.

Reddy, C. S. and Reddy, V. S. (2011) 'Urban poverty: A challenge', *Nagarlok*, 43(3), pp. 63-70.

Risbud, N. (2009) 'The poor and morphology of cities', in Ministry of Housing and urban poverty Alleviation, Government of India and United nations Development Programme , *India urban poverty report 2009*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 177-198.

Sanderson, D. (2000) 'Cities, disasters and livelihoods', *Environment & Urbanization*, 12 (2), pp. 93-102.

Satterthwaite, D. (1997) 'Urban poverty: Reconsidering its scale and nature', *IDS Bulletin*, 28(2), pp.9-23.

Satterthwaite, D. (2000) 'Towards more pro-poor local government in urban areas (editorial)', *Environment & Urbanization*, 12(1), pp. 3-11.

Sen, A. (1997) 'Editorial: human capital and human capability', *World Development*, 25(12) pp. 1959-1961.

Singh, U. B. (2011) 'Jawaharlal Nehru national urban renewal mission: a critique', *Nagarlok*, 39(4), pp. 55-60.

Sivaramakrishnan, K. C. (2010) *The JNNRUM story*. New Delhi: Centre for Policy Research.

United Nations (2009) *The World Urbanisation Prospects: The 2009 Revision*, New York: Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division.

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (2003) *The challenge of slums*. London: Earthscan.

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT 2008) *State of the world's cities*. London: Earthscan.

Unni, J. (2009) 'The unorganised sector and urban poverty: Issues of livelihood', in Ministry of Housing and urban poverty Alleviation, Government of India and United Nations Development Programme, *India urban poverty report 2009*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp.76-93.

Water And Environmental Health at London and Loughborough (WELL 1998) *DFID Guidance manual on Water Supply and Sanitation Programmes*, London: Department for International Development.

Wratten, E.(1995) 'Conceptualizing urban poverty', *Environment and Urbanization*,7(1), pp.10-38.

