



Homeless International
&
The Alliance of SPARC, NSDF & Mahila Milan

[photo]

Slum Rehabilitation Project

JFS 1596

Second Year Monitoring Report

Executive summary

MJ to complete

The goal of the project is to improve the living conditions of slum and pavement dweller households in India. The project aims to obtain state recognition and financial backing for development methodologies created and implemented by Federations of people living in informal settlements. To achieve this, the project has four specific outputs:

- ⇒ A Management Information System holding detailed information on a minimum of 15,000 households.
"Refine and systematise a Data Management System for handling information collated by and for 15,000 low-income households living in informal settlements in order to negotiate rehabilitation solutions"
- ⇒ Sustainable shelter solutions developed for 15,000 households and agreed by state authorities and relevant land owners.
"Use the information and documentation created to negotiate viable shelter solutions with private land owners, and state agencies"
- ⇒ Documentation clearly describing the processes used in a form that can be easily understood by national and international policy makers.
"Document the processes used and develop a range of educational and campaign materials targeted at local and international policy makers"
- ⇒ State agencies functioning effectively as arbitrators between landowners and households living in informal settlements.

Authorship

This report was written by Malcolm Jack from Homeless International in collaboration with Sheela Patel (SPARC) and other SPARC staff. It is based upon information from regular ongoing discussion with SPARC, from the monitoring visit carried out in May 2001¹, and from publications and records produced by the Alliance of SPARC, NSDF and Mahila Milan (see below for details of their roles). The monitoring trip included visits to resettlement camps and apartment buildings, informal interviews and discussion with members of the Railway Slum Dwellers Federation (RSDF), and discussion with one of the Community Officers from the Mumbai municipality involved in the process. Some information has also been drawn from research carried out by Sundar Burra and Sheela Patel (both SPARC).²

Reporting period and budget

This report covers the period from 1st April 2000 to 31st March 2001, which is the second and penultimate year of the project.

A signed statement of expenditure, with budget notes, has been included as Appendix 1 to this report.

¹ The monitoring visit was due to go ahead in January 2001, but the trip was postponed due to illness in the family of a member of Homeless International's staff. The budget for the project was renegotiated with DFID to take account of this change.

² Burra & Patel (2001), *Norms and standards in urban development – the experience of an urban alliance in India*, paper presented at an ITDG workshop in Rugby (UK) during May 2001.

Background and wider context

The project was initiated in a local and international context dominated by rapid urbanisation. Mumbai, the base for the project, is one of the World's largest mega-cities, with a population of over 12 million people. Over half of these inhabitants live in informal settlements – in slums, on the pavements or beside the railway tracks, but occupy only about eight percent of the land. Slum density, overcrowding and insanitary living environments are common.

The need to address urban poverty has been recognised by city officials in Mumbai but also by other state and international policy makers. At the international level the focus of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat or UNCHS) has increasingly been on the need for secure tenure for all, and for effective urban governance. This focus has been supported by the World Bank and by a range of bi-lateral agencies including DFID, as part of their poverty eradication strategies.

The Alliance of SPARC, NSDF and Mahila Milan (see below) promote an approach whereby a 'space' is created for community groups to articulate their ideas, improve their asset base and hence to enable them to harness the energy within communities to take the lead in improving their living conditions. Although settlement rehabilitation and community resettlement are important objectives within this initiative, they should be understood in the context of the Alliance's ongoing work to promote urban development processes which recognise that poor communities can play valuable proactive roles.

Introduction to the organisations involved

Three organisations – SPARC, Mahila Milan and NSDF – work in an Alliance.

SPARC

The Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centres (SPARC) is a registered voluntary organisation that was established in 1984 as a vehicle to explore ways for cities to work with poor communities through partnerships. Today SPARC is based in Mumbai (also known as Bombay) and, although it is active in 21 cities throughout India, SPARC only has offices in Mumbai.

NSDF

The National Slum Dwellers' Federation (NSDF) is a national organisation of leaders of informal settlements around India. Community leaders who were disillusioned with welfaristic interventions set up NSDF in 1974. The NSDF focuses its efforts on securing land tenure and basic amenities for its constituents and organising them in the cities where they reside. NSDF has worked with several organisations since its inception and in 1986 it entered into a partnership with SPARC. The NSDF/SPARC Alliance combines the strengths of both organisations, with SPARC providing the interface with formal development authorities while NSDF mobilises communities at the grassroots.

Communities are often mobilised and linked by their common situation or location. One pertinent example of this is the **Railway Slum Dwellers' Federation (RSDF)**, made up of families living alongside the tracks in Mumbai, which acts as a **sub-organisation** under the auspices of NSDF. There are similar arrangements representing (and made up of) Pavement Dwellers and families currently living on airport land. In turn these groups contain many smaller community '*mandals*' who save together and officially register as housing co-

operatives as and when they move into permanent accommodation. These groups often become well organised and structured internally, with office bearers and joint bank accounts opened.

Mahila Milan

Mahila Milan emerged as the third partner of the SPARC/Mahila Milan/NSDF Alliance from a common concern that women should be the central focal point in communities. Through NSDF, Mahila Milan collectives are able to gain recognition in their respective settlements and are gradually trained by other women's collectives and SPARC to play key leadership roles in their communities. Mahila Milan collectives manage processes within their communities in co-operation with the traditional male leadership, in order to strengthen the capacities of the poor to face the outside environment. Over time, women in communities are able to manage all the assets owned and controlled by the community. Eventually, they become empowered to re-negotiate their relationships with other, more traditional, leaders.

Achievements

Purpose

The purpose of this initiative is to “*obtain state recognition and financial backing for development methodologies created and implemented by Federations of people living in informal settlements*”. In the first two years there has been significant progress in achieving this in relation to three main schemes:

- The resettlement of families living alongside the railway tracks – under the Maharashtra Government- and World Bank Municipal Urban Transport Project (MUTP II)
- The rehabilitation of slum housing in Dharavi under the Rajiv Indira-Suryodaya Project.
- The Resettlement of pavement Dwellers under the Slum Rehabilitation Act of the Maharashtra Government.

Achievement of the outputs described below provides the basis for enabling organisations of the urban poor in Mumbai to engage constructively, and proactively, with the Mumbai Metropolitan Regional Development Authority (MMRDA) and other agencies. The asset bases created and owned by communities, such as settlement information, savings, organisation and the network of support provided by the Alliance, are used to negotiate with these agencies around solutions and priorities designed by the Alliance with communities.

Output 1: A Management Information System holding detailed information on a minimum of 15,000 households.

“Refine and systematise a Data Management System for handling information collated by and for 15,000 low-income households living in informal settlements in order to negotiate rehabilitation solutions”.

Community mapping is a vital component of the Alliance's strategy in enabling communities to negotiate and access adequate and secure shelter within the resettlement process. The results of the mapping equip communities with an information asset base, with which to identify and suggest viable resettlement solutions. This is particularly important when other agencies, such as municipalities, do not have either the resources or imperative to conduct accurate enumeration exercises. As SPARC's director Sheela Patel puts it, grant funding for community-led surveying and information gathering is “*a strategic investment in the process.*”

Members of NSDF/RSDf carry out all the mapping activities, supported by SPARC. The RSDf, for example, conducted their first survey in 1989 and have since conducted many others, refining and establishing skills over time. SPARC also help to enter, record and manage the results in the database system, and then to provide detailed reports to agencies such as the Maharashtra government and World Bank. By collecting their own information, informal settlement dwellers not only develop new skills and organisational capacity, but also increase the cohesion of their community through gaining more knowledge about each other. Importantly, the sense of ownership of the information is also increased, thus encouraging the Federation members to take the lead in negotiating for appropriate settlement improvements. In other words, the process enables communities to build up two vital assets:

- Social capital, in terms of creating more closely-knit communities.
- Information capital, through investigating and documenting settlements and their inhabitants.

It is difficult to estimate the exact number of families that have been surveyed, as mapping exercises are often tailored to a specific purpose, meaning that full information is not always collected about every family on every occasion. However, varying types of information have been collected for at least 18,000 Railway slum families and almost 25,000 families in total. SPARC estimate that they also hold information about roughly 23,000 pavement dwellers.

The information gathered during mapping exercises aimed at resettlement is however extremely comprehensive. Economic, social and cultural information is gathered in addition to basic information about existing structures and family size. Information about the duration of families' occupation of a given space is essential in proving the right to relocation and rehabilitation under the various initiatives discussed under output 2. SPARC uses all of this information to provide extensive documentation to other agencies, which in turn enables all those involved to effectively implement resettlement initiatives. An example of the range of information presented to the MMRDA, as part of the MUTPII process, is presented in table 1 below.

Table 1: Information contained in typical report to MMRDA

<p>Section 1: Structure related information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House ID, location & map no • Name of owner • Name of resident • Type of use (residential, resi-cum-commercial etc) • Occupancy status (owner, occupant, non-occupant, locked/unknown) • How long family lived there • Family size • Where family originally from • Size of structures (carpet area) • Construction of structures (wall, floor & roof materials) • Where children go to school 	<p>Section 2: Household level baseline socio-economic data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House ID, location & map no • Name and sex of head of household • Tenure status • Caste • Mother tongue • Family size • Family type • No of married couples • Monthly household income • Monthly per-capita income • Vulnerable category 	<p>Section 3: Socio-economic profile of PAPs (individuals)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House ID, location & map no • Name of individual • Relation with head of household • Sex • Age • Educational level • Employment level • Monthly income
<p>Section 4: Basic data on commercial establishments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House ID, location & map no • Name of structure owner • Name of establishment owner • Year of establishment • Nature of commercial activity • Carpet area • Monthly turnover • No employees 	<p>Section 5: Socio-economic data for those working in commercial establishments (employees, owners, family members)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House ID, location & map no • Name of employee, age, sex • Literacy status • School class attended • Nature of work • Travel time from residence 	<p>Section 6: Summary data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of structures • Distributions by sex, marital status & education, employment level • Households duration of living there • Distribution by religion, mother tongue & caste • Tenure status • Household income, per-capita income

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly salary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of structures • Vulnerable categories • Commercial activities • Employment status
--	--	---

The information is also used to produce documentation for families in slum communities and informal settlements. These play a dual role, firstly as part of the relocation process to confirm rights to accommodation, and secondly as a means to gradually enabling families to become recognised as citizens. In this way the information recorded on these ID Cards helps families to establish a legitimate identity, in turn allowing them to obtain ration cards and electoral registration as authorities increasingly recognise the Alliance's documentation.

Family ID Cards were designed and are produced by SPARC and NSDF. They contain the names, ages, sexes, occupations and relationships of all the occupants in a given dwelling, including details of both the male and female heads of households. Photos of the entire family standing next to their original dwelling (numbered as part of the initial mapping process) are also included on the Cards, providing an additional cross-check during the resettlement process. The information is also tallied against the full enumeration reports produced.

Output 2: Sustainable shelter solutions developed for 15,000 households and agreed by state authorities and relevant landowners.

“Use the information and documentation created to negotiate viable shelter solutions with private land owners, and state agencies”.

In-situ settlement rehabilitation and community resettlement have continued in the second year of this initiative. Table 2 provides a snapshot of the situation in April 2001, although it should be noted that numbers can only be approximate because of the daily changes that take place.

Table 2: Rehabilitation and resettlement (April 2001)

Settlement	Project	Approx. no families in transit Accommodation [^]	No families in permanent accommodation	Design and construction	Cost per unit of transit accommodation
Walela	MUTPII	3,600	2,500*	All financed, designed & built by govt and govt. contractors	70,000 Rs
Mankhurd	MUTPII	2,740~ (2 camps)	2,000	Transit accommodation designed & constructed by communities, financed by world bank	20,000 Rs
Kanjur Marg	MUTPII	850	-	Transit accommodation designed & constructed by communities	20,000 Rs
Antophill	MUTPII	-	600		
Dharavi		-	500		
Rajiv Indira-Suryodaya	Slum rehabilitation	-	105 flats _‡	Designed by community after endless arguments with authorities	

Notes

[^] Numbers can only be approximate because families move on into permanent accommodation and newly relocated families arrive

* Mumbai Metropolitan Regional Development Authority (MMRDA) purchased apartments from Maharashtra Housing Board (MHB) and handed over to SPARC

~ 2 transit camps, both started construction in March 2000 and finished in 6 months

_‡ Construction complete, as soon as water / electricity tidied up, families will move in (due end May / beginning June 2001)

The Alliance has been able to **relocate a total of around 18,000 people**, the majority of which have been railway slum dwellers from the Central, Western and Harbour Lines in Mumbai. Other agencies involved with MUTP II have remarked to SPARC about their surprise at the speed and effectiveness with which the Alliance has achieved (and surpassed) the resettlement target. There are several reasons for this success.

Firstly, the idea, supported by the Alliance, of using temporary resettlement accommodation has significantly speeded up the process at the same time as ensuring an improvement in living conditions even prior to moving into permanent accommodation:

*“It was to be a **two-phase resettlement strategy**: small houses measuring 160 sq.ft. were built in record time and people shifted.... The advantage of the two-phase strategy was that the benefits of the main project would be available much earlier. Had the project waited for the buildings to be completed, there would have been a delay of 2 or 3 years and project costs would have escalated.*

This was an important precedent in urban resettlement in Mumbai. Though some World Bank officials opposed the two-phase strategy initially on the grounds that the accommodation was too small, in time this strategy became acceptable and both the Government of Maharashtra and the World Bank appreciated it and it became a model for the MUTP. The initial objections were misplaced because the accommodation provided was only temporary and people would get 225 sq.ft. apartments when the permanent buildings were ready. Also, they had moved from dangerous conditions along the tracks where they faced the possibilities of death and injury; moreover, they moved from a situation without basic amenities to one where there were common facilities of drinking water, sanitation and so on. The initial disquiet over the Kanjur Marg experiment was at least partly because it had never taken place before. The establishment of precedents is always helpful in national or international bureaucracies. Kanjur Marg stood out for the speed of resettlement (less than a year) and for the absence of police or municipal force to “manage” the physical resettlement. People moved voluntarily and demolished their own houses along the tracks.”³

The two-phase strategy has had the additional benefit of creating space for gradual social adjustment to living in non-slum settlement accommodation, important for the long-term success of resettlement.

Secondly, the combination of accurate information and a sound organisational basis has helped not only in construction of transit accommodation (as mentioned above), but more importantly in accurately **identifying those eligible and implementing the actual movement of families** speedily. NSDF staff estimate that they can process 300-400 people in a day into transit accommodation. Co-operative leaders play a vital role in organisation and helping in disputes during moves, while community involvement means that the relocation can be timed to minimise disruption to people’s economic activities (e.g. moving on Sundays or holidays). Similarly, the Alliance’s involvement in identifying suitable resettlement land close to people’s original locations has been important in reducing economic dislocation and hence generating support and enthusiasm for the process within communities. Since the occasion of the illegal demolitions in February 2000 (reference), communities have also organised the demolition of vacated structures either by giving the bulldozers the all-clear to move in or by demolishing structures themselves. In the case of structures on the edge of the safety zone (ten meters from the edge of the tracks), structures have usually been demolished by communities to minimise damage to adjoining structures just outside the safety zone. When a wall is constructed on the edge of the cleared safety zone, remaining communities often agree to informally police it to avoid others re-encroaching.

As seen in table 2 (above) many of the designs for transit settlements, transit accommodation and apartment-buildings have been community-led, with technical support provided by SPARC and some consultants. **Community-designed transit camps and apartment blocks** tend to include office space and communal

³ Burra & Patel (2001), *Norms and standards in urban development – the experience of an urban alliance in India*, paper presented at an ITDG workshop in Rugby (UK) during May 2001.

areas for meetings, celebrations etc. For example, in Walela and Mankhurd, apartment blocks have these spaces on the ground floor, but in the case of Rajiv Indira-Suryodaya the communal area is on the roof.

Communities have also **contributed to construction work**, whilst the Alliance has supported RSDF in managing subcontractors (engaged to ensure tight construction targets for transit accommodation were met). In 138 Transit Camp, Mankhurd, communities have **implemented all infrastructure**, whilst they continue to extend it in other camps where necessary – for example, a new toilet block is currently under construction in the settlement at Kanjur Marg. On average there is a toilet and a tap per five families in transit settlements, whilst electricity supply is also available. Communities **manage payments for these services** - in Kanjur Marg for example, families pay 15Rs per month for water and toilets and pay between 100-200Rs per month for electricity depending on consumption. **Maintenance**, garbage collection and drain cleaning are also organised and carried out by communities.

After long negotiations, and over 20 re-designs, the Rajiv Indira-Suryodaya apartment scheme in the Dharavi slums is finally fully constructed, containing 105 apartments. At the time of writing, families were due to move in subject to water and electricity connections being completed. The project is increasingly viewed as a **flagship example of the Maharashtra SRA policy** in action on the ground⁴. Importantly, the communities' desire for 14ft. high apartments, which can then include a mezzanine or loft area, has been incorporated in the final design. This allows extended families to have some privacy between generations, as well as providing additional space for storage or income generating activities. Plans for between five and seven similar schemes elsewhere in Dharavi are already underway, although the capital-intensive nature of such initiatives implies that the Alliance is facing increased risk that it must manage and mitigate. At the same time, the Alliance and Homeless International will continue to search for, and negotiate for, additional sources of finance that can accommodate work of this scale. The lessons learnt during the Rajiv Indira-Suryodaya scheme will play a significant role in helping the agencies involved in similar future projects (see under objective 3).

The Alliance also signed an historic agreement on 14th June 2000, with Landowners, developers, the Slum Rehabilitation Authority and the Mumbai Municipal Corporation (MMC), to grant 3,000 pavement dwellers in the Island City of Mumbai the opportunity to embark upon rehabilitation work in new settlements. The landowner agrees to give half to the Slum Rehabilitation Authority, and can use the rest for construction or creating Transferable Development Rights (TDR). The Slum Rehabilitation Authority and MMC arrange to make the land available to poor households, whilst the Alliance take responsibility for identifying families, constructing transit tenements and subsequent resettlement. The MMC also agrees to provide water, sanitation and off-site infrastructure. The developer constructs the tenements, hands them over to the municipality and communities and gains some TDR in proportion to the amount of living space constructed. This will hopefully pave the way for other similar schemes.

Output 3: Documentation clearly describing the processes used in a form that can be easily understood by national and international policy makers.

“Document the processes used and develop a range of educational and campaign materials targeted at local and international policy makers”.

Homeless International and the Alliance have combined their skills, efforts and resources to promote understanding and recognition of the processes involved. From Homeless International's perspective, our

⁴ See appendix 3 for a brief explanation of how the SRA policy works, based on an extract from McLeod (2000), *Bridging the Finance Gap – The Alliance Case Study, India*

advocacy work is only effective when it is built upon the experiences of our partners in practice. We aim to add value through our ability to help partners such as the Alliance to articulate their experiences, at the same time as providing direct links to senior policy makers in bi-lateral and multi-lateral agencies involved in urban development work and promoting sustainable livelihoods.

As mentioned in last year's report, **regular video production and photography** play important roles in documenting the processes involved. They provided vital evidence in proving the illegality of the demolitions in February 2000 (see Appendix 2 for further details) and are frequently used at **presentations / meetings / other?** In the run-up to the Istanbul + 5 meeting held in New York during June 2001, TVE International approached Homeless International and partners to help produce a series of films for broadcasting on the BBC World Service about organisations engaged in urban poverty and development work. One of these focused on the demolitions and subsequent successes of the resettlement process in MUTPII, using some of SPARC's existing footage whilst Subash Day (a film-maker with close ties to SPARC) carried out the main filming in Mumbai.

As mentioned in last year's report, the January 2000 edition of **Face to Face**⁵ describes the exchange process that lies at the heart of the Alliance's approach. Similarly, Homeless International's **Dialogue** (January 2000) includes details of the Rajiv Indira-Suryodaya scheme, house-modelling exhibitions in India and the Alliance's involvement in exchange processes. Both Homeless International and the Alliance have continued to use these two publications as resources that highlight the opportunities and successes of the Alliance and other Federations' involvements in slum rehabilitation and resettlement initiatives. It has been used in numerous events and activities organised by SDI, and it has been a valuable resource in promoting the work of the Alliance and other ACHR / SDI partners to policy-makers and other agencies involved in urban development.

Websites continue to be important tools in publicising work and sharing information. During the period of illegal demolitions, websites and email were used to ensure that up to date, accurate information was shared with partners in SDI and ACHR. This also enabled the organisations involved to demonstrate solidarity and international awareness of the situation, as a number of SDI partners wrote and faxed protests to the Railway Authorities upon learning of the incidents.

SPARC have continued to be involved in much of Homeless International's **research**. Homeless International and SPARC have collaborated closely on the Indian segment of the DFID-funded Knowledge and Research programme looking at *Bridging the finance gap in housing and infrastructure*. Several aspects of this research are based upon, and deepen understanding of, the processes involved in rehabilitation and resettlement, including:

- Identifying, managing and mitigating the risks faced by organisations of the urban poor when engaging with other agencies to take on large scale initiatives.
- Investigating the types of finance required for pilot initiatives and scaling-up (such as in the case of the Rajiv-Indira-Suryodaya project and developments at Kanjur Marg).
- Investigating how organisations of the urban poor can negotiate access to (loan) funds from formal financial institutions, often in the absence of traditional forms of collateral.

The results of the research are used in presentations to agencies such **as ???** and are made available through Homeless International's InclusiveCity website (www.theinclusivecity.org).

⁵ *Face to Face* is a publication produced by the Asian Coalition for Housing Rights (ACHR) with whom the Alliance has strong links. Extracts relevant to this particular initiative are included as appendix 4 of this report.

Homeless International and Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG) are collaboratively researching the effects of planning regulations on the capacity of poor communities to develop and activate housing and settlement solutions. It is likely that Homeless International and SPARC will look at effects of the 'Coastal Regulation Zone' regulations on slum developments similar to the Rajiv-Indira-Suryodaya construction, to highlight experiences in India.⁶ A workshop, held in Mumbai during May 2001, looked at the initial work carried out in Mumbai and other parts of India and included site visits to the transit camps and Rajiv Indira-Suryodaya. It involved representatives from NGOs, other research groups, UNCHS and government agencies (see Appendix 5 for the list of organisations involved).

Output 4: State agencies functioning effectively as arbitrators between landowners and households living in informal settlements

Both the Rajiv Indira-Suryodaya scheme, and the development of the Kanjur Marg settlement as part of MUTPII, have made particularly significant contributions to the notion of redefining government roles in rehabilitation and resettlement. In the case of Kanjur Marg, the emphasis is on the changing relationship between agencies, whereas Rajiv Indira-Suryodaya has implications in terms of financing arrangements and how city Development Plans relate to, and may conflict with, the SRA policy. The process of constructing community-designed resettlement accommodation has also thrown up issues regarding the World Bank's procurement policies (see under 'Problems and changes').

Patel and Burra's (2001) research identifies how the relationship between government authorities and the Alliance has evolved as a result of their interaction during MUTPII:

"It [Kanjur Marg] also showed a new way of doing things: government provided land, the Railways paid for infrastructure and people took loans to build their own houses. A realignment and renegotiation of roles and relationships between government and NGOs and CBOs took place in which government became a facilitator rather than a provider and a far more proactive role was played by the community in selecting land, designing and helping to construct the houses and moving to the new site on their own. This realignment of relationships carried forward into the main MUTP as well, where the Alliance of SPARC/NSDF/MM was given the task of relocating the other 19,000 households living along the rail tracks..... The Alliance sees Kanjur Marg as a milestone in the changing patterns of urban resettlement and rehabilitation. Well-established norms and standards were set aside and new paradigms came up in their place."

One concrete result of the improved relationships and understanding between the Alliance and government has been the significant reduction in the time taken for *mandals* to register as official housing co-operatives. The process used to take around two years, but procedural changes now allow it to be completed in four months. This is important because the ownership of apartments encapsulated in a registered co-operative arrangement has a significant bearing on sustaining benefits in terms of making sure that poor families are not excluded from the process or later forced to relinquish their apartments (see under 'Impact and sustainability, below').

Patel & Burra's (2001) analysis of the relationships between the planning regulations contained within Mumbai's Development Plan, and the newly developed SRA policy, highlight some likely friction between the two. They suggest that:

- Development Plans are often formulated from a narrow class perspective.
- Middle-class 'environmentalism' can dominate the debate.
- The process of public consultation is weakly developed and the published Plan is an '*inaccessible gazette*'.
- The Plans are developed behind closed doors, leaving scope for vested interests to dominate and possible corruption.

⁶ The results of any research in this area will be discussed in the final report for this project, due next year.

- The government excuse that no land is available for the urban poor belies the progress made within this initiative.
- Development Plans are treated with unwanted reverence when there may in fact be opportunities for positive change.
- Ecological interests are prioritised excessively against people's housing needs (especially the poor).

Some of the changes and arguments preceding the eventual construction of the Rajiv Indira-Suryodaya centred around the application of Coastal Regulation Zone policies (CRZs) that have been defined with reference to building and high tide lines. The interpretation of which areas fall into CRZs is contested, especially where buildings already exist. These arguments are likely to be continued as this initiative continues – as Patel & Burra put it:

“Discussions with experts and officials are going on to find a way of reconciling the interests of the marine environment and the housing contexts of the urban poor. To see them as mutually opposing and irreconcilable would be shortsighted and sectarian. A consensus will have to be crafted.”

Problems and changes

The two main issues that have emerged during the project so far have been touched upon already. The potential for conflict between CRZs and the SRA policy is discussed above – the manner in which they are reconciled will likely impact on in-situ slum rehabilitation plans

The second interesting set of issues revolve around World Bank procurement practices within MUTPII. Initially, the World Bank's response to the urgent need to construct transit accommodation was to follow its conventional approach of calling for tenders and selecting a contractor before building commenced. The Alliance argued that this process would be expensive and slow, and offered to do the job in 9 months at a lower cost, whilst supporting households to take out affordable loans to cover remaining costs. It took a number of meetings in Mumbai, New Delhi and Washington before the idea was accepted, but the results described under objectives 1 and 2 have shown the benefits of the decision.

Recommendations and lessons learnt

A much broader and more detailed analysis of lessons learnt during the process will be produced in next year's project completion report. Homeless International and SPARC are currently exploring new methods for carrying out collaborative evaluations that benefit all project participants (by reflecting and consolidating on the processes), as well as providing useful information for funders such as DFID. The evaluation methods used in another DFID-JFS funded project with the Alliance (Ref: JFS1478 – see project completion report due to be submitted at the end of June 2001), will be built upon to improve the evaluation process.

However, there are two main recommendations stemming from the second year of this initiative in relation to the Alliance's involvement in resettlement and construction during MUTPII. Firstly, although it is apparent that an Alliance of NGOs and CBOs can implement rapid and effective resettlement, it should be noted that the whole process relied on the strong organisational and information base that had previously been built up. Thus the work supported through this initiative, such as settlement mapping and organisation building, is an essential prerequisite to taking on initiatives on the scale of MUTPII or similar. There is no substitute for this sort of preparatory work.

Secondly, agencies (such as the World Bank in this case) need to be flexible enough to consider alternative tendering and contracting arrangements that allow NGOs and CBOs to take part. The concrete benefits in MUTPII of cost effectiveness and speed would have been missed had there not been a willingness to explore alternatives in this case.

Institution building and linkages

Discussion with one of the Community Officers within **MMRDA** produced some interesting information regarding their view of the partnership with the Alliance during MUTPII. Firstly there was explicit recognition that the project was one of the most successful that they had been involved in because of the Alliance and community involvement. In particular, they recognised the Alliance's comparative advantage in conducting surveys due to their experience and legitimacy in the eyes of slum communities. In turn the MMRDA hopes that communities will have gained a more positive view of government and will recognise the positive impact of their involvement in the partnership.

The involvement of Gautam Chatterjee (from the Mumbai municipality) and Mr D M Sukthankar (formerly Municipal Commissioner in Mumbai) in the ITDG workshop is an encouraging sign that their relationship with the Alliance is deepening.

The Alliance's experiences in this and other work has been spread internationally through the **Slum/Shack Dwellers' International (SDI) network**. On several occasions representatives of municipal agencies and police forces have taken part in exchanges, notably in Cambodia, Zimbabwe, Kenya and India.

This initiative, combined with research into the Alliance's other work, has helped develop links with **formal financial institutions**. Full and open discussions have been a particular feature of the relationships with Citibank and the Unit Trust of India (UTI), helping both sides to understand each other and to establish a common 'language'.

Impact and sustainability

The arrangements that exist within *mandals* and the newly registered housing co-operatives are important aspects of sustainability, in terms of ensuring that nobody is forced to leave their newly acquired home. Firstly, the arrangements are egalitarian – RSDF officials proudly announced that like their regular members, they only had one apartment. This helps to retain genuine, positive participation in the cooperative even after new homes have been obtained. Secondly, cooperative savings and loans are managed flexibly to help members deal with emergencies or to overcome cash shortages that prevent immediate payment of water bills etc.. Finally, ownership of the property remains with the cooperative not with individual families. This ensures that families are unable to merely sell the property for a profit and return to the slums.

Appendix 1: Statement of expenditure

Appendix 2: Demolitions, evictions and negotiations for the resettlement of Railway Slum Dwellers

Appendix 3: How the SRA policy works

Appendix 4: Extracts from ACHR's *Face to Face* publication

Appendix 5: Notes from ITDG workshop (Mumbai)