National Seminar on JnNURM

Challenges to the Mission

Hazards Centre

New Delhi
21-22 June 2008

Other Publications of Hazards Centre:

Blueprint for an Apartheid City: Draft Delhi Master Plan 2021, July 2005

Whither Indian Cities: Urban Reforms and Counter Strategies
A report on the National Consultation on JnNURM, April 2006

Delhi Metro Rail: A new mode of "Public" Transport?, July 2006

Government by the People: Analysing 74th Constitutional Amendment Act 1992, January 2007

Badalte Sheher mein Rozgaar: Jaipur mein Mahila Kaamgaar, Februrary,2007

Badalte Sheher mein Rozgaar: Jaipur mein Nirmaan Mazdoor, Februrary,2007

Badalte Sheher mein Rozgaar: Indore mein Asangathit Ksetra ke Mazdoor, Februrary,2007

2010 Commonwealth Games In Delhi
How much does national prestige cost?,September 2007

A fact finding report on the evictions and resettlement process in Delhi, October 2007

Urban Renewal or Cities of Exclusion?
A report of the National Seminar on JnNurm, June 2008

Hazards Centre

Hazards Centre, 92 H, Pratap Market, Munirka, N.Delhi-67
e-mail: hazardscentre@gmail.com Tel: 011-26714244, 26187806

‘Challenges to a Mission’

Report

National Seminar
on the Jawaharlal Nehru
National Urban Renewal Mission

21-22 June 2008

Indian Social Institute,

New Delhi

Organised by

Hazards Centre
A unit of Sanchal Foundation, Delhi

October 2008

Publisher: Hazards Centre
(a unit of Sanchal Foundation)

Compiled by: D. Leena

Publication: Hazards Centre, 2008

Printer: Print Craft, New Delhi,
Ph: 9891094240

Cover Page Design: Vartika Srivastava

Layout and Formatting: D. Leena

Content

Acronyms
4

Introduction
5 - 6

Technical Structure of JNNURM
7 - 17

Process of Participation, Consultation in JNNURM
18 - 23

Infrastructure vs Basic Services for All
24 -27

Future Strategies with City Level Action Plan
28 - 35

Annexure 1: Programme schedule
36

Annexure 2: Press release
37 - 38

Annexure 3: List of participants
39 - 47

Acronyms

ADB: Asian Development Bank
AUWSP: Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme
CDP: City Development Plan
CRH: Committee for Right to Housing
DDA: Delhi Development Authority
EIA: Environment Impact Assessment
FAR: Floor Area Ratio
GATT: General Agreement in Trade and Tariffs
HIG: High Income Group
IDSMT: Integrated Development for Small and Medium Towns
IEC: Information Education and Communication
IHSDP: Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme
IMF: International Monetary Fund
INHAF: Indian Habitat Forum
IRMA: Institute for Rural Management Anand
JNNURM: Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission
LIG: Lower Income Group
LUDA: Lucknow Urban Development Authority
MIG: Middle Income Group
MLA: Member of Legislative Assembly
MNC: Multi National Corporation
MP: Member of Parliament
NAMA: Non Agricultural Market Access
NEP: National Economic Policy
NREDO: National Real Estate Developers Organizations
NSDP: National Slum Development Programme
NTP: National Transport Policy
PIU: Project Implementation Unit
PIL: Public Interest Litigation
PMU: Project Management Unit
PPP: Public Private Partnership
SEZ: Special Economic Zone
SJSRY: *Swarna Jayanti Shehari Rozgar Yojana*
SLSC: State Level Steering Committee
SMC: Sanctioning & Monitoring Committee
SRA: Slum Rehabilitation Authority
TAG: Technical Advisory Group
UEIIP: Urban Environment and Infrastructure Improvement Programme
ULB: Urban Local Body
ULCRA: Urban Land Ceiling Regulation Act
URIF: Urban Renewal Infrastructure Fund
VAMBAY: *Valimiki Ambedkar Awaas Yojana*
WB: World Bank (or International Bank for Reconstruction and Development)
WTO: World Trade Organisation

Introduction

[Note: Almost all the deliberations were in Hindi but this report has been prepared in English to permit wider circulation within a particular section of researchers, academics, policy-makers, and non-Hindi speakers.]

On behalf of Hazards Centre, D. Leena welcomed all the participants to the National Seminar on **"Challenges to JNNURM"** (Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission). She recounted that since December 2005, when the Mission document was made public, many organisations including Hazards Centre have been working on highlighting various aspects that underlie the Mission document. One of Hazards Centre's first commentaries on JNNURM was taken out in the form of a Delhi Fact Sheet as early as February 2006. It was the beginning of a series of debates on JNNURM.

The first task in the Mission was the submission of City Development Plans (CDP) by all the 63 million-plus cities listed under JNNURM. It was on the basis of a comprehensive CDP that each city would be able to negotiate for a share of the central funding pool. Given the pressure of time, inevitably most cities, including a few "mega" ones, came out with a CDP within three months and this meant that there have been few participatory consultations or primary level studies. Thus the process of preparation of the CDPs has been demonstrably undemocratic and arbitrary.

A preliminary analysis of the Mission document revealed that the Mission was deliberately divided into two components of Urban Infrastructure Development and Basic Services to the Urban Poor, under two separate Ministries and Directorates. In other words, urban infrastructure had no relation with the urban poor in the minds of the policy makers. This marked the anti-poor motive of the Mission behind a pro-poor face. It was within this context that the first National Consultation **"Whither Indian Cities?"** was jointly organised in Mumbai in April 2006 by the Committee for Right to Housing, Mumbai and Hazards Centre. The report of this Consultation has been published.

The Consultation was well-attended by representatives from 16 cities and, as a consequence, various NGOs working in those cities whose CDPs had been submitted to the Urban Development Ministry, began analysing the CDPs and organising public meetings, protests and demonstrations against the very nature of the gigantic and undemocratic Mission. They started looking deeper into the "reforms" agenda of the Mission wherein the basic legal framework relating to land and property had to be amended, and the Municipalities had to incur loans from the market and improve their financial health.

But the Mission has been steadily rolling on for the last 2½ years trying to complete all the "reforms" entrusted to it. Leena disclosed that the Hazards Centre had the opportunity to intervene in a series of meetings of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) of the Mission held in Delhi from mid-2006, and raised the concerns of hawkers, vendors, ragpickers, cyclists, unauthorised colonies, slums, and resettlement colonies. Constituent partners of the *Sajha Manch*, a federation of organisations in Delhi, built up pressure on the TAG to include all sections of the urban population in the Mission. But this actually resulted in the exclusion of Hazards Centre and *Sajha Manch* from the TAG meetings!

As activists and organisations in Delhi got to know more about the Mission and its various components, protest began to simmer in the city. The *Sajha Manch*, for instance, organised *padyatras* (foot marches) in five *bastis* (working class settlements) in Delhi and burnt the JNNURM document publicly. Thereafter, on December 12, 2006, a huge effigy of JNNURM and its designers was burnt at *Jantar Mantar*. During this period, Hazards Centre conducted a spot poll to ask whether the public knew details about the JNNURM, and almost all said 'NO'.

In February 2007, Hazards Centre organised a two-day National Seminar on **"Cities of Exclusion?"** in Delhi, which discussed the recent developments under JNNURM. The report of the Seminar is available in English, and the Seminar concluded with a critical resolution in Hindi which was widely circulated. In October 2007, CIVIC Bangalore and INHAF Ahmedabad too, in consultation with Hazards Centre, jointly organised another two-day Seminar in Bangalore, at which participants unanimously passed a set of recommendations emphasising that there were alternative ways of looking at urban renewal.

Leena further explained that this National Seminar has been organised because of the commitment made by the Hazards Centre in the February 2007 Seminar to follow up with the process of debate and the search for alternatives. Since earlier Seminars and Consultations had focussed more on presentations by guest speakers and analysts, at this Seminar less time has been allotted to speakers and more time has been left aside for discussion and debate by the participants so that they can share their experiences and come up with a joint strategy for the future.

***

Session I

Technical Structure of JNNURM

Chair: Dr Jatinder Adsule, Committee for Right to Housing, Mumbai

Technical Structure

TAG, CDP, PPP, Guidelines, Nodal Agencies[1]

Dunu Roy, Hazards Centre

JNNURM should not be seen as a separate unique programme but is actually a part of a package of development programmes undertaken by the Government of India in recent years. Many of us are familiar with the *Swarna Jayanti Shehari Rozgar Yojana* for urban employment, the National Slum Development Programme, and the *Valmiki Ambedkar Aawaas Yojana* for housing; while the Integrated Development for Small and Medium Towns, the Master Plans, Urban Environment and Infrastructure Improvement Programme, Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme and Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme are more closely linked to the JNNURM. All these programmes cover the more than 5000 cities and towns in India.

What links them all together is the Tenth Plan, which in turn has at its core the neo-liberal National Economic Policy, the National Transport Policy, and the World Trade Organisation's Non Agricultural Market Access conditionalities. Behind them lie the shadowy influences of multi-lateral institutions like the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. And, at the core, lies the notion of Public Private Partnerships (PPP) in which private companies like Mahindra, which earlier were known for manufacturing Jeeps, have now diversified into infrastructure and services. Thus, a concerted attempt is being made to change the face of each and every city.

The JNNURM has two sub-Missions: one for Urban Infrastructure Development (UID); and another for Basic Services for the Urban Poor (BSUP). The objectives state that urban services are being turned over to private players because they have to be made 'efficient' and 'accountable'. Unusually, the preservation of water bodies has also found mention. The Mission covers 63 cities for a period of 7 years and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) has given a 'facilitation loan' of $6.4 billion, on condition that the cities bring in mandatory reforms. The Government of India will provide 35-90% of the total money to

[1] This presentation was prepared on the basis of information released by Asian Development Bank (April 2008) and Ministry of Urban Development (December 2006)

the State Governments provided they sign tripartite Memoranda of Agreement to implement the reforms.

These reforms have to cover three areas relating to property, governance, and participation. With respect to property, the Urban Land Ceiling Regulation Act (ULCRA) has to be repealed, the Rent Control Act and property taxes have to be reformed, while property title has to be certified, registration computerised, conversion simplified, and construction streamlined. Changes in governance relate to planning by urban local bodies, putting in place double entry accounting systems, promoting e-governance and user charges, and encouraging public-private partnerships. It is apparent that all these are to enable real estate companies to buy huge pieces of land within the city to develop and sell at exorbitant prices.

The reforms relating to participation make it mandatory to implement the 74th Amendment, participation and public disclosure laws, and provide basic services (water, sewerage, sanitation, health, education, social security) to the poor. In addition, 20-25% of housing has to be set aside for weaker sections. But these provisions conceal more than they disclose because a participation law could be different from the 74th Amendment, while a public disclosure law is not really necessary in light of the existence of the Right to Information Act. And when private players are to be made responsible for housing and services then it is difficult to imagine the urban poor being able to afford them.

The process of implementing the Mission is also full of contradictions. The City Development Plans (CDP), with a vision range of 7 years, are supposed to be prepared through a process of "consultation" with "stakeholders" – which is very different from the democratic process of public hearings followed for Master Plans. The Detailed Project Reports (DPR) follow from these CDPs, and then funds are released once the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) has been signed between the Centre, the State, and the Urban Local Body that reforms will be implemented. Each one of these steps is appraised and sanctioned by committees set up for the purpose and a series of 8 Toolkits have been specified for this purpose.

So far, all 63 CDPs have been prepared through Consultations conducted by private consultants, but the speed of the process has prevented any detailed need-based assessments of the city. All the CDPs have been appraised and sanctioned and Rs 4,500 *crores* released as the first instalment. On the basis of the CDPs, so far the Ministry has sanctioned 324 DPRs for a total amount of almost Rs50,000 *crores*. The policy framework for all this has been laid down through a structure of a National Steering Group, Sanctioning and Monitoring Committees, and Mission Directorates in two separate Ministries. This is followed by Steering Committees and Nodal Agencies at the State level who route the funds; and then by the Urban Local Body which is supposed to prepare the projects and implement them.

A look at the composition of the above Groups and Committees shows that they have only two people's representatives (Ministers at the National level and Members of Parliament / Legislative Assemblies at the State level); the rest are all bureaucrats and a few technocrats. A quick glance at the list of consultants engaged for the Mission, which has also been specified by the Ministry, shows that half are located in Delhi while the rest are from Bangalore and Hyderabad, with two from Mumbai, and one each from Chennai, Kolkata, Indore, and Salem – and most of them do not have experience with urban planning. Dominating this structure is the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) composed of very carefully selected "civil society" representatives, known for their market-friendly outlook.

It should, therefore, come as no surprise that 80% of the sanctioned DPRs are for water supply, sewerage, roads / flyovers, and drainage projects: considered to be very profitable enterprises by construction companies and consortia. Public transport and solid waste management barely get 10%. And two-thirds of the money has gone to just four big States - Maharashtra, Andhra, Gujarat and Karnataka (none of which can claim to be 'backward'). Even for BSUP, three-fourths of the money goes to these same States. What makes this harsher for the urban poor, particularly in the less developed States, is that wage employment and creation of fresh employment are strictly forbidden under the Mission.

According to the ADB, the 'achievements' in reforms until April 2008 comprised of Public Disclosure Laws in place in Assam, Tripura, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, and Chandigarh; Community Participation Laws enacted in Assam and Gujarat; ULCRA repealed in Maharashtra, Andhra, and West Bengal; and urban development laws passed in Sikkim and Mizoram, with Arunachal proposing to do so. Elections had been held in all existing ULBs, and for the first time in Gangtok, Aizwal, and Shillong. E-governance was accomplished in 9 cities; double entry accrual based accounting systems in 24 cities; 85% property tax coverage in 21 cities; 100% cost recovery in 6 cities for water supply and 3 cities for solid waste management; while 40 cities had earmarked internal funds for BSUP.

However, ADB has also listed out some challenges with "slow implementation" at the top, followed by weak reporting on reforms by the States, multiple contracts with inexperienced smaller firms, delays in implementation, and "poor visibility to citizens". But, perhaps crucial from the policy-makers point of view, is the admission that "expectations that JNNURM will leverage market funds did not materialise". In order to overcome these deficiencies, ADB thinks "enthusiasm has to be sustained to implement the reforms", elected representatives have to be "involved", and private sector participation has to be "facilitated". But the constraints lie in the capacities of the Ministry, the Mission Directorate, the ULBs, and training institutions, for which new management units are required.

In other words, the policy-makers are still unwilling to accept that the Mission is largely driven by public funds and institutions and are still hopeful that the implementation can be improved by by-passing these accountable agencies and turning the reins over to private bodies. However, the government is going to undertake a mid-term review, especially to evaluate implementation of the mandatory and optional reforms. This review allows participation by NGOs but only for those who have "expertise", that too at the "international level".

Hence, the questions that face civil society organisations may be mentioned as:

- Can JNNURM be understood as a part of globalisation?
- Are Reforms acceptable as a relationship between property and people?
- How participatory are Consultations and Toolkits?
- Is Democratisation of the supervisory Groups and Committees possible?
- What is the Social Competence of the empanelled Consultants?
- What is the Technical Competence of appraisal Agencies?
- Is the emphasis and thrust of DPRs and BUSP what people need?
- What is the linkage of urban renewal with Employment?
- If Market Funds do not get 'leveraged' where will money come from?
- What is civil society's role in the Comprehensive Review?
- How efficient and accountable is 'Private Participation'?

In brief, is it possible for us to examine the Mission to make it more inclusive by involving people's voices in all the committees, assess the real requirement of the people, comment on the competence of the appraisal and supervisory agencies, and restore accountability through public agencies who are spending public funds?

Dr J Adsule - Chair

The presentation draws a clear picture on various aspects of JNNURM and brings in pertinent questions about the Mission. Two years back when we had a similar consultation in Mumbai, there were many questions at that time. Generally people were questioning us and listing down the merits of the Mission which would bring in large scale development of the city. They confronted us as we were opposing it. This presentation raises the critical question whether the project is for the poor or is it only for the richer class. Moreover, there has been no debate in any public forum or even in Parliament or in the State Assemblies. Are the "civil society representatives" who are in the TAG really representing the people's issues? With this we begin the question-answer session.

Hemlata Kansotia,
Labour Education and Development Society, Jaipur, Rajasthan

We have started looking into JNNURM in Jaipur and distributed pamphlets, posters, news clippings, so that people get informed about the Mission. There are unauthorised *bastis* in Jaipur which need regularisation and people want land titles but, under JNNURM, the administration has planned a multi-storied building complex for them. When we showed people documentary films on high-rise buildings in Delhi and Mumbai, people could understand the drawbacks of such resettlement. As a result they fought back and some of the *bastis* have got land titles instead of constructed flats. The consultants have prepared plans running into many pages which are not possible for a lay person to understand. We thank Hazards Centre for giving us information about plans under the Mission, but if the plans are prepared by consultants and NGOs who have no experience in working at the grass-roots, then one can easily understand the quality of the plans.

Jai Prakash Trivedi,
Manav Sewa Sansthan, Agra, Uttar Pradesh

While some of the activists working in some other cities in UP such as Lucknow, Allahabad, Kanpur have been discussing about the Mission and engaging people, in Agra the consultants had called some media people, so-called NGO representatives, and government officers in a consultation meeting at the time of preparing the CDP. Out of the 45 people present barring few all were from outside Agra and they were treated with lavish dinners. The people of Agra were not invited to any of the consultations. We have come to know that Agra will be receiving Rs8000 *crores* under JNNURM, out of which Rs4800 *crores* is to be spent on road construction, water and sanitation projects. A public agency called MBP is associated with the planning of Agra, but they are unaware of the needs of poor. Even the MLAs and MPs of Agra don't know about JNNURM. If only NGOs working hand in glove with the government are included in various committees then where can the grass-root organisations go to protest against such undemocratic policies?

Kiran Kale
Lok Vikas Samajik Sansthan, Nasik, Maharashtra

Firstly, how has JNNURM violated the scope and content of 74th Amendment to the Constitution? Secondly, is SEZ part of JNNURM and if so then how is it linked with this Mission?

Ranjan Kumar
Nidan, Patna, Bihar

As Dunu mentioned that three States have repealed the Urban Land Ceiling Act which is one of the mandatory reforms under JNNURM. Now the question is how the States which

have not repealed it are receiving funds under JNNURM?

Dhananjay Tingal
Milestones, Delhi

Is there a mention in the JNNURM document of bringing in public private partnerships in services or it is just that the government wants to bring in the private sector for services so that they are absolved from all responsibilities including collection of user charges? The next question is how can we check and protest against the NGOs working with the government that are part of the Mission?

S A Azad
Prasar, Delhi

The presentation was a good piece of research, but then what is the next step? If all the Committees are occupied by government Secretaries then where should we go? There is a need to have a discussion in this seminar on how to take this forward.

Rajesh Jaiswal
Association of People's Initiative for Liberation, Kolkata

Are the consultants and planners accountable for their ill-planning? For example, three years back the Kolkata Environment Impact Project was approved to minimise the water-logging problems of the city. Rs1200 *crores* was sanctioned. Recently, it was found that after spending about Rs500 *crores* on the plan, there has been a serious planning error. It is also said that the government has to now spend Rs200 *crores* to demolish the construction. The entire money has been raised by way of loan on 14% interest which has to be repaid by the poor at higher rates.

Sita Ram
Yuva Sanstha, Mumbai

If Dunu could throw some light on the way Maharashtra has been given special treatment in this entire process of JNNURM.

Benny Kuruvilla
Focus on the Global South, Delhi

Dunu said that the JNNURM funds are a mix of grants and loans; grants from the Centre and loans from the financial institutions. What is the break-up of the funds that have been given to the States like Karnataka, Andhra, and Maharashtra? It would be useful to know how much loan has been given in last two years by international financial institutions such as the World Bank and the ADB and how the city governments are going to pay-back the loans.

Jawahar Singh
Jhuggi Jhopri Ekta Manch, Delhi

There has been large-scale eviction of the people, even of those living in the resettlement colonies of Delhi. Why has the government resorted to such a policy where people are evicted and resettled twice or thrice?

Indu Prakash Singh
Action Aid India International, Delhi

For the past three years, since the inception of JNNURM, one could see that many more policies and plans have been prepared simultaneously, such as National Housing Policy, 10th Five Year Plan, SEZs etc which have been justified in the Housing Policy. There have been many civil society initiatives to discuss the urban issues, which have analysed and critiqued the processes. In Mumbai for instance, there is no affordable housing but there is a scheme of rental housing. However, a family is eligible only if it earns Rs5000 pm, and preference is given to Maharashtrians. The strategy is clearly to divide the society from within.

Madhuresh
CACIM, Delhi

All the discussions are very technical and directly related to governance. If one presumes that instead of Private Public Partnership it was only Public, with no representatives of the people, then would JNNURM be successful? There is a fundamental flaw in the Mission. The conception of the city itself is for the rich or middle class and it is not for the poor. If one talks about NGO participation the Government can put up many NGOs, even big corporates have their NGOs, World Bank too has got many NGOs, and all these Committees have NGOs. It would be wise for us to talk about people's representatives and ward *sabhas*. NGOs can be there but only as advisory bodies.

Sarita Ramamoorthy
Focus on the Global South, Mumbai

74th Amendment should be followed in all the States, but there seems to be an attempt to sideline the 74th Amendment Act. We need some clarification on this aspect.

Pradip Kamble
Koshish, Mumbai

What is the reason behind choosing people under the new housing plan; who are these people having an income between Rs5000 to 8000?

Dunu Roy

I do not have the answers to all the questions, but shall try to give a few of the critical answers. Every city has a cut-off date: on the basis of this some people get housing and others don't; this divides the people. Thus organised protest falls apart. In Delhi, there are two cut-off dates, some get 18 sq.m plots and others get 12.5 sq.m plots, even though Delhi's Master Plan has recognised that people should get 25 sq.m plots. In Mumbai, when MUTP was implemented, NSDP and SPARC organised the slum dwellers with a promise that everyone will get housing. So there was a shift from individual plots to built-up flats, wherein those who have the capacity to pay the rent and user fee will have the privilege to live in affordable housing. Hence, there is a design that interlinks all these polices.

The 74th Amendment can be interpreted differently too: in one State the elected representatives comprise the ward committees; in another, elections are held at the ward level; and in a third the *Mohalla Sabhas* have been constituted for every 100 families. Similarly, accountability is also judged variously. In the Bhopal case the corporation could not be held liable because the environment laws make the regulatory agency accountable. Through the Right to Information Act, the citizen can access a lot of information, even file notings, but unless bureaucrats cooperate and a public disclosure law widens its scope, there will not be much relief.

One has to also understand how the formation of various Authorities sidelines democratic procedures in the name of the people. For instance, in 1948, when 5 *lakh* refugees came to Delhi from Pakistan, DLF (Delhi Leasing and Finance company) acquired land in the periphery of the city, in anticipation that there will be a big demand for residential areas. The then government sensed that there would be huge speculation in land, and it was to prevent profiteering by private companies that the Delhi Development Authority (DDA) was set up and the control of hand transferred entirely to it to develop it for affordable housing. But now DDA itself is auctioning off the land to private builders in the name of Public Private Partnerships (PPP).

Kalyani Menon-Sen
New Delhi

In a democracy, the elected representatives are supposed to be accountable but now there is a need to find ways to make them more accountable so that when citizens ask questions then they are not threatened by these MLAs and MPs who are made to answer the questions.

Beena Jadav
Action Aid, Ahmadabad

For the last 15 years, ever since the Sabarmati Improvement Project was launched, they have surveyed the *bastis*. People have protested against the project and many NGOs were part of the campaign, but the government was clear that people would be relocated and sent 15 km away from the city.

Dunu Roy

Under JNNURM, it was specified that a State Government would be given funds only if it gives a commitment to repeal ULCRA within six months. But on non-compliance, the State will not be given the second instalment. As far as the financial break-up is concerned, it is not very clear from the available data who has got what money for which project. The picture should be clearer by the end of this year.

But it is clear from the trend data that there is an increasing shortage of regular employment opportunities and government jobs are decreasing. For instance, when employment in post-offices was frozen, there was a rise in courier companies, and this is how there was a shift from permanent jobs to temporary, ad-hoc ones. So there is this insecurity which is built into the system by design. This insecurity will not be removed with the Social Security bill. There is a need, therefore to prepare to combat all these designs on several fronts.

It is not that only we need to ask questions, we also need to prepare the people so that they can debate with the government. For instance, the CDP is a voluminous document, it is difficult for the common man to read and understand it. We have to make them available to such an extent that the public can challenge the experts or the consultants and bring in the real picture of the city. In Delhi, for instance, we were able to disseminate so much information that people began to question the Master Plan and eventually the DDA had to accept before the Chief Information Commission that the Master Plan was formed without any primary data collection but on the basis of "expert views". It is these small victories that show how the planners and policy makers can be challenged.

Simanta Borah
SSTEP, Guwahati

There are many developmental projects that been undertaken in Guwahati but none of these follow the Master Plan. Moreover the Master Plan is also prepared on the basis of studies done by foreign companies.

Anshu Malviya
Human Rights Law Network, Allahabad

In Allahabad, there are around 22,000 people living in small clusters primarily settled in out-houses of the big bungalows in Civil Lines area. CDP had no mention of this and when we asked the Mayor, he came to know that the CDP had his signature without his knowledge! Most of the plans under JNNURM are ad-hoc, such as subways, road widening, removal of street-side markets, and the funds are used arbitrarily. The Municipality said that they don't have any land but when we surveyed we found that there are 9-10 places which are lying vacant and could be used to rehabilitate people. Moreover, there are 4-5 plans which are under construction of which the DPRs have not been passed. From where the government is getting funds to continue the work of these projects is unknown. We have to jointly take action against all the projects which have come up now and also previously in 1990 or even earlier from 1982, when the city was planned for a very different purpose.

Thaneshwar Adigaur
National Forum for Workers Rights, Greater Noida

Where are the funds for JNNURM coming from and who is sanctioning them? There is no employment generation mechanism. No one has any idea of who is the "public" in PPP. Why don't we have a GURM which would be the Grassroots level Urban Renewal Mission, which is prepared by the ward *sabhas*? If we can work together in this direction then only we would be in a position to really critique and oppose the government policy. This effort should not be limited to the city or State but should be at a national level. MPs, MLAs, Councillors should be made aware of the fact that none of the plans under JNNURM have been conceived with their consultation. The answer which DDA gave with respect to the studies not being done before making the Master Plan for Delhi should be made an issue and a rightful protest should be launched.

It is unfortunate that the NGOs have not been able to agree on some minimum understanding and this is why we fall apart. The General Elections are around the corner and we should not wait for Election Day to negotiate with the elected representatives. We should start preparing ourselves to negotiate and prepare an agenda to get to our goal.

Thaneshwar Adigaur, NFWR, Delhi

Sandeep Khare
Vigyan Foundation, Lucknow

We have organised around eight consultations on this topic so far and raised questions from time to time. Thus, the CDP of Lucknow was made on the basis of 2001 population data, and according to that there are no slums in the city. There are only two cities in India which are called slum-free: one is Lucknow and the other is Patna. While the present status indicates that there are 10-12 *lakh* people living in 787 slums in Lucknow alone. LUDA also gives a figure of 287 slums but that has not been recognised. The projects have started even before the DPRs were approved. CDP and DPRs are nothing but an illusion of city development, but people are unable to relate it to the increase in electricity charges in UP. JNNURM faintly talks about basic services for urban poor. *Kashiram Shaheri Vikas Yojana* is going to implement JNNURM in 5-8 wards; this is in turn transferring the power from Municipalities and *sabhasads* to the Urban Development Authorities all over UP, in spite of a lot of protest.

Conclusion:
Dr Adsule concluded the discussion by stating that the discussion illustrated the obvious fact that JNNURM is anti-poor, and that housing, education, health etc of the people should be given greater priority than growth in GDP.

***

Session II

Process of Participation and Consultation in JNNURM

Chair: Indu Prakash Singh, Action Aid India

Toolkits: a "how to" manual for reinventing our cities

Who were excluded, who collected the data, who made the plans?

Kalyani Menon-Sen, New Delhi

The JNNURM Toolkit is a document which explains in detail how to access funds from the Central Government for infrastructural development and is highly technical. One of the stated aims of JNNURM is provision of basic services to the urban poor, including security of tenure at affordable prices, improved housing, water supply and sanitation, and convergence of delivery of other existing universal services of the government for education, health, and social security, but it excludes new projects for provision of health and education and creation of employment opportunities. After reading and re-reading it, one actually discovers that it does not have any thing to do with the urban poor.

The first part of the Toolkit emphasises on sustainability, which is only possible through cost recovery which can be done phase-wise. The services will be based on user charges, with more charges for better services, and this can only be achieved by encouraging the private sector in service delivery. The Toolkit also emphasises on "capacity building" through engaging consultants for community participation and IEC (Information-Education-Communication). But there are no modalities suggested for how many people or organisations will be consulted for "participation", and there is no benchmark. There is a mandatory provision for community participation which gives guidelines on how to educate people in the usage of water to lessen wastage. But the DPR on water does not give any details for the recovery of capital and maintenance costs. This shows that the consultants have already presumed that the poor are the culprits, ignoring the fact that it is the rich who waste water.

On the structure of JNNURM, the Toolkit mentions that the presence of civil society actors in the various Directorates, Steering/Sanctioning Committees, and Monitoring Committees is not mandatory. In the previous presentation we could see how only 3 NGOs from all over India have been selected to be part of only the Technical Advisory Group, which also has no experts in urban society. Moreover, the "Voluntary Technical Corps" is likely to comprise of elite citizens with access to high-level processes. There is no space for the grassroots level NGOs.

It is a mandatory reform to include passage of a "Community Participation Law", but no benchmark is specified as to what community means and what the level of participation is, and how this is different from the provisions under the 74th Amendment to the Constitution. One of the optional reforms is earmarking of land for LIG housing, which indicates that the government is not serious about actually building housing for poor. There is no analysis of the lateral impacts of reforms either – apart from a mention that "any two optional reforms can be implemented each year".

In the CDP, there is a mention of "broad-based consultations" but there are no details of how these consultations are to take place. The Toolkit also mentions about "consensus-building" and "balancing competing demands" but has not specified any methodology for how this may be done. A close analysis of the CDP guidelines shows great concern towards a "strategy that integrates concerns of the poor" but there are no formats given for collecting data about the concerns of the poor.

In the guidelines for preparing DPRs, there is a detailed guideline for selection of consultants, but no similar norms have been set for "consultation with citizens". There is only a clear "market-oriented approach" to determine the consumers', especially the poor's, willingness to pay. "Community involvement" is seen as necessary to secure material contributions such as land, labour, or equity. But there is no recognition of the need for consultation with especially vulnerable groups. On the other hand, the detailed checklist for assessing cost/benefit of public vs private options for service delivery indicates a clear and visible bias favouring private firms.

Ranjan Kumar
Nidan, Patna, Bihar

The JNNURM is indeed anti-poor and to protest against it we need to join hands with the people, media and also the elected representatives. In Patna, massive protests against JNNURM have taken the shape of a campaign since 2006, and the State government has had to declare that they will soon have 100,000 houses for the poor in the entire State, out of which around 34,000 houses will be built in Patna. The government has sanctioned Rs312 *crores* and allotted 89 acres of land for this purpose. But actually 300 acres land is needed in Patna alone to accommodate all the slum dwellers, so we have filed a PIL. It is also noticeable that if a project is prepared in favour of the poor it takes a long time to get implemented, whereas the projects that are anti-poor get priority and are implemented immediately.

Ravinder Rai,
All India Trade Union Congress, Delhi

The entire project has been prepared by consultants without any research to get data on the present day situation. The documents are based on old data. These planners first make

constructions, which are subsequently demolished when they fail, and then a new project is designed. In the process the construction companies make a lot of money. The time has come for ordinary people to realise this and to come out in protest.

Jawahar Singh
Jhuggi Jhopri Ekta Manch, Delhi

The people have been displaced from one place to another more than three times. The Government agrees to the rich people's idea that the slum dwellers cause a lot of dirt in the city. People have got a plot of 22 sq yards after a long battle, but now the Government is moving them into multi-storied apartments, and one flat would cost a dweller around Rs3-4 *lakhs* which is not within their reach. On top of it, people have been resettled 30-40 kms away from their place of work. Why is this aspect never considered by the policy-makers?

Dhananjay Tingal
Milestones, Delhi

According to our survey in 2000, there were 52,000 homeless in Delhi, but the Government in the 2001 Census said that there were only 30,000 homeless in Delhi. In 2007, it was found that there are 90,000 homeless in the city, but there may be as many as 1.5 *lakh* people living in the city who are homeless. This illustrates the lack of reliable data on which to base planning.

Sadre Alam,
Hazards Centre, Delhi

In one of the surveys undertaken by *Sajha Manch*, we found that 50% of the people are opposed to the idea of multi-storied flats.

Dunu Roy,
Hazards Centre, Delhi

Can we provide the people more information through a dissemination campaign and is it possible to prepare an alternative "people's" Toolkit?

Dharmendra,
FDI Watch, Delhi

The JNNURM is manifestly anti-poor and a conspiracy by the State to sell off public utilities to the private sector.

Dr Kshitij Urs, Action Aid India, Bangalore

Dr Kshitij Urs
Action Aid India, Bangalore

JNNURM is only one programme out of many, but the others don't have the visibility of JNNURM. Urban renewal is not a new process. It happened during the Roman Empire, and in all programmes the poor have always been excluded. So urban renewal is not merely a programme but a political ideology. There are three main ideologies behind JNNURM: one is to minimise State responsibility; the second is to promote corporate governance; and the third is to facilitate privatisation of all services. For instance, Mukesh Ambani has just bought a house worth Rs 8000 *crores*. We are thus creating a society where one man can own a house worth Rs 8000 *crores*, while under JNNURM the government cannot buy land for the poor. The size of plots for the poor is also becoming smaller and smaller. So the government is playing the role of an agent consolidating land for the poor to buy.

The World Bank's Water and Sanitation Programme was prepared while sitting in New York. The argument begins with the WB saying that the middle class and the elites have doors for their toilets, which means that what is happening behind those doors is a 'private' act and the State has nothing to do with it. But the poor don't have doors to their

toilets, hence it is a 'public' act. So if there is a new development then the poorer residents should pay for the sewage which goes out of the house and will have to be metered. This is a vulgar interpretation of public life. Who owns the rain, rivers, and water bodies? How can the water be privatised? Even the State can not have ownership over any water bodies.

What precedes privatisation is commodification. We are currently in the middle of a huge rise in petrol prices, and at the same time the petrol companies are making maximum profits. Shell has a profit of 20 billion dollars over the last two years because we can't call petrol a national commodity. Similarly when water is commodified, it will go the same way as petrol. Earlier water was considered as a social need, even the Government was obliged to provide water, but now the scenario has changed. Now ownership of water has gradually changed; it is now is a private good. In resistance to it, people are saying that it should be a Human Right. But people have not contributed to this transformation; it is the powerful class which brings in new theories.

Now the condition is that if you can buy water then you will get it, otherwise you will not get it. Commodification has reached such an extent that water meters have been installed in all the slum pockets in Bangalore, which have 24 *lakh* people living in them, but there is no water. In one event a family did not pay any money, and over a period of two years the monthly charge of Rs 57 accumulated to Rs 42,655 with interest and arrears, and on account of non-payment, 26 people where arrested. The bill was not generated by a private agency but by the Government. In a sense what is happening is that for the poor there is an 'access deficit' and 'democratic deficit' and they are interlinked.

The evolution of PPP is very interesting; the investment is not coming from companies but from the public, but the ownership is of companies. This is what is happening in five cities of Karnataka, where the water is being supplied by a French company. The Government spends money to build the infrastructure to bring water to the city from the river and lay down the pipelines etc in the city with public money, while the French company will supply water from the tanks to the houses and recover the bills. The State is also giving them Rs 24 *crores* for two years without any conditions and half of the money will be in Euros. Nothing was discussed with the municipalities; they came to know about the scheme only after implementation.

There is a multi-level attack to dilute the democratic process both vertically and horizontally. Horizontally, because of the advent of consumerism, the liberalisation of the economy is growing fast, reducing the accountability of the State and producing a decaying democracy. Vertically, the Urban Local Bodies and Public Service Providers are by-passed and more centralisation of powers is happening, further diluting accountability and democratic functioning. Thus it is clear that Democracy is being removed from the functioning of the State. This reflects the whole process of JNNURM: it is designed to destroy the democratic fabric of the country.

Vimala
Mahila Pragati Manch, Delhi

In our *basti* in Sundernagari, the Delhi Jal Board advised the people to install a collective water meter and then pay to the authority. This means that now no one knows how much water they have individually consumed. People have also been misled into buying flats in multi-storied buildings. Reliance Company has come and is slowly entering into all the spaces of the poor, from electricity supply to selling vegetables and fruits.

Shashi Kaur
CFAR, Delhi

Why can't the poor live the way they are now, with the government giving plots for 7-10 years?

Kaushalya
CFAR, Delhi

How is it possible for women who earn Rs400 per month, to buy such expensive plots?

Anita Soni
Independent Researcher Activist, Delhi

We have to look at the rays of hope amidst these repetitive failures. Democracy is the only weapon the people of India have, they can vote anyone out or vote them in. Why are we calling workers 'poor', when they are the people who are fighting for their rights and not asking for charity?

K Rajendra
Samata, Vishakapatnam

Under JNNURM there is a threat to water, land, and forests of Vishakapatnam. It is the wrong policies that are leading to the crisis in maintaining the natural resources, so who should we blame for it? For instance, one of the major threats is the petro-chemical waste that is being released into the sea.

***

Session III

Infrastructure vs Basic Services for all

Chair: Dr Kshitij Urs, Action Aid India, Bangalore

Sanjay Vijayvergiya
Centre for Policy Advocacy, Lucknow

JNNURM is a milestone in the last 30 years of all developmental planning for the cities in India. In most of the cities the development started with the formation of Development Authorities since 1970, barring DDA which was formed earlier. The only work which these Development Authorities have done is to acquire vast lands around the cities through public notices and then sell it. During the '70s, around 40% of India's population was deprived of tenurial security, while the Development Authorities constructed HIG, MIG flats, so that the house was related with the economic class of the people. The 10th Five Year Plan (2002-2007) stated that Government does not have data on the residents of the city. Hence, huge funds have been sanctioned to map the entire city and collect data through URIF.

The 2001 census shows that Lucknow has 1.55 *lakh* people living in slums and 1.99 *lakh* in Agra – where 42% of the entire population lives in slums. URIF was succeeded in 2005 by JNNURM, and the opening statement of the Prime Minister was, "Cities are the growth centres of the country". Thus, the ground was paved for declaring the world class city as a prime necessity of the nation. But by focusing too much on one project, we are giving it unnecessary importance. We have to look at four other policies which go hand in hand with the JNNURM.

In 2004, the last Prime Minister had announced the *National Vending Policy* before relinquishing his post. This was welcomed by many people across the country as a tool to give social security to the unorganised work force. The Policy determines which part of a city will come under the vending zone and which under a non-vending zone. But in most of the cities it was seen that those areas, where there are the most vending activities, were declared as non-vending zones. And in 2005 came this related Mission which supported the Vending Policy by advocating decongestion of cities.

The linkage can be seen in 2006, when the Government gave permission to corporate retail trade for systematising the vending trade. Hence, in Indore, a place like Palasia was made a non-vending zone; so was the Animia Chowk in Lucknow. In Delhi, they have zoned out Chandni Chowk and Karol Bagh on the pretext of giving the vendors dignified entrepreneurship, but which has actually led to loss of employment. In Indore, among the first new shops to open in Palasia was Reliance Fresh.

In 2007, the Government announced *Rashtriya Awaas Niti* for housing, and for the first time in Indian history an ongoing project was given the shape of policy. This *Rashtriya Awaas Niti* complements the reform agenda of JNNURM. Under the *Niti*, housing was declared a basic need like water and food, to overcome the lack of 247 million houses as per the 2001 Census, which states that 22% of the urban population lives in slums. But the *Niti* stipulates that the funds will be raised by private developers, who will develop 15-25% housing for the people who can't afford houses. It is to encourage such developers that JNNURM has mandated the repeal of ULCRA, leading to acquisition of vast tracts outside the current city boundaries by private firms.

In Lucknow, where such private corporations have built townships with houses for "all sections", the minimum rate for a flat is Rs 14 *lakhs*. JNNURM has a slogan of "housing for all, and basic facilities for all". However, the National Housing Policy (NHP) says that government can't build houses for all, so it can be built through public-private partnerships. Under the 11th Five Year Plan, it is estimated that 15 *lakh* houses are required. In Lucknow, under PPP these houses will cost Rs 1.85 *lakh* with a monthly instalment of Rs 1765. For the 22% people living in slums, out of whom 26% are BPL, these houses are clearly unaffordable.

ADB was at first only a technical advisor in JNNURM, now the Government wants ADB to invest money also. In Indore, the water privatisation will scale the water charges up by 30%. In theory, therefore, JNNURM will decongest the cities, and NHP will provide housing, but the cost is not known. In similar fashion, the *Rashtriya Kisan Ayog* was established for farmers and its report suggested that corporate farming will solve the problem of farming suicides.

There is a strong relationship between all these policies, and the Government's plan of selling the country to the multi-national corporations (MNCs) through the *New Economic Policy*. Kshitij's presentation showed us that the Government is functioning in a centralised manner. It is happening to such an extent that the Central Government is by-passing the Urban Local Bodies and State Governments. In Lucknow, when the corporate retails were closed under public pressure, the Central Government threatened the State Government that they should remove the ban otherwise the support for the farming sector will be lifted. There has been an 80% increase in the international loan between Dec 2007 and March 2008. This is directly related to the conditionalities imposed by the international funding institutions. For instance, in the case of the farm policy, 40% of the project fund goes to consultants. All these consultants used to be share brokers and now they are responsible for developing our farms and our cities. We all know that we are supposed to be a democratic nation, but then, taking further from the idea of electoral democracy we should demand voting rights in the US elections, because that is the country which is really running our nation. Let us stop talking about the World Bank's role in government. The protest should be against the Central Government, it has nothing

to do with the State Government or Local Bodies. We have to develop a strategy which would talk about all these five policies simultaneously.

Dunu Roy
Hazards Centre, Delhi

What is the role of the regional governments in JNNURM? What are the possibilities for workers to protect their own interests?

Sanjay Vijayvergiya
Centre for Policy Advocacy, Lucknow

In 1991, GATT was not even discussed at the Chief Ministers' meeting. The Central Government has negated the existence of State Governments so that they can establish a strict federal control. All State Governments are running in deficit. The big question is whether we still have democracy in our country.

Dr J Adsule
Committee for the Right to Housing, Mumbai

While working in Mumbai our experience is that people often pressurise us to work with the Builders. Committee for the Right to Housing sensitised people through handbills, publications etc on the SRA scheme which is supported by the Builders. Nowhere, throughout India, have slum populations ever asked for free houses, so why have free housing schemes come into existence? It was in the interests of the Builders who built small flats in the name of the eligible slum population and then used the surplus prime land for their commercial pursuits. After a one-and-a-half month struggle, people avoided us and then they asked CRH to prepare handbills on how to form a society to be eligible for SRA scheme and also develop a mechanism so that there is minimum loss. We could not do anything beyond a limit because the Builders employ agents and they influence people so much that people agree to the terms of Builders. Then we had to start working on issues like possession of documents for proof of residence, services in the high-rise apartments, etc. People want immediate solutions, they don't want to organise and protest against such programmes. This is something which is too challenging for us. CRH is coordinating around 22 NGOs working on housing rights. Most of the NGOs say that housing is the priority and then is eviction. So they engage themselves in SRA schemes: this is unfortunate, but it is the reality.

Indu Prakash Singh
Action Aid India International, Delhi

Housing policy has been talked about everywhere but it is interesting to know who are talking about it. There was a meeting of about 50 real estate giants under NREDO (National Real Estate Developers Organizations) such as DLF, Ansals, MR, etc. They were

discussing about affordable housing for all and were demanding from the government to give them concessions such as convenient EIA, FAR, etc. Even then, the minimum cost of a house they could come down to was Rs 5 *lakhs*. In the meeting it was also discussed how MR Infrastructures, a Dubai based multi-million construction company, will be developing flats costing about Rs 2 *crores* each near the Commonwealth Games Village. In another Euro-India Meet, chaired by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, it was discussed how India could get money for preservation of monuments and heritage.

The Housing Policy is nothing but a sham one and we need to simplify it so that people can understand it better. It has always been that the poor are targeted many times but actually nothing happens for them.

Conclusion:

Summing up the discussion, Dr Kshitij Urs said that the Prime Minister had, in his speech, said that he wants to build 300 Singapores in India. But, on the contrary, 99% of the housing is controlled by the government. Until 1995, Singapore also did not allow any private builders. Then later some big corporate houses wanted to build palatial houses, so a small portion of land was given to them but under the control of the government. All the information relating to the cost of construction and the cost of land was shown and discussed with the client. But this imagery of Paris or Singapore fools us.

In JNNURM there are five different aspects related to the land, and if they are combined then one can see the cumulative effect. First is the repeal of ULCRA; second is to bring down the registration fee from 13 to 5 percent; third is to combine satellite imagery with e-governance; fourth is easy conversion from agriculture land to residential land; and fifth is foreign companies can have free land holding. So if one needs to buy a house, then one is theoretically competing with Bill Gates to buy that piece of land. He creates the imagery of the city and his company can buy any land at whatever rate.

Second thing is that not all state budgets are deficit budgets. For instance, in Karnataka there is a surplus of Rs 2000 *crores*. Then why should Karnataka take loans? The State is showing a surplus budget so that it can take more loans. But now the situation is that the Central Government does not see a self-sufficient city and the city has to prove its credit worthiness. Bihar is getting lesser funds because it has not shown the credit worthiness. This credit worthiness is projected through the reform agenda under JNNURM in terms of cutting down on the social costs.

***

Session IV

Future Strategies with City Level Action Plan

Chairs: Dunu Roy, Ranjan Kumar, Sanjay Vijayvergiya, and Dr J Adsule

Dunu Roy opened the session on Future Strategies by raising three issues that emerged from the two-day deliberations:

- First, is it possible to have a citizen's review of JNNURM? It is important to challenge JNNURM, we can call it by whatever name. Many of the organisations present have collected data of the urban poor population, their education and employment etc. On the basis of that can we collectively produce an Alternative Report on JNNURM?

- Second is the aspect of centralisation. It is true that the Central Government is trying to centralise control of programmes but there is no central command. The reason is that the political situation is based on alliance formation at the Centre and there is no single Party rule. In the forthcoming election, can we use the alternative report with a charter of demands to negotiate with the candidates standing for election?

- Third is the importance of building strong links between us. It is well known that the government and other agencies have been buying the obedience of various NGOs. In coming years, anyone who speaks for the rights of the people will be curbed. For instance, in Kolkata, recently the police tried to suppress the findings of an Independent People's Tribunal. These retaliations show that the State is under threat and insecure. In such a situation how can we remain together?

Sanjay Vijayvergiya gave a brief account of the discussions in a small group on the previous evening. One of the successes the group noted was that people who had met in Chennai previously could meet again in Delhi for a follow-up. It was also recognised that there is some organisation or the other working in almost all the cities, and it is important that we share information and activities among us to bring it to the public domain with unconditional access. We should bring data from all the cities and form a consolidated report which would be the report of all the organisations involved in it. All organisations should use the report at all levels and get it translated into vernacular languages so that more and more people have access to the Citizen's Report. Another issue that was discussed was that we have to restrain ourselves from 'academic terrorism': if we are to speak on people-centric issues, we have to work in a people-centric way.

Ranjan Kumar remarked that the most important thing discussed yesterday was to create the Citizen's Report. With this report we can create pressure both at the National and State levels. We should take our protest to the Constitutional and elected bodies. We have to find ways to integrate with various other campaigns such as those on judicial accountability, media, etc. The consensus developed at the National level could be followed at the State level.

K Rajendra offered to organise some workshops and training programmes in Vishakapatnam and Hyderabad on JNNURM. He invited the participants to come to these workshops to elaborate further on JNNURM. With the help of the documents we have collected, he would make people aware of the Mission and build a public consciousness around it.

Rajesh Jaiswal reported that they have an alliance of 3-4 organisations in Kolkata working on workers' rights. We should analyse the impact of a new policy on different policies already running in the State. The Government is adamant in banning the hand-pulled rickshaws in the city in the name of humanity, but it is unfortunate that it is not seeing the impact on the livelihood of these rickshaw pullers as it is their only source of income. It is not right to bring in a new policy without understanding the plight of these workers and properly rehabilitating them. We also have to be cautious about the bureaucrats, as they discuss things with us but when it comes to preparing the policy they do what they want to do and then put our names in the list of discussants.

Pradip Kamble said since Mumbai is the commercial and financial capital of the country, on one hand the government figures show about 60% of Mumbai's population lives in slums, and on the other hand government is bringing in many infrastructure development projects to develop the city under JNNURM. We work with the homeless people and speak about their right to work and live but they are not given any rights. Now that organisations such as CRH are working against these anti- people projects, we should work together to develop an alternative plan with a worker's perspective.

Dhananjay Tingal felt our objectives and goals should be clear. If our aim is to stop these projects then we should be in a position to identify the common threats and work together to tackle them.

Dunu Roy commented that this question has been discussed throughout the seminar. The basic strategy was to understand the linkages between all policies and programmes in almost all the cities and how they posed a common threat to the people. We have to discuss how to involve more and more people in discussions and debates.

Kiran Kale said they had organised a workshop with the Corporators of Nasik, about 12 of them came, and we found that even the Corporators are not aware of JNNURM provisions. So when the CDP was prepared on the basis of 1995 data the Corporators

assisted in organising meetings in various slum localities and informed people about the Mission.

Beena Jadav, Action Aid, Gujarat

Beena Jadav reported that the CDP of Ahmedabad has already been prepared and appraised and sanctioned. There are 37 projects which have been passed so far under JNNURM in Gujarat for a total of about Rs16,856 *crores*. There are 20 projects in Ahmedabad, 3 in Rajkot, 11 in Surat, and 3 in Baroda. As far as housing is concerned there is not much mention in the CDP of Ahmedabad. The area of the city has been increased by including 110 *nagar panchayats* and the city is now divided into five zones. All this data had to be acquired through RTI. Rs5,522 *crores* has been sanctioned for the Ahmedabad CDP, of which Rs495 *crores* is allotted for urban housing.

More than one *lakh* people have been evicted to implement these projects. According to the 2007 data, there are about 12 *lakh* people living in 714 *bastis*. In one of the orders by Gujarat High Court, a slum cluster was removed because the court observed that it is obstructing development work. The cluster was removed and sent 15 km away from the city with no basic amenities as the resettlement site is not equipped with any facilities. In

Surat 55,000 houses are to be built of which about 30,000 houses have been built for the poor, but they have not been allotted till date while the cut-off date for eligibility is 1967. We have to come together to protest against the eviction of people at the national level.

Mansoor Khan suggested that a National level campaign should be launched to protest against JNNURM simultaneously in all the cities in India. This should be clubbed along with candle marches and JNNURM documents should be burnt in public.

Rakhi requested Hazards Centre to help their organisations to work on this in Jaipur.

Hemalata Kansotia further added that JNNURM work started about one and half years back in Jaipur. Before that, the organisations had no idea about JNNURM but there are many big NGOs now which are part of the community development programme of JNNURM. The city is developing into a tourism city with malls, etc which will affect the livelihood of hawkers and vendors. The government fails to understand that a city cannot function without workers. Then we had a city-level alliance with CFAR and organised a training workshop, in which some of the officials also joined us in our protests. But we need to understand all the projects and programmes. In the recent blasts in Jaipur, it is the poor hawkers and vendors who have been arrested on mere suspicion, and in this situation we have to organise people more and more.

Sandeep Khare said that his organisation is committed to spreading awareness among the urban poor in UP but still there is a huge difference between the work we do for the people and the actual problems faced by them. At the national level we may make media strategies etc but it is not always needed at the local level. For instance, when there was a water crisis in Old Lucknow, people captured a water tanker and admitted to doing so when the police asked them. They said that they will do it again tomorrow and if the police want to arrest then let them arrest.

Instead of wasting time to protest against World Bank, ADB etc we should be more involved at the local level. The urban poor are mainly concerned with their basic services rather than thinking about JNNURM; they are happy if development activities take place. In the case of the Ganga Expressway, people were getting evicted but they are satisfied because they want to get more and more compensation. So it is sometimes very difficult to understand what and for whom are we fighting.

Jai Prakash Trivedi described his organisation's work on three things in Agra. One was a protest against insufficient water supply which was led by women, where they jammed the main important crossing on the National Highway. The second was against the Municipality which wanted to construct 125 toilets at places where they were not required, and eventually the people did not allow them to be built in around 10-12 areas. The third was with women to get the liquor shops demolished.

Also under *Kanshi Ram Awaas Yojana*, the authorities distributed application forms for Rs300 and when they stopped people *gheraoed* them and forced them to declare that the forms would be available for the rest of the week. But according to the plan there will be only 7,000 houses, while 50,000 forms have been sold. So it is clear that the demand is for 50,000 houses, although the authorities are constructing only 7000. We should, therefore, also think of how our city should look like. NGOs should be involved at the time of policy formulation and we all should unite.

Anshu Malviya recounted that it is now three years since JNNURM discussions began but there is not much improvement in the quality of the discussion. This is due to the lack of networking and interactions and lack of engagement with the media. There may be some difference among all of us, but we should work towards removing these differences. There isn't enough information among people, and we should first develop that and refrain from forming platforms.

Thaneshwar Adigaur said that his organisation is working in Greater NOIDA, which is not under JNNURM but the area is being developed under SEZ. It has been 18 years since Greater NOIDA has been developed but apart from facilities for rich people, there are none for the poor such as government schools, dispensaries, public toilets, transport, and even housing. As part of the action plan we should include last year's recommendations and prepare for elections. We should also analyse Commonwealth Games and compare with the Asiad Games.

There is a need for all organisations to come together. There may not be a forum but it should not be left completely open at the same time. Together we can plan some actions which can be done simultaneously in all the 21 cities present here. Since the general elections are coming, organisations present here should use this opportunity to build pressure on all governments and parties.

Mithilesh Kumar Verma felt that he had learnt many things from this workshop and would go back and share them with his colleagues. We have to mobilise people against JNNURM and Hazards Centre should assist in organising training workshops and programmes in Varanasi.

Naresh Kumar agreed that he would share these experiences and try to contact people on this issue in Dehradoon, to try to implement the action plan agreed to in this meeting.

Simanta Bora affirmed that it is important to join with the Northeast in this campaign as almost all the projects are being implemented by removing slums. A lot of support and information is required for organising workshops and public meetings in Guwahati.

J S Walia said that they had organised two rallies in April and May 2008 on the housing issue in Faridabad. But because of lack of information, the people have not been able to

come together. We may not be able to provide data but can help in collecting it so that we can intervene at all political levels in order to register our protest against this Mission.

Yacoub Zakaria suggested that, since for the past one month, TISS Mumbai has been working on a JNNURM laboratory, which looks into the day to day developments under the Mission, all the grassroots organisations could suggest what support they need and what should be the content of the laboratory.

Bholeswar Prasad Kushwaha informed that, in Delhi, Rs 18 *crores* is generated by rickshaw pullers and any move to render them jobless should be strongly resisted. But most of the national leaders and political parties were treating the people's mandate very lightly. Hence, there should be a seminar for the elected representatives and a committee should be formed at the national level for dissemination of information.

Dr Kshitij Urs revealed that, in Mumbai last week, three former MLAs went to court against the repeal of ULCRA. According to ADB, the States are receiving less than one-third of the budget, while there is a shift of responsibility from the government to consultants in city planning. Thus, Price Waterhouse Coopers has been hired by the State of Karnataka to prepare the 11th Five Year Plan. Since 2004, a City Managers Association has been set up, consisting only of IAS officers, to whom projects are being out-sourced. For instance, the Commissioner of BBMP is the Chairman of the CMA, which is a clear conflict of interest.

We are exposing many of these aspects, including the role of Ramesh Ramanathan, head of TAG under JNNURM, so that he had to leave Bangalore. We have also been trying to get permanent land titles for the urban poor, so that no projects can uproot them, but it may get stalled because of the BJP government. Hence, there is a need to prepare the young generation by sensitising and informing then about these projects, missions, etc. There is also a strong need to build a grassroots people's struggle to expose the truth behind such events as repealing ULCRA and *Patta* Act under JNNURM.

Ranjan Kumar added that we have to work continuously to strengthen peoples' struggle. It is important to exchange information among us. People for their own benefit should strengthen these kinds of initiatives.

Dr J Adsule emphasised that the participants who have come from other States should be given all sorts of assistance so that a national protest against JNNURM is launched. We should have a centralised data-bank on this issue. We have to prepare a strategy for all the 21 cities attending the seminar, and discuss the mechanism of sharing, protest, and research: this should include developing new models of protest. All activists should be trained and informed on the issues of workers' rights and their alleviation.

Sanjay Vijayvergiya reminded that along with the 63 cities under JNNURM, we have to bring all 5300 small and big cities in the country together. Without this, we would not be able to bring out a comprehensive Citizens' Report. In small cities there is also large acquisition of land by corporate houses. For instance, in Jhansi, 63,000 acres have been bought by a builder. There has to be a strong protest against urban renewal missions by the people's organisations and a demand to withdraw it. In future, any programme in the name of the people should include participation from all sections of the public.

Sadre Alam felt that we have to change our own self and the contradiction that lies within us. Until then it is difficult to work with the people.

Indu Prakash Singh argued there should small protests and actions instead of one large, big intervention. For example, in Bihar, there is a foundation stone which says that this land is for the poor, but the people who have occupied it are rich professionals. We should train cadres who can lead the protests, but we also need to keep training and re-training and also assert the rights of the workers. We should take the responsibility to take some initiatives and appeal for support from all concerned organisations.

Sarita Ramamoorthy said there can be one common platform, where there can be information sharing. We should put the emails of all those who are present in a yahoo-group on JNNURM, so that we can have a space to exchange information.

D Leena agreed with Sanjay, that it is not the matter of 63 cities alone, so we need to collect more and more information on many other smaller towns and cities and network with them. We should work towards forming a data-bank at the State level on all the projected programmes.

Conclusions:

Dunu Roy summed up the deliberations of the two-day seminar by identifying the consensus on the future course of action and responsibilities:

- Instead of forming a national forum, there should be a common slogan on the lines of '*Humse Hai Sheher*'. But this does not fully incorporate the interests of workers. So a more inclusive slogan is invited.

- An interactive group can be formed to raise the issues of all the cities. It may not begin with a centralised data resource centre, but all the organisations should be able to use each others' data, pamphlets, reports, etc in their own urban work.

- The Planning Commission is planning a mid-term review of JNNURM and we could work towards preparing a Citizens' Report on JNNURM with the help of a "citizens' toolkit". The responsibility of preparing a draft citizens' toolkit is accepted by Dr Kshitij Urs of Bangalore and Sanjay Vijayvergiya of Lucknow / Indore (later joined by Kalyani Menon-Sen of Delhi). This draft will be then sent to all the groups in various cities and together we can prepare a Citizens Review report on JNNURM.

- In order to share information easily and quickly, we could have an e-group that will be uploaded with all the reports, documents, handbills, plans, protests etc conducted by groups / organisations in various cities on JNNURM.

- An action plan to protest simultaneously against JNNURM in all the linked cities is to be planned and held on November 14, 2008, the birthday of Jawaharlal Nehru.

- There have been several suggestions of envisioning what should a city look like? A daft manual of how to make a people's plan for the city, based on sustainable and worker-friendly concepts, will be prepared for circulation by Hazards Centre.

- Vigyan Foundation and Centre for Policy Advocacy have offered to organise the next seminar in Lucknow in September or October 2008.

In conclusion, on behalf of Hazards Centre, Dunu Roy thanked all the participants for coming from all over India to share their experiences and evolve a consensus on a future plan of action.

***

ANNEXURE - I

Challenges to JnNURM
June 21-22, 2008, at Indian Social Institute, New Delhi
Programme Schedule

Day one – 21st June 2008

Schedule	
9.30 am	*Registration of the delegates*
9.45 am – 10.15 am	Introductory Session of the Seminar Summary of the deliberations and recommendations of the past seminars.
Session – I (10.15 am to 1.00 pm)	
10.15 am – 10.45 am	Technical Structure of JNNURM Formations of TAG, CDPs, PPPs, Guidelines, Nodal Agencies Dunu Roy, Hazards Centre
10.45 am – 1.00 pm	City level Discussions**
1.00 pm – 1.45 pm – Lunch Break	
Session – II (1.45 pm – 5.00 pm)	
1.45 pm – 2.15 pm	Process of Participation, Consultation in JNNURM Who were excluded, who collected the data, who made the plans? Analysis of toolkit Ranjan, Nidan, Patna Kalyani, Jagori, New Delhi
2.15 pm – 5.00 pm	City level Discussions**

Day two – 22nd June 2008

Session - III (9.30 am – 1.00 pm)	
9.30 am-10.00 am	Infrastructure vs Basic Services for all: Urban Poverty Removal Strategy and Financial break-ups under JNNURM. Sanjay Vijayvergiya, Centre for Policy Advocacy
10.00 am – 1.00 pm	City level Discussions**
1.00 pm – 1.45 pm – Lunch Break	
Session – IV (1.45 pm – 5.00 pm)	
1.45 pm – 3.45 pm	Future Strategies with City level action plan
3.45 pm – 5.00 pm	Conclusions and recommendations

*** Representatives from various cities will be called to speak on the topic*

ANNEXURE - II

To The City Editor

PRESS RELEASE

June 22, 2008

National Seminar on
Challenges to the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission, New Delhi

The Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JnNURM) is a subterfuge to foist the agenda of market-driven urban reforms on to all State Governments without any democratic debate or public discussion. This was the conclusion arrived at after two days of deliberations at a National Seminar on Challenges to JnNURM, held in Delhi on June 21-22, 2008, at the Indian Social Institute. Representatives of activist groups and civil society organisations from17 cities covered under the Mission were unanimous that these reforms would prove disastrous for the cities and their working populations. These cities include Bangalore, Ahmedabad, Jaipur, Lucknow, Allahabad, Agra, Guwahati, Patna, Kolkata, Dehradun, Mumbai, Nasik, Vishakapatnam, Varanasi, Faridabad, and Delhi. This was the third seminar organised by Hazards Centre on this Mission.

Almost all the delegates coming from these cities have been involved in mobilizing the urban poor for their entitlements and analyzing the JnNURM and its consequent CDPs (City Development Plans) and the impact on the city. Hence, they were not only equipped with information on the Mission but were also familiar with the conditions of the people at the grass-roots and an understanding of their requirements from the city. Two years after the commissioning of the Mission, the consensus was that the JnNURM has done nothing but transferred the onus of providing services and infrastructural facilities from the public sector to the private sector. This has not even brought in any significant market investment leave alone providing efficient and accountable services.

In all the cities, the City Development Plans have been prepared by a set of empanelled Consultants without any working experience of urban planning, in the absence of any sound primary baseline data, and without widespread consultations with the urban population. A preliminary analysis of 15 CDPs published by Hazards Centre, the organizers of the Seminar, opened the debate on the conditionalities underlying the process of the preparation of the CDPs. Sanjay Vijayvergiya from the Centre for Policy Advocacy, Lucknow showed how the Mission documents stated that if a City is unable to implement the mandatory reforms within a fixed period then its next instalment would be stopped. Thus the Government of India was treating the State Governments in the same manner as the international funding agencies like ADB were behaving with India. According to him, there are five mega projects similar to the Mission and all the

documents indicate the same transition from the public to the private sector. Hence, the wider context is that of the struggle against the concerted efforts of the Central Government to sell our country to the international merchants and corporations.

Dunu Roy of the Hazards Centre, Delhi, explained the structure of JnNURM and which agencies have been given the tasks to frame, appraise, and implement the Mission. He showed how the same class of people are present in the National Steering Group, the Technical Advisory Group, and also in the Monitoring Committee and Reforms Appraisal Committee. He also pointed out that, at the level of implementation, the major share of the funds from the Mission is going towards road widening, water, and sanitation programmes, and that too in the cities of the four States of Maharashtra, Gujarat, Karnataka, and Andhra Pradesh.

Kalyani Menon Sen of Delhi gave a presentation on the Mission Toolkit to supplement the point that the manner in which they are prepared implicitly favours a non-democratic and elite vision of the city. Ranjan Kumar of Nidan, Patna illustrated how even the city corporators did not know of the CDP and the implication for the urban local body as well as the city. Dr J. Adsule from Committee for Right to Housing, Mumbai spoke on the previous deliberations on JnNURM and how people have begun coming together on one platform. Dr Kshitij Urs from Action Aid, Bangalore emphasized that the Mission was facilitating the shift of democratic institutions of governance to centralised rule that favoured the rich and powerful.

After a rich discussion on different aspects of the Mission and how it was unfolding in the real context of their cities, the delegates arrived at the following decisions:

1. A slogan was coined to bring together people from different cities on the issue of the "Working Class City" or "*Mehnatkasho ka shaher*".
2. A Citizen's review of the Mission will be conducted to challenge the scheduled mid-term review by the Ministry and the ADB and their consultants.
3. For this purpose, a Citizen's Toolkit will be formulated and distributed among all those citizen's groups willing to conduct such a review in their city.
4. On November 14, all the city reviews will be combined into a Citizen's Report and a nation-wide protest launched against the JnNURM.
5. Information on the Mission and the Citizen's review will be widely disseminated at local, State, and National levels.
6. A process would be initiated to prepare an alternative working class perspective document for the planning of the city.

ANNEXURE – III

Participants

National Seminar on Challenges to the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission On June 21 - 22, 2008, Indian Social Institute, New Delhi

SN	Name	Organisation & Address	Phone and Email
1	Dr J Adsule	**Committee for the Right to Housing** P.P.C Chawl, Plot No. 341, Near Ram Mandir , Khelwadi, Bandra (E), Mumbai –400051	022-22916941 crhmumbai@rediffmail.com
2	Rajesh Jaiswal	**Association of People's Initiative for Liberation** 31/1 Dr. Dhiren Sen Sarani, Kolkata – 06	09831691041 apilindia@gmail.com
3	K. Rajendra	**Cry Net / Samata** Mahinvanipeta, Vishakapatnam	rajendr _sujana@rediffmail.com 09848557107
4	Beena Jadav	**Action Aid - Gujarat** 10/A Chandra Colony, Near Cargo Motors Lane, Opp. Infolines, Ahmedabad	079-26463792 09426173764 beena@actionaidindiaorg.in
5	Kiran Kale	**Lok Vikas Samajik Sanstha** Old Municipal School No. 56/67, Peth Road, Fule Nagar, Panchavati, Nasik – 501673	09822028349 lvsskkiran@rediffmail.com lokvikassamajiksansantha@yahoo.com
6	Mansoor	**Beghar Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti** RZ-70/350,Jagdamba Vihar, Sagarpur West, New Delhi - 110046	09211979454 begharkadost@gmail.com
7	Andrea Wright	**Tata Institute of Social Sciences** Deonar, Chembur, Mumbai - 400088	09967761726 andrealeewright@gmail.com
8	Pradip Kamble	**Koshish** Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Deonar, Chembur, Mumbai – 400088	09821824958 pradip_tiss @yahoo.co.in tarique_n@rediffmail.com
9	Simanta Borah	**SSTEP (Society for Social Transformation and Environment Protection)** Manik Nagar Japarigoge, House No. - 11, Ganeshgowri, Guwahati	09435063428 borah.simanta@rediffmail.com sstepghy@gmail.com
10	Rakesh Bhardwaj	**PEACE** F - 93, Katwaria Sarai, New Delhi	09953504626 Rockypeace@gmail.com

11	Ranjan Kumar	**Nidan** Sudama Bhawan, Boring Road, Patna – 800001	09835017165 09430246270 nidan@rediffmail.com
12	Sitaram Shelar	**YUVA** 53/2 Nare Park Municipal School, Opp. Nare Park Municipal Ground, Parel, Mumbai - 400012	09833252472 022- 2411639314 sitaram_shelar@yuvaindia.org
13	Phoebe Simon	**YUVA** -do-	022 - 24116393/94 phoebe.s@yuvaindia.org
14	Prakash	**Delhi Star Metro Club** E-159, Rohini, Sector-24, New Delhi - 85	09250155589 prakashfisher@yahoo.co.in
15	Ashi	**Delhi Star Metro Club** -do-	09250155589
16	Jyoti	**Delhi Star Metro Club** -do-	9210539071
17	Khalid Mohammad	**Darpan** D-164, Wazirpur Industrial Aria, Udam Singh Park, Gali No-1, New Delhi – 110052	09350370835
18	Ajay Thakur	**Darpan** -do-	09871256191
19	Dilip	**Darpan** -do-	09871256191
20	Priyanka Malviya	**Student** C-24B, Gaur Enclave, Shalimar Garden, Extn. 2, Sahibabad, Ghaziabad, U.P. - 201005	09760210279 priyank_malviya@yahoo.co.in
21	Dr Kshitij Urs	**Action Aid India Bangalore** 139, Richmond Road, Bangalore - 560025	09845452242 Kshitij.urs@actionaidindia.org
22	Indu Prakash Singh	**Action Aid India International** N - 222, Greater Kailash - I, New Delhi – 110048	09313327669 indupragya@gmail.com indu.singh@actionaidindia.org
23	Neeraj	**Yuva Sanskritik Mandli** D-306, Khanpur J J Colony, Ambedkar Nagar, Sector -2, New Delhi - 110062	09212091830 neeraj.rockey@gmail.com
24	Benny Kuruvilla	**Focus on the Global South** c/o Intercultural Resources, 33 D, Vijay Mandal Enclave, DDA SFS Flats, New Delhi - 110 016	011-26560133 011-65665677 bennyk@focusweb.org
25	Sarita Ramamoorthy	**Focus on the Global South** A-201, Kailash apartments, Juhu Church Road, Juhu, Mumbai	022-65921141/51 Saritar13@gmail.com sarita@focusweb.org
26	Matthew Pruter	**Focus on the Global South** -do-	bellflower@berkely.edu

27	Girija	**Centre for Advocacy and Research** F-19, 3rd Floor, Kalkaji, New Delhi – 19	09871659966 cfardelhi@gmail.com
28	Vimla	**Mahila Pragati Manch** O-22, A-1, Janta Flat, Dilshad Garden, New Delhi - 110095	09810674344
29	Radheyshyam	**Beghar Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti** RZ, 70/350, Jagdamba Vihar, Sagarpur West, New Delhi – 110046	begharkadost@gmail.com
30	Lalit Mohan	**Beghar Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti** RZ, 70/350, Jagdamba Vihar, Sagarpur West, New Delhi – 110046	begharkadost@gmail.com
31	Videh Upadhyay	**Lawyer** J - 30F, Sarita Vihar, New Delhi - 110076	09910966477 videhup@gmail.com
32	Nivedita Bhathacharjee	**Student** School of Environmental Studies, Delhi University, New Delhi – 110007	nel-niv@yahoo.co.in
33	Pratik Chandra	**Human Rights Law Network** 65, Masjid Road, Jangpura, New Delhi -14	pratikchandra@rediffmail.com
34	Nick Robinson	**Human Rights Law Network** -do-	nickrobinson5@gmail.com
35	Amy	**Human Rights Law Network** -do-	
36	Jitendra Chahar	**PEACE** F - 93, Katwaria Sarai, New Delhi -16	09999046291 jitendrapeace@gmail.com
37	Snehlata	**Mahila Pragati Manch** (CFAR), F-19, 3rd Floor, Kalkaji, New Delhi – 110019	09818282647
38	Shashikant	**Department of Sociology** Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi - 110067	09868612237 shashikant.111@gmail.com
39	Jaya Kumar	160C/1, Baba Gangnath Mandir, near MCD School, Munirka, New Delhi -110067	09899366970 jayakc@gmail.com
40	Yacoub Z. Kuruvilla	**Tata Institute of Social Sciences** School of Habitat, Deonar, Chembur, Mumbai – 400088	09892755976 yacoubzak@gmail.com
41	Bheemeshwar Reddy	**Tata Institute of Social Sciences** -do-	09930794249 bheem.mads@gmail.com
42	Sarita	**The Aawaz Welfare Society** A Block, Masjid ke pas, Udham Singh Park, Wazirpur Industrial Area, New Delhi - 110052	Aawaz_usb@yahoo.com
43	Sheela	**The Aawaz Welfare Society** -do-	Aawaz_usb@yahoo.com
44	Rekha	**The Aawaz Welfare Society** -do-	09212110190 Aawaz_usb@yahoo.com
45	Brijesh	**The Aawaz Welfare Society** -do-	Aawaz_usb@yahoo.com

46	Ranjeet Kumar	**The Aawaz Welfare Society** -do-	09211104984 Aawaz_usb@yahoo.com
47	Jai Prakash Trivedi	**Manav Sewa Sanshthan** F - 772, Kamla Nagar, Agra	09415494629
48	Jawahar Lal	**Beghar Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti** RZ, 70 / 350, Jagdamba Vihar, Sagarpur West, New Delhi – 110046	begharkadost@gmail.com
49	Hemlata Kansotia	**Labour Education and Development Society** 74 / 1, Pocket D-6, Sector VI, Rohini, New Delhi – 110085	09968285212 leds.jaipur@gmail.com
50	Rajendra Rawat	**LEDS** -do-	09928179527 rajendrarawatjp@gmail.com
51	Teerath Ram	**LEDS** -do-	09450990764 teerathmsw@yahoo.co.in
52	Bablee	**LEDS** -do	09413341943
53	Hemlata	**LEDS** -do	09968285212
54	Sumit Kumar	**LEDS** -do-	09212462603 sumitmsw@yahoo.co.in
55	Ashok	**LEDS** -do-	09250282429
56	J. Hansraj	**LEDS** -do-	09213575211
57	Ranjeet Singh	**LEDS** 28 / 3914, Rehgarpura, Karol Bagh, New Delhi	09259113968
58	S. Kumar	A - 424, Shahid Sukh Dev Nagar, New Delhi	09873067271
59	Pappu Kumar Singh	C / o Sri S. B. Verma, Student's Health Centre, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 05	09889025116 pappusingh@gmail.com
60	Kartik	**Beghar Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti** RZ, 70 / 350, Jagdamba Vihar, Sagarpur West, New Delhi – 110046	09990019785 begharkadost@gmail.com
61	Madan	**Beghar Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti** -do-	09311892302 begharkadost@gmail.com
62	Arjun	**Beghar Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti** -do-	09911805017 begharkadost@gmail.com
63	Ashok Pandey	**Beghar Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti** -do-	09718451454 ashokday@gmail.com
64	Dinesh Nagar	**Beghar Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti** -do-	begharkadost@gmail.com
65	Madan Tiwari	**Beghar Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti** -do-	begharkadost@gmail.com

66	Nazeem Ali	**Student** Department of Social Work, Jamia Millia Islamia, Jamia Nagar, New Delhi - 110025	09911950094 naaz_mrcool@yahoo.com
67	Dhananjay Tingal	**Milestone** B - 30, Pushpanjali Enclave, Pitampura, New Delhi - 110034	09811546261 dtingal@gmail.com
68	Madhuresh	**CACIM** A - 3, Defence Colony, New Delhi - 110024	011-41551521 madhuresh@cacim.net
69	Mithilesh Kumar Verma	**SPID** E-8, Badshah Bagh Colony, Maldahiya, Varanasi	09335764244 spidsociety@gmail.com
70	Kalyani Menon. Sen	J - 1229, Palam Vihar, Gurgaon - 122017	09910306382 kmenonsen@gmail.com
71	Meera Devi	**CFAR** F-19, 3rd Floor, Kalkaji, New Delhi - 110019	
72	Nafisha	**CFAR** -do-	09313978004
73	Sehjadi	**CFAR** -do-	09313978004
74	Govinda	**CFAR** -do-	
75	Shashi Kaur	**CFAR** -do-	09268010114
76	Kamlesh	**CFAR** -do-	
77	Nasreen	**CFAR** -do-	
78	Jashmat	**CFAR** -do-	09911346629
79	Shyama	**CFAR** -do-	
80	Kundan Chauhan	**CFAR** -do	09968329797
81	Preeti	**Delhi Young Artists' Forum** C - 85 JJ Colony, Khanpur, New Delhi	09871839694
82	Arvind Kumar	**Jhuggi Jhopri Ekta Manch** C-125, Brindapur Part-4, New Delhi - 110059	09810491657
83	Jawahar Singh	**Jhuggi Jhopri Ekta Manch** -do-	09211661830
84	S.A. Azad	**PRASAR** G 12. 462 A, Sangam Vihar New Delhi – 110062	09811914329 prasar21@rediffmail.com
85	Madhu	**Delhi Mahila Kamgar Manch** D-306, Khanpur JJ Colony, Ambedkar Nagar,Sector-2, New Delhi - 110062	09211515847 aniladmkm@yahoo.com

86	Noni Gopal Mandal	**Student** P. G. Men's Hostel, Room No. 44, University of Delhi, New Delhi - 110007	09911875731 Nonigm2503@gmail.com
87	Dr. S.K. Dwivedi	**Sathee** H 1/24 B Budh Vihar, Delhi - 110086	09911598454
88	Shivani Chaudhry	**Housing and Land Rights Network -- Habitat International Coalition** **South Asia Regional Programme** A-1 Nizamuddin East, New Delhi - 110 013	schaudhry@hic-sharp.org
89	Shashi B. Pandit	**All India Kabadi Mazdoor Mahasangh** B-12A, Lane No 2, East Nathu Colony, Shahadara, Delhi-93	09968413109 shashi.pandit@gmail.com
90	Bali Charan	**All India Kabadi Mazdoor Mahasangh** -do-	bali.charan@gmail.com
91	Sweety	**All India Kabadi Mazdoor Mahasangh** -do-	
92	Om Prakash Pal	**All India Kabadi Mazdoor Mahasangh** -do-	09868655109 pal.omprakash1@gmail.com
93	Masaud	**All India Kabadi Mazdoor Mahasangh** -do-	09968005784
94	Dr. Rupesh Verma	**All India Kabadi Mazdoor Mahasangh** -do-	09953461516
95	Almona Prisca	**Student** School of Environmental Studies, Delhi University, New Delhi - 110007	almonap@gmail.com
96	Aparna Sen Gupta	**Student** -do-	1986.aparna@gmail.com
97	Swarup Mishra	**Student** -do-	09911978170
98	Upma Manral	**Student** -Do-	09953153818
99	Mridula Bajaj	**Mobile Crèches** DIZ Area, Raja Bazaar, Sector IV, Near Gole Market, New Delhi - 110001	mobile.creches@gmail.com
100	J.S. Walia	**Abhavgrast Gramini Shram Sanghthan** 654, Jawahar Colony, MIT, Faridabad	09873726323 waliaindia1@rediffmail.com
101	Thaneshwar Adigaur	**National Forum for Workers Rights** B – 150, Karampura, near Deendayal Upadhay College, New Delhi - 110015	09213731844 nfwr.india@gmail.com
102	Rajesh Chandra	**PEACE** F-93, Katwaria Sarai, New Delhi – 110016	09871223317
103	Amjad Hassan	**DANMU** 1996/5, Pilangi, Kotla Mubarkpur, New Delhi - 110003	09868366532 damu.org@gmail.com
104	Kamala Akhtar	**DANMU** -do-	damu.org@gmail.com

105	Surender Singh	**Matrisudha** D -35, Sriniwas puri, Delhi - 110065	09910144337 matrisudha2000@yahoo.co.in
106	Anita Soni	**Independent** M-26,Flat 403, Lado Sarai Village, near MCD School, Delhi	09811360937 aanita_soni@yahoo.co.in
107	Vijay Soni	**Independent** -do-	
108	Alka Punj	**Humanity Peace Society**	09891424128
109	Ram Niwas	**Manav Jagarti Mission Arya Samaj** Green Park, New Delhi – 110016	09810592752
110	Naresh	**SRISHTI** Vill / PO - Mehuwala (Mati) Dehradun	09871365944
111	Rajnandan Paswan	**Bhartiya Tipahiya Chalak Sangh** Gali no. -2, RZF – 770 / 15, Rajnagar Part – 2, Palam Colony, New Delhi	
112	Laxmichand Kashyap	**Bhartiya Tipahiya Chalak Sangh** -do-	09899681171
113	Anshu Malviya	**Human Rights Law Network** A - 111 Mehndori Colony, Teliyerganj Allahabad – 211004	09415812917 anshumalviya@yahoo.com
114	Nazrul	**Bal Vikas Dhara** A - 72, Masood Pur, Vasant Kunj New Delhi - 67	09958680745 bvd_childhelp@yahoo.com
115	Shambhu Nath	**Bal Vikas Dhara** -do-	09811380113
116	Jaival Chaudhury	**Bal Vikas Dhara** -do-	
117	Sandeep Khare	**Vigyan Foundation** D - 3191, Indira Nagar, Lucknow, UP	09415011703 vigyanfoundation@yahoo.com
118	Sanjay Vijayvergiya	**Centre for Policy Analysis** 6 / 84, Vineet Khand, Gomti Nagar, Lucknow	09935057006 cpaindia@gmail.com
119	P.K. Praveen	**Action Aid** A-3, Vivekanand park, Patliputra Colony, Patna - 800013	09431093496 Pravin.kumar@actionaid.org
120	Dharmendra Kumar	**India FDI Watch** 564, Sector 4, Timarpur, Delhi 54	09871179084 dkfordignity@gmail.com
121	Kaushalya	**Mahila Pragati Manch (CFAR)** F-19, 3rd Floor, Kalkaji, New Delhi – 110019	09312491250
122	Chandrakanta	**Mahila Pragati Manch (CFAR)** -do-	
123	Bholeshwar Kushwaha	**Bihar Sanskritik Vikas Manch** D – 102, Pratap Garden, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi - 110059	09871218891
124	Madan Kumar Dubey	**M N Consultant**	09968417461 mjbd_hr@yahoo.co.in

125	Subhasis Chakraborti	**National Coalition for Workers' Rights**	09873171359 nfwr.india@gmail.com
126	Pushmana	**Nirman Mazdoor Panchayat Sangam** Millenium Apartment, Sector 18, Rohini, New Delhi	09950323634
127	Ramjilal Purka	**Nirman Mazdoor Panchayat Sangam** -do-	09460868660
128	Ravindra Roy	**All India Trade Union Congress**	09891617850
129	Himanshu Upadhaya	**Intercultural Resources** 33B, 3rd floor, Said-ul-ajaib, Mehrauli – Badarpur Road, New Delhi - 110030	011-29531814 09868945209 himanshugreen@gmail.com
130	C.L. Nagar	**Samajik Nyaya Sangram Samiti** 264-A, Shiv Vihar, Trishal Garden, Nangloi, New Delhi - 110041	09213730933
131	Imrana Qadeer	C-4/111, LGF, SDA, New Delhi - 110016	011-26510824 qadeeroy@gmail.com
132	BBG Tilak	**American Centre** B-5/2, Welcome, CGHS, Sector-3, Plot no- 6, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075	09891587654 bati@loc.gov
133	Binod	**Chintan** C-14, II Fl, Lajpat Nagar – III, New Delhi	09312812089
134	Anand Mishra	**Chintan** -do-	
135	Vivek	**Delhi Young Artists' Forum** D-306, Khanpur J J Colony, Ambedkar Nagar, Sector -2, New Delhi - 110062	09911913854
136	Vicky Singh	**Delhi Young Artists' Forum** -do-	
137	Lopamandra Baruah	House No.377, Ground Floor, Indira Vihar, Mukherjee Nagar, New Delhi - 110009	09873506956 lopamudrabaruah@gmail.com
138	Satinath Chowdhary	**Think Tank for Progressive Action** 1358, Multi-storey Apartment, Type-2, Timarpur, Delhi - 110054	09212224183 Satichou2@yahoo.com
139	Anand Kumar	192-Pocket-D, Mayur Vihar-2, New Delhi – 110091	09871167535 alphanand@yahoo.com
140	Girija Shankar Shukla	**Sneh Bandhan Society** B - 184, Karam Pura , New Delhi - 110015	011-25176497
141	Rajinder S Bhaduria	**Sneh Bandhan Society** -do-	09818980496
142	Bipin Kr. Rai	**YASA** F - 14, Lado Sarai , New Delhi – 30	09999046469

143	Arif Clinton	**Labor League Foundation** 20, Mata Sundari Lane , New Delhi - 02	09213978834
144	Janardan Bhati	**H.R.A.** B - 12A, Lane no. 2, East Natthu Colony, Shahdara, New Delhi - 93	09958509015
145	Maya	**Yuva Sanskritik Mandali** E-159, Rohini, Sector -24, New Delhi - 110085	9210539071
146	Mandeep	**Kurukshetra University** 5/54, 3rd Floor, Subhash Nagar, New Delhi	9868284407 mechsuccess@gmail.com
147	Prem Bahukandi	**Bandhua Mukti Morcha** Daya Nand Bhawan 3/5, Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi	9810881284 prembahukhandi@gmail.com
148	Sadre Alam	**Hazards Centre** 92- H, Third Floor, Pratap Market, Munirka, New Delhi - 110067	011-26714244,26187806 hazardscentre@gmail.com
149	Mukesh	-----do---	---do---
150	Mrinalini	-----do---	---do---
151	Jayanta	-----do---	---do---
152	Pankaj	-----do---	---do---
153	Seela	-----do---	---do---
154	Shabnam	-----do---	---do---
155	Satyajit	-----do---	---do---
156	Vartika	-----do---	---do---
157	Shambhu	-----do---	---do---
158	Dunu Roy	-----do---	---do---
159	D.Leena	B-803, Defence Officers Appartments, Plot 33, Sector 4, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075	09811137421 dabiru .leena@gmail.com

***