

Decentralized Urban Governance and Poverty Alleviation: A Sociological Study of Lucknow City

Yatindra Kumar Jha*

ABSTRACT

Widespread urbanization is a twentieth century phenomenon. In 2000, the world's urban population had increased to almost 2.9 billion, about 47 per cent of the total population. Today Asian countries have emerged as most populous countries. More than 27 per cent population of India resides in urban areas and the larger cities are swelling due to increasing urban population and migration from rural and semi-urban areas. The structural reforms and the associated development strategies launched in 1991 are expected to accelerate rural urban migration and boost the pace of urbanization. The demographic and economic growth in India is likely to be concentrated in and around fifty to sixty large cities with population of about a million or more. There is migration from villages to town and cities which results in growth of metropolitan cities since they provide multiple avenues, services and amenities viz. education, health care, employment, business and entertainment options etc. People also migrate for economic opportunities and urban life styles. Though urbanization brings about development in the social, economic and cultural spheres of life but sometimes it disturbs the ecological system. Rapid and unplanned growth of urban agglomeration generates a series of negative environmental and social effects. Today urban India presents a very pathetic scene. Cities have become a site of rotting garbage, degrading drainage system and shocking night soil removal system. Besides, poor have practically no access to covered toilets and in many towns and cities, the majority have to defecate in the open. The untreated sewage being dumped into the nearest water body leads to health hazards.

Key Words: Decentralization, Urban Governance, Poverty, Alleviation

*Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Dr. R. P. M. Degree College, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

INTRODUCTION:

India is one of the least urbanized countries in the world because between 1951 and 2001, the level of urbanization increased by 13 percentage points only. Widespread urbanization is a twentieth century phenomenon. In 2000, the world's urban population had increased to almost 2.9 billion, about 47 per cent of the total population. Today Asian countries have emerged as most populous countries. More than 27 per cent population of India resides in urban areas and the larger cities are swelling due to increasing urban population and migration from rural and semi-urban areas. The structural reforms and the associated development strategies launched in 1991 are expected to accelerate rural urban migration and boost the pace of urbanization. The demographic and economic growth in India is likely to be concentrated in and around fifty to sixty large cities with population of about a million or more. There is migration from villages to town and cities which results in growth of metropolitan cities since they provide multiple avenues, services and amenities viz. education, health care, employment, business and entertainment options etc. People also migrate for economic opportunities and urban life styles. Though urbanization brings about development in the social, economic and cultural spheres of life but sometimes it disturbs the ecological system. Rapid and unplanned growth of urban agglomeration generates a series of negative environmental and social effects. Today urban India presents a very pathetic scene. Cities have become a site of rotting garbage, degrading drainage system and shocking night soil removal system. Besides, poor have practically no access to covered toilets and in many towns and cities, the majority have to defecate in the open. The untreated sewage being dumped into the nearest water body leads to health hazards.

India is one of the least urbanized countries in the world because between 1951 and 2001, the level of urbanization increased by 13 percentage points only. However, it has the second largest urban population in the world and more than two third of it lives in the 393 cities that have population of over one lakh. The four mega cities viz., Mumbai, Kolkata, Delhi and Chennai with a population of more than 7 million each in 2011 account for almost one fourth of population living in cities. As per 2011 census, 296 million population i.e. 28.3 per cent of 1129 million total population of India is residing in 4368 cities and towns in the country, where as in 2001, 27.8 per cent population lived in urban areas. The decadal growth in urban population during 2001-2011 has been 33.5 per cent whereas at the beginning of the 20th century, only 10.8 per cent of total 218 million population of the country resided in cities and towns. The number of million plus cities has increased to 35 in 2001 from 12 in 1981 and 23 in 1991. These 35 million plus cities account for 107.9 million urban population of the country.

The task of improving urban services is constantly more challenging due to the large increase in population. This will put a strain on the present management and delivery systems. In many cases delivery mechanisms would need to be redesigned to meet the large demand. If urban population growth is to be accelerated, it will need even greater acceleration in urban infrastructure investment. With the rapid urbanization that is now expected in ensuing decades in India, it would be better to decentralize the instruments of infrastructure provision so that the agencies providing such infrastructure services are able to finance themselves and can respond flexibly to the changing demand of growing city. It would be better if private agencies are given more opportunities to perform the functions of financing, planning and management of urban infrastructural services and amenities. There is strong demand for (I) wider coverage of urban infrastructure services, which is a daunting task given in the expected huge growth in urban population and (II) improvement in the quality of urban infrastructure services especially in large cities, making the demand for urban infrastructure more heterogeneous than what has been witnessed in the past. The Tenth Plan had in the context of urban development, laid stress on improving the functional and financial autonomy of urban local bodies, strengthening of their finances through smooth implementation of SFC's awards, rationalization of property taxation system and levy of user charges. The Plan advocated broad based urban sector reform measures and emphasized that public private partnership should be brought on urban agenda in order to improve the efficiency and delivery of services. The growth of population has put urban infrastructure and services under severe stress. Smaller cities have found it particularly difficult to cope with the increasing demands on services because of inadequate financial resources.

As we approach 21st century Indian polity has been striving for establishing democratic goals through modernizing its political and administrative institutions. With a change in development paradigms, the focus of development planning has shifted to participatory development with social justice and equity. It called for decentralized administration ensuring people's participation in decision making and giving priorities to their local needs. The 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendment Acts, 1992 made the provision for ensuring local self governance through empowering local bodies. Thus, the units of the local self governments were given statutory status and state governments were given the mandatory provisions for establishing three tiers of local governments both in rural and urban areas. Importantly, the local bodies have become the units of the governments to have a share in decision making and active participation in development process for social-economic development of the region. The constitution of 74th Amendment Act, 1992, has marked the beginning of a historical reform to decentralize power at the grass root level in urban areas of the country. This act has provided a constitutional form to the

structure and mandate of municipalities to enable them to function as an effective democratic institution of local self government. One of its important objectives is to promote people's participation in planning, provision and delivery of civic services. It introduced some fundamental changes in the system of municipal governance with a new structure, additional devolution of functions, planning responsibilities, new system of fiscal transfers and empowerment of women and the weaker sections of the society. There have been significant changes in the institutional structure for the financing and management of basic services in the post decentralization period. In order to improve the urban infrastructure and strengthening the delivery of municipal services, Government of India has invested a huge amount on new infrastructure development schemes viz. Jawaharlal Nehru Urban Renewal Mission, Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme for Small and Medium Towns and Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme. JNNURM has been implemented in 63 selected cities of the country while other programmes are being implementing in all the towns and cities of the country. JNNURM focuses on improving governance and providing urban basic services to poor while UIDSSMT is being implemented for the small and medium towns and IHSDP is focusing on improvement of urban slums, housing conditions and developing infrastructure for urban poor. In the state of Uttar Pradesh, 7 towns viz. Lucknow, Kanpur, Varanasi, Allahabad, Agra, Meerut and Mathura have been selected under JNNURM.

Urban poverty is a major challenge before the urban managers and administrators of the present time. Though the anti-poverty strategy comprising of a wide range of poverty alleviation and employment generating programmes has been implemented but results show that the situation is grim. Importantly, poverty in urban India gets exacerbated by substantial rate of population growth, high rate of migration from the rural areas and mushrooming of slum pockets. Migration alone accounts for about 40 per cent of the growth in urban population, converting the rural poverty into urban one. Moreover, poverty has become synonymous with slums. The relationship is bilateral i.e. slums also breed poverty. This vicious circle never ends. Most of the world's poor reside in India and majority of the poor live in rural areas and about one-fourth urban population in India lives below poverty line. If we count those who are deprived of safe drinking water, adequate clothing, or shelter, the number is considerably higher. Moreover, the vulnerable groups such as Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, minorities, pavement dwellers etc., are living in acute poverty. Housing conditions in large cities and towns are depicting sub human lives of slum dwellers. With the reconstruction of poverty alleviation programmes in urban India, it is expected that social and economic benefits will percolate to the population below the poverty line.

However, eradication of poverty and improving the quality of life of the poor remain one of the daunting tasks.

Again, about 81 million persons in urban areas were reported living below poverty line during 2004-2005. Importantly, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh and Bihar account for larger share in urban poor. The percentage of urban poor was recorded highest in Orissa (44.3 per cent), Madhya Pradesh (42.1 per cent), Uttar Pradesh (30.6 per cent), Bihar (34.6 per cent) and Maharashtra (32.2 per cent). Indian poverty is predominant in the rural areas where more than three quarters of all poor people reside, though there is wide variation in poverty across different states. Moreover, progress in reducing poverty is also very uneven across different states of the country.

Though several programmes of poverty alleviation have been initiated by government but effective dent on poverty could not be ensured. The schemes had certain limitations, which ultimately resulted in poor results or failure. Environment Improvement of Urban Slums (EIUS) launched in 1972 provided physical infrastructure and could not cover social services like health, education, community development, etc. The scheme could not help in preventing growth of new slums.

Similarly UBSP was designed to foster Neighbourhood Development Committees in slums for ensuring the effective participation of slum dwellers in developmental activities and for coordinating the convergent provisions of social services, environmental improvement and income generation activities of the specialist departments. The low level of resource allocation for the scheme led to sub critical releases to the state governments, which consequently gave low priority to the scheme. Importantly, NRY scheme was launched in 1989 to provide employment to the unemployed through setting up of micro-enterprises and wage employment through shelter upgradation works and creation of useful public assets in low income neighborhoods. The scheme could not yield good results due to shortfall in employment generation on account of some states not taking up labour intensive schemes. Importantly, progress under Housing and Shelter Upgradation Scheme was recorded slow growth due to non-completion of the necessary documentation and procedural formalities. Interestingly, PMIUPEP was launched in 1994 and sought to improve the quality of life of the urban poor by creating a facilitating implementation. The scheme provided for the creation of a National Urban Poverty Eradication Fund (NUPEF) with contribution from private sector. The National Slum Development Programme (NSDP) was initiated in 1996 as a centrally sponsored scheme. The scheme highlighted on the creation of community structures as the basis for slum development and gives the maximum possible leeway to the

states, ULB's and the community development societies at the slum level to plan and carry out development works as per the local assessed needs. The SJSRY was initiated in 1997 and was designed to replace the UBSP. During the year 2009, the scheme was revamped while in the subsequent years National Urban Livelihood Development Mission in selected cities was launched by Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India. The Mission envisages to empower urban poor and poverty alleviation through institutional development, SHGs based micro financing, social mobilization of urban poor, skill training and placement, promoting self employment and micro enterprises. The Mission has made provision of interest subsidy rather than capital subsidy. In order to improve the living conditions of urban poor, Government of India has introduced the draft policy for Habitat and Housing, Slum Free Cities and has also established a task force for empowerment of urban poor, Swachhh Bharat Mission, Housing for all, Rajiv Awas Yojana, Rajiv Rin Yojana, etc.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Several studies have been conducted on urban poor and poverty alleviation programme in India by various universities and research organization. Institutions have also studied on governance also, but we need more studies on the issues. There is increasing focus on Reforming Public Services in India through urban good governance.

World Bank (2006)¹ in its report on Reforming Public Services in India highlighted the common factors that influence the delivery of public services in India and demanded for restructuring of public services in India.

Singh (2006)² in his paper on "Restructuring of Municipal Services in India" maintained that there has been considerable debate in India about the indifferent quality of public service delivery which remains poor on a whole. Though, decentralization initiatives have brought about institutional changes in municipal services, yet urbanization, unplanned urban development and inadequate infrastructure of resources have stressed urban services. These services have not been able to keep pace with the fast growing population.

Dhar (2006)³ in his paper on "Good Governance, Civil Service Reforms and Decentralization" said that in developing countries like India, full transition to market systems has to be very wisely and continuously brought about or ills the impacts of change can be inequitable and even catastrophic. He

highlighted the need of a bold, effective and credible state which trusts people, which governs through policy and bold, open, people's friendly action.

Singh (2007)⁴ in his paper on "Fostering Excellence in Public Services in India" remarked that independence India has been constantly endeavoring to bring efficiency, particularly in public service delivery through more accountability, transparency and responsiveness.

Singh (2008)⁵ in his report on "Decentralized Urban Governance in India" highlighted the need for introducing municipal reforms and strengthening the urban local governments for delivering public services to urban poor.

Pintu (2006)⁶ in his paper on "People's Centered Development and Participatory Urban Governance" said that in the emerging scenario, under a liberalized regime and in the context of participatory democracy, movements, action groups and the like are representatives of a vibrant civil society have introduced new conceptions of power and politics. They have initiated new modes of organizations, emphasizing self government and decentralization.

Benjamin and Bhuwleshwari (2006)⁷ in their paper on "Urban Futures of Poor Groups in Chennai and Bangalore" highlighted the emerging issues in the era of post-74th Constitutional Amendment and their implications on urban poor. They called for local accountability and strengthening of parastatals and local bodies for empowering urban poor.

Singh (2007)⁸ in his paper on "Urban Poverty in India" discussed in detail the nature, extent, dimensions and magnitude of urban poverty in India. He also reviewed the plans and policies for urban poverty alleviation.

World Bank (2002)⁹ in its report on "Challenges of Poverty in Uttar Pradesh" highlighted the incidence and dimensions of poverty in the state of Uttar Pradesh. The report maintained that about 8 per cent of world's poor live in Uttar Pradesh alone.

Planning Commission (2007)¹⁰ in its Uttar Pradesh Development report elaborated the governance framework and social development.

Krueger (1993)¹¹ maintained that accelerated growth and social welfare improvements have a lot to do with strong leadership and a well functioning bureaucracy.

Mauro (1995)¹² said that bureaucratic inefficiency could affect growth indirectly or directly by leading to a misallocation of investment among sectors.

Hart, Shleifer and Vishny (1997)¹³ have maintained that private provision is likely to work well for some public goods but not at all well for some others.

Oates (1972)¹⁴ said that decentralization is the transfer of decision making from the highest level of the government to quasi autonomous units of the local government. The strong merit of decentralization is that it enables the government to be more responsive to local needs, tastes and financial viability.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK:

Poverty generally arises from lack of income or assets. The low income of the poor can be attributed to the following problems facing them: (i) Low access to financial resources and production assets which are necessary to sustain the micro-enterprises beyond day today basis, (ii) Monopolistic control over micro-enterprises by larger entities which, through control over inputs and/or insecurity of wage employment, compel the poor to accept lowest wages and to work overtime without pay. The urban poor have low access to formal education, health services, shelter and safe living environments. Moreover, poverty is also perpetuated by division of labour and time, away from income earning uses and towards daily physical, environmental and energy management tasks, necessary to sustain life itself. This diversion further limits chances of investing household resources in skill attainment and enterprises.

Poverty has been measured on the basis of nutritional requirement, monthly per capita expenditure and housing conditions. Thus income-based poverty lines set for the whole country do not allow for high costs of living in cities. No single poverty line can take into account the large differences in the availability and cost of food, shelter, water sanitation and health care services. Housing poverty has been defined by UNCHS as lack of safe, secure and healthy shelter with basic infrastructure like piped water and adequate provision for sanitation, drainage and removal of household's wastes. The definition of poverty line in India was set for the first time in 1962 by a working group after taking into account the recommendations of the Nutrition Advisory Committee of the Indian Council of Medical Research (1958) regarding balanced diet. The working group proposed the poverty norm in money terms in urban and rural areas. It was based on broad judgment of minimum caloric need. Importantly, the Planning Commission in 1977 constitutes a Task Force on projections of Minimum Needs and Effective Consumption Demand. It defined the poverty line as a per capita consumption expenditure level which

meets the average per capita daily caloric requirement of 2400 calories in rural areas and 2100 calories in urban areas long with a minimum of non-food expenditure. The Planning Commission constituted the Expert Group on estimation and number of poor in 1989. It did not redefine the poverty line but estimated separate poverty line for each state by desegregating the national level poverty line. It used the state-wise consumer price index of industrial workers for updating urban poverty line.

The poverty is broadly defined in terms of material deprivation, human deprivation and a range of other deprivations such as lack of voice, vulnerability, violence, destitution, social and political exclusions, and lack of dignity and basic rights. In India, and indeed throughout the world, the conventional approach equates poverty with material deprivation and defines the poor in terms of incomes or levels of consumption. The Planning Commission has defined poverty in terms of the level of per capita consumer expenditure sufficient to provide an average daily intake of 2400 calories per person in rural areas and 2100 calories per person in urban areas, plus a minimal allocation for basic non-food items. There is no doubt that material deprivation is a key factor that underlines many other dimensions of poverty. Despite uncertain progress at reducing material deprivation, there has been greater progress in human development in the states throughout the 1990's. Human Development Indicators capture important dimensions of well-being and reflect not just the rate of growth in the economy but also levels and quality of public spending. Effective public spending on basic services (education, health, water and sanitation) can compensate for limited capacity of the poor to purchase these services through the market. Education is a key indicator of human development. Many desirable social and economic outcomes are limited to rising levels of education, particularly education of women and of socially vulnerable groups. Health status is another key indicator of human development. Vulnerable, powerlessness, exclusion and social identity crises are some of the issues related with human poverty. Vulnerability is a fact of life for the poor. They are distressed not only by current low levels of resources and incomes, but also by the possibility of falling into deeper poverty and destitution. The poor are at risk because they lack the income, the assets and the social ties that protect the better off from the impact of unexpected setbacks. Illness requires expensive treatment; the temporary or permanent disability of a breadwinner or a natural or man-made disaster can obliterate a poor household's small savings. Death, disability, disease, etc. are such factors, which are linked with vulnerability.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

The study has the following main objectives:

- ❖ To analyze emerging trends, patterns and issues of urbanization and its social implications on urban development in India and particularly in Uttar Pradesh.
- ❖ To review policies, programmes, schemes and projects oriented towards urban development and poverty alleviation in India and particularly in Uttar Pradesh
- ❖ To analyze the extent, dimensions and magnitude of urban poverty and also to review the programmes and policies for poverty eradication.
- ❖ To examine the socio- cultural profile of urban poor and their living condition in Lucknow city.
- ❖ To assess the impact of various programme on basic services for urban poor and poverty alleviation in Lucknow city .
- ❖ To examine the problems, constraints and challenges in implementation of urban poverty alleviation programmes.
- ❖ To suggest policy measures for improving urban governance, empowerment of urban poor and effective functioning of urban poverty alleviation programmes.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES:

- ❖ The following hypotheses will be empirically tested:
- ❖ The quality of municipal services is declining despite increasing financial support by the government.
- ❖ State level response to the policy shift and urban reforms is poor which affects the delivery of services to poor.
- ❖ Corruption in delivery of municipal services to poor is increasing due to lack of transparency and accountability in system.
- ❖ New Infrastructure Development Schemes – JNNURM, IHSDP & UIDSSMT have provided an impetus to the development of urban infrastructure, strengthening municipal services and their effective delivery to the poor.
- ❖ The policy shift in urban governance and development has created opportunities for development and empowerment of urban poor.
- ❖ The impact of urban poverty alleviation programmes vary from city to city depending upon socio-cultural and administrative factors.

WORK PLAN & METHODOLOGY:

The present study will be empirical in nature and based mainly on primary data collected through field survey. Besides survey and analysis of primary data, secondary data and pertinent literature will be compiled from published and documented sources for getting insights on the topic of the research. The study will focus on national perspective however; the field survey will be confined to the state of Uttar Pradesh. We will select Lucknow city for in-depth study. The study will cover urban slum dwellers, street vendors, manual scavengers and other urban poor who have been benefited under various inclusive programmes and schemes. Besides the survey of urban poor and slum dwellers, the people's representatives and officials of ULBs, NGOs and other stakeholder agencies engaged in implementation of urban poverty alleviation programmes, schemes, and delivery of basic services to urban poor will also be contacted. We will select about 300 urban poor including manual scavengers, street vendors and slum dwellers in the city. The field survey will be conducted with the help of structured interview schedules. Two sets of interview schedules for urban poor including scavengers, street vendors, and slum dwellers, and municipal officials and people's representatives of ULBs, NGOs and other stake holding agencies will be developed. The interview schedules will contain the relevant questions, research points and scales of view perception related to awareness, sensitization, participation, impact etc. of programmes, schemes and projects. The secondary data will be compiled from the municipal records, reports and documents. Besides, previous surveys, reports, studies and other relevant research work will also be consulted. The filled-in interview schedules will be thoroughly checked and processed with the help of relevant statistical tools and techniques including appropriate software and tabulation. The primary and secondary data will be interpreted, discussed and analyzed. The central tendencies, results, conclusions and trends and patterns will be drawn out from the analysis of data. Besides, the pertinent literature will be critically reviewed for insight stimulation on the topic of research. The policy measures and action plan will be based on the analysis of research findings and critical appreciation of pertinent literature.

FINDINGS:

- ❖ Skills are essential to improve productivity, incomes, and access to employment opportunities. Thus, poverty reduction strategy should focus on vocational education and training since vast majority people living in poverty cannot afford and have access to training opportunities, which are commercially managed. International Labour Organization has invested in the field of employment intensive infrastructure programmes. It has now widely recognized that these programmes are effective in bringing much needed income to poor families and their communities.

- ❖ Financial investment in jobs and employment may create addition opportunities to poor youth. The labour intensive projects should respect standards, promote gender equality and encourage enterprise development through contracting systems. The entrepreneurship development may promote income generating enterprises and livelihood development. This will also promote self-employment among educated unemployed youth. Interestingly, it is impossible to build an enterprise without access to credit. Micro-finance activities should be promoted, strengthened and encouraged along with entrepreneurship for enabling poor to borrow for productive purposes.
- ❖ Participation and inclusion are central to new approach to poverty reduction. Cooperatives and people's associations including Self Help Groups are ideal instruments in such a strategy. Cooperatives have proved to be a key organized form in building new models to combat social exclusion and poverty. Similarly, SHG's are proving crucial instrument for availability of micro-finance and social empowerment of poor. Significantly, discrimination is a basis for social exclusion and poverty. Promoting gender equality and eliminating all forms of Discrimination at work are essential to defeating poverty. Child labour is both a cause and a system of poverty.
- ❖ In order to ensure effective functioning of SJSRY, formation and strengthening of community development societies is imperative. The community development structure may be formed and strengthened effectively only through community organizers and active role of nongovernment organizations including civil societies. Similarly, training and entrepreneurship development among the urban poor may be ensured through public private partnership involving non-government organizations.
- ❖ The state government should setup Urban Poverty and Slum Improvement Task Force. This task force may be allowed to give direction and control of the functioning of Urban Poverty Alleviation programme including JnURM and IHSDP.
- ❖ City-wide master plans for slum upgradation should be drawn up with the objective of removing the slum characteristics of the selected settlements. Slum mapping along with biometric survey is imperative for the inclusive development of the cities.
- ❖ Capacity building is essential for developing communication and interpersonal skills among the people responsible for providing for the needs of the urban poor, for improving the level of services and satisfaction of the beneficiaries, and for providing coordinated services from a number of line agencies.
- ❖ The wage employment component under SJSRY should be used only for building assets and infrastructure relating to the urban poor, and not for general municipal works. The requirement

should be selected by the beneficiaries themselves and implementation should be from such lists of works identified by the beneficiaries.

- ❖ Poverty elimination is impossible unless the economy generates opportunities for investment, entrepreneurship, job creation and sustainable livelihoods.
- ❖ People living below poverty need voice to obtain recognition of rights and demand respect. They need representation and participation in urban planning and implementation of urban poverty alleviation programmes.
- ❖ Skills are essential to improve productivity, incomes and access to employment opportunities. Therefore, it is imperative to have a major component of vocational education and training in poverty reduction strategies.
- ❖ Policies to reduce eradicate poverty need to address both the demand and supply sides of the labour market. Urban poverty reduction can not be possible without integrating the rural poverty. Thus, there is equally need of addressing poverty reduction and employment generation in rural areas to check the migration of rural poor to urban centres.
- ❖ Training systems need to become more flexible and responsive to rapidly changing skill requirements. Reform should focus on how learning can be facilitated, not just on training for specific occupational categories. There is also imperative need of increasing the investment in training and skill development for sustainable livelihoods.
- ❖ Small and micro enterprises constitute a large and growing share of employment and are generally more labour intensive. However, small business development requires management skills to survive and grow. Self help group based micro financing may be an effective instrument for empowering urban poor and promoting micro and small enterprises for livelihood development.
- ❖ Eradicating poverty calls for the coordination of policies that focus on different dimensions of life of people living in poverty. Coordination and cooperation among various stake holding agencies is imperative to effectively implement the urban poverty alleviation programmes.
- ❖ The Civil Societies and Public Sector Participation is imperative and it should be strengthened through community mobilization, participation and entrusting NGOs by government agencies.
- ❖ Public-private partnership is to be further strengthened through state level policy environment and support. The creative role of corporate sector in delivery of civic services and empowering poor may be explored through creating enabling environment and effective participation of corporate sector by providing incentives.

- ❖ The community participation should be ensured in planning and designing of the development projects including housing. .



REFERENCES:

1. World Bank (2006), Reforming Public Services in India, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
2. Singh, A.K. (2006), Restructuring of Municipal Services in India, Indian Journal of Public Administration, Vol. LII (3), July-September.
3. Dhar, T.N. (2006), Good Governance, Civil Service Reform & Decentralization, Indian Journal of Public Administration, Vol. LII (3), July-September.
4. Singh, A.K. (2007), Decentralized Urban Governance in India, Project Report, Regional Centre for Urban Environmental Studies, Lucknow.
5. Singh, A.K. (2008), Urban Poverty Alleviation Programmes in India, Working Paper, Regional Centre for Urban Environmental Studies, Lucknow.
6. Pinto, M.R. (2006), People Centred Development and Participatory Urban Governance: The Mumbai Experience, IN Local Governance in India: Decentralization & Beyond, Edited by Jayal, N.G. et.al., Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
7. Benjamin, S. & Bhuvneshwari, R. (2006), Urban Futures of Poor Groups in Chennai & Bangalore: How These are Shaped by the Relationships between Parastatals & Local Bodies, IN Local Governance in India: Decentralization & Beyond, Edited by Jayal, N.G. et. al., Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
8. Singh, A.K. (2007), Urban Poverty in India, IN India in Global Economy, Edited by G.R. Krishnamoorthy & A.K. Singh, Serials Publications, New Delhi.
9. World Bank (2002), Poverty in India: Challenge of Uttar Pradesh, World Bank, Delhi.
10. Planning Commission (2007), Uttar Pradesh Development Report, Academic Foundation, New Delhi
11. Kruger, A.O. (1993), The Political Economy of Policy Reform in Developing Countries, MIT Press, Cambridge.
12. Mauro, Paolo (1995), Corruption & Growth, Quarterly Journal of Economics, 110 (3).
13. Hart, Oliver et.al. (1997), The Proper Scope of Government, Theory and an Application t Prisons, Quarterly Journal of Economics, November
14. Oates, W.E. (1972), Fiscal Federalism, Harcourt Brace, Jovanovich, New York.
15. ODSG, Overseas Development Paper No. 19, Urban Poverty, Overseas Development Study Group, London.