RESEARCH ARTICLE

Participatory planning processes in Indian cities: its challenges and opportunities

Sudeept Maiti*, João Villela de Faria

Integrated Urban Planning, Sustainable Cities, World Resources Institute India

Abstract: Historically, India has had strong local governments and probably drawing from this, is the spirit in which the country enacted the 73rd and the 74th constitutional amendment acts (CAA), in 1992[1]. This amendment aimed at a re-distribution of powers to enable local bodies which are closer to local issues to respond more quickly and efficiently, rather than relying on a distant central body. However, the practices in participatory planning in Indian cities have been, at best, tokenistic in nature in the face of the challenge of implementing an effective decentralisation processes. The paradigm of citizen engagement and participative planning today must shift from one of the traditional redressal of grievances to that of collaborative solution building bringing both the government and citizen together in the development of local areas. This paper aims to analyse and evaluate participative local area planning practices in India, particularly at the level of the smallest administrative unit, i.e. wards. The study has been categorised in mainly two aspects: institutionalised and non-institutionalised processes dealing with participation at the bottommost rung of planning. This study is an attempt to highlight successful models of engagement, institutional structure and processes that allow for effective participatory planning and to identify possible ways of overcoming challenges of inclusiveness, budgeting and financing and the disconnect between citizens and administration in this process.

Keywords: local area planning, Ward Committees, fair representation, budgeting, citizen engagement, citizen-led initiatives, 74th amendment.

*Correspondence to: Sudeept Maiti, Integrated Urban Planning, Sustainable Cities, WRI India; E-mail: smaiti@wri.org

Received: September 2, 2016; **Accepted:** November 1, 2016; **Published Online:** February 5, 2017

Citation: Sudeept M and de Faria J V, 2017, Participatory planning processes in Indian cities: Its challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Sustainable Urbanization, Planning and Progress*, vol.2 (1): 1–17. http://doi.org/10.18063/JSUPP.2017.01.001.

1. Introduction

Participatory processes have been hailed as a robust method for improving development projects, assuring community buy-in and significant rates of implementation since the mid-90's, with multilateral organizations such as the United Nations and the World Bank, being strong advocates.

According to the World Bank, participatory planning is "a process that convenes a broad base of key stakeholders, on an interactive basis, in order to generate a diagnosis of the existing situation and develop strategies to solve jointly identified problems[2,3]". This process can vary significantly, depending on the methods used, the players involved, the source of financing, and its level of institutionalization.

The implementation of the UN's Local Agenda 21 is a good example of how citizen participative processes can serve different objectives, from environmental protection, to social development, local area planning, adaptation to climate change, or emergency responsiveness[4,5].

In India, the 73rd and the 74th constitutional amendments (CAA) enacted on 1st June 1993 extends constitutional status to municipalities, empowering people and locally elected representatives the power to act in common interest and have a say in how their communities should develop[6]. The amendment looks to em-

power the ward council as an enabling platform for local solutions to local problems to bridge the lacunae in bureaucratic top down schemes[1].

The case studies following this section, exhibit diversity in participatory processes in India. The study has been categorised in mainly two aspects: institutionalised and non-institutionalised processes which cover initiative by citizens, government heads and other organisations, all of which deal with issues at the bottom-most rung of planning. The first part will deal with how the 74th amendment has been adapted across different states in the country, primarily through the constitution of ward committees and Area Sabhas. The second part, studies non-institutionalised initiatives across cities like Delhi, Mumbai, Pune and Bangalore, looking at the methodology and financial mechanisms adopted, and the stakeholders involved. The conclusions and discussion section highlights key recommendations and learnings from the examples that can essentially help make participatory planning processes more effective in urban areas in India.

2. Scope and Limitations

This paper aims to analyse and evaluate practices of participative local area planning in India, particularly at the level of the smallest administrative unit, i.e. administrative and electoral wards. This qualitative study is an attempt to highlight successful models of engagement and processes that allow for effective participatory planning and identify possible ways to overcome challenges faced in implementation. While the subject matter itself is broad, with varied contexts and examples to draw from, this particular paper will limit its scope of study to urban areas.

3. Institutionalised Efforts

Historically, India has had strong local governments. Before the British rule, local bodies comprised of residents administered villages throughout the country. It was from this system that Mahatma Gandhi drew inspiration and envisioned India's administrative system. It was also with that spirit in mind that the country enacted the 73rd and the 74th constitutional amendment acts (CAA), in 1992[1].

Both CAAs tackle the issue of decentralization and local government, while the 73rd CAA deals with rural settings, the 74th addresses urban areas. The 74th CAA establishes a three-tiered administrative system, with the empowerment of urban local bodies with civic functions – defined by state legislatures, together with the sources of revenue and election methods. At the local level in a municipality, citizens are empowered to participate in the municipality's political life through bodies known as ward committees[1]. The ward committees were to be the vehicles of decentralised administration, initiating a bottom approach to city planning.

Ward Committees

India divides its urban areas, cities and towns, into electoral and administrative units, called wards. India's 74th CAA mandates the establishment of ward committees, comprised of one or more wards in the geographical area under a municipal corporation with a population of more than 3 hundred thousand people. States are required to enact or amend municipal regulations towards this objective, granting those committees with certain powers and responsibilities[1]. In general, ward committees are composed of elected representatives, a government officer and civil society participants, with responsibilities that include the recommendation and supervision of municipal budget in the ward-level.

Up to 2006, only 19 out of 29 states enacted related legislation, out of which only seven were actually implemented[7] In most cases, the devolution of responsibilities was not accompanied by the devolution or creation of revenue sources to fund those responsibilities. Below is an in-depth look into the composition, functioning and powers of ward committees in cities in Karnataka, Kerala, Maharashtra, and West Bengal.

3.1 Case 1: Cochin, Kerala

In 1996, the Government of Kerala decided to move away from the conventional approach and went in for large scale fiscal devolution and opted for full and immediate devolution of funds, designating 35%–40% of the state's development budget to the local self-government institutions. The local governments received almost 90% of the funds to prepare their own schemes and implement them. The broad policy framework for the distribution of funds for urban areas were: 10% of funds in productive sectors not more than 50% on roads and at least 10% for Women component plan[8]. This was a direct departure from the traditional step-wise reform model of decentralization.To support the participatory process, Kerala carried out one of the most extensive adult education and empowerment programs in India's history[9]. Training occurred on three levels: state, district, and local. They

also took measures to institute these changes, primarily by establishing the Committee on Decentralization of Powers. In 1999, the government comprehensively amended the Kerala Panchayati Raj Act of 1994, incorporating the lessons learned from feedback and interaction with the campaign. Implementing these changes quickly protected the People's Plan Campaign from losing ground when a new government came back to power. Although subsequent amendments were made to the Kerala Panchayati Raj Act and some of the decentralized powers were curtailed, local level planning continues, supported by the processes, institutions, and funding structure that they developed and institutionalized early on.

The success of decentralisation has seen success at different levels. Cochin has 74 ward committees, each connected to one electoral ward and with strong participation of neighbourhood groups and resident welfare associations. Ward committees' meetings in Cochin are generally open-ended, with participation via vocalization, when participants can raise their own issues and agree or disagree with prepositions by rising their voices or remaining in silence. However, the slow response of the municipal corporation to ward committees' requests, due to red tape, bureaucracy, and its own limited powers that require approval from the State, makes many citizens' organizations skeptical about ward committees' effectiveness.

3.2 Case 2: Mumbai, Maharashtra:

Maharashtra has four municipal acts that govern its local urban bodies, and 19 out of its 23 municipal corporations have constituted ward committees. Ward committees are open for elected councillors, ward officers and, at maximum, three representatives of neighbourhood groups and resident welfare associations. However, only seven functioning ward committees have civil society representatives as members. Among their responsibilities, ward committees in Maharashtra have to deal with the redressal of citizens' grievances and make recommendations on expenditures and grant administrative approval and financially sanction ward-level projects of up to INR 5lakhs (approximately only 0.2% of the collective development funds available to councillors in an administrative ward) [10].

Maharashtra introduced its own Community Participation Law (CPL) to ensure the continuous funding from JNNRM, but did not enact it. The Community Participation Law also termed as the Nagar Raj Bill is an elaborate law that prescribes the structure, powers and functions of the Area Sabhas well as prescribes the constitution and governance of ward committees. As per the law the hierarchy of the representation after municipal body would be ward committees followed by area Sabhas[10].

Legislation restricts the number of ward committees in Mumbai to no higher than 25, despite the city's 227 electoral wards and 24 administrative wards (each administrative ward is composed of 8–10 electoral wards). Until 2010, only 16 committees were constituted[10], resulting in, on an average, 14 electoral wards make up a ward committee, with population between seven and eight thousand people each. Additionally, only seven ward committees included civil society representatives as participants, and only after a judicial decision. The process of selection of civil society representation is tightly controlled by councilors, making the committee to vulnerable to political pressures[10,11]. Alongside the complex political pressures that are faced by ward committees their functions are further usurped by ALMs who are preferred by local governments to implement infrastructure and maintenance projects[10].

While ALMs can be perceived as a duplication of ward committees the nature of their compositions and functioning are distinct. The ALMs are organised user-groups engaged in maintenance and operational services while ward committees voice concern of all citizens of the ward and have small planning and decision making roles. ALMs provide a channel of engagement for middle class residents to co-ordinate with the executive wing of the local government while ward committees are seen as channels of engagement for vulnerable groups.[11]

3.3 Case 3: Bangalore, Karnataka:

The State government approved an ordinance[12] with amendments to the Karnataka Municipal Corporation Act in 1994 without any debate, and, four years later, published the rules on ward committees. The state government can nominate up to five experts on municipal administration and two civil society representatives. The elected representatives and participants nominated by the State government, have equal voting rights, and this created conflict and resistance from the elected councillors[13]. There is very little defined in terms of qualification for nomination into the committee, the attendance required for the meeting by the officers or format of matters to be discussed[13]. The process of selection is often biased and not considered

transparent. Furthermore, Karnataka's citizen participation law is void of real citizen power and influence, given the veto power awarded to the councillor[14].

Despite disparate sizes and varying resident populations, wards receive a standard budget with no connection to their projects or property tax collection. Furthermore, ward committees do not have a budget under the State regulation, but only have administrative approval to works not exceeding a nominal 50,000 INR despite their multiple responsibilities (INR 100,000 in the case of Bangalore) [13].

Up until 2010, the only municipal corporation to have implemented ward committees was Bangalore. Mangalore has an informal ward committee functioning since the 1980's. Bangalore has had functioning ward committees since 2004, after a brief run between 1999 and 2001 (Between April 1999 and November 2001). However, after the Municipal corporation elections of November 2001, the formation of ward committees was delayed by two and a half years and formed only in July 2004[15]. Its regulation allows no more than 30 ward committees, which means committees usually comprise three or four wards and have between 10 and 15 thousand voters. Ward committees have an array of responsibilities, though these overlap with the functions of the municipal corporation. Under the supervision of the municipal corporation, committees in Bangalore are responsible for, among others, garbage collection, health immunization, slum improvements, citizens' grievance, numbering of streets and premises, apart from monitoring and supervising property tax collection, the utilization of budget grants, the execution of public works not exceeding one lakh rupees (this being subject to availability of the funds) and the issuance of birth and death certificates[13]. The allocated funds for projects form a very small percentage of the total average budget allocated to wards, ranged between 10 million INR to 40 million INR[16].

3.4 Case 4: West Bengal

West Bengal is one of the few states to quickly constitute functional wards committees following the 74th CAA. [13]. Presently West Bengal is constituted of 127 Urban Local Bodies with 2819 wards, and among these Ward Committees have been constituted in 2534 wards[17].

The State introduced amendments to the West Bengal Municipal Act in 1994 and published ward rules in 2001. Under these regulations, each ward in a municipal corporation that meets the population requirements shall have its own ward committee, constituted both by elected and nominated members. Nominations come from the elected councillors and the number of nominated members is contingent on the population of the ward. Under 2,500 people, there are seven nominated members, additional members added with every extra 500 people up until 17 members. To ensure diversity in the committee, the rules state that at least two members must come from the community development societies created for West Bengal's poverty alleviation program (at least three if the committee has more than nine members). All members need to be residents of the ward[10].

Ward committees do not do physical planning, but are required to prepare a list of schemes for deciding priorities, which is prepared and submitted within three months of the constitution of the committee. The list should be for two time frames, short-term (1 year) and long-term schemes (5 years). The participation in the preparation of the draft development plans is conducted with the widest range of stakeholders, building on existing grass root structures such as Ward Committees, Neighbourhood Groups(NHG), Neighbourhood Committees (NHC), and Community Development Society (CDS) [18]. Neighbourhood Groups (NHG) are constituted by 15–20 families and may have volunteers that work in micro neighbourhood scales in education, planning and health. All NHGs in a ward together form an Area Development Society (ADS) and the ADS in a municipality form a part of a registered society called the Community Development Society (CDS)[19]. Neighbourhood Committees (also known as MohollaSamitis) represent polling booth areas in civic elections and need a representation from at least 10 percent of residents of the area[20].

The regulations allow the Ward committees in West Bengal to generate resources for the municipal corporation, 60% of which are available for committees to spend in projects in the ward. As sources of revenue, committees can use government lands for commercial use, private land for joint ventures, water bodies for pisci-culture or entertainment, among others. Ward committees can implement development projects, but do not have planning powers[10,21]. However, ground realities show that one of the biggest drawbacks in the functioning of the ward committees have been the lack of funds for development work and that the committees have not been entrusted with any power to generate resources.

Additionally, the nominations of members to the

committee, while mandated to be publically vetted, the system of selection ends up being completely up to the discretion of the councillor and leading to them becoming political organisations[13].

Alongside decentralized administration and a bottom up approach to city planning, another premise of the 74th CAA was to set up democratic involvement of all citizens in the planning of urban areas. This goal though has not been achieved at a great extent in Indian cities due to a host of issues, pertaining to the structuring and language of the CAA, the institutional and financing gaps and the lack of clarity with regards to implementation processes.

The case examples are evidence to some clear challenges faced by ward committees alongside developments and strategies that have proven effective in

Table 1. Ward Committee Policy Provisions by State

	Kerala	Maharashtra	Karnataka	West Bengal
How members are chosen				
Maximum number of members	• Changes with population	• Fixed	• Fixed	• Changes with population
Non-civil society representation	• Councillors from elected wards Nominated rep from every political party	• Councillors from electoral wards • Officer of ward	• Councillors from electoral wards • Participants nominated by state	• Councillors from electoral wards
Civil Society representation:	• 15 elected reps from RWAs and 20 from neighbourhood groups • All heads of educational institutes • 20 nominations by councillor from civil society	• 3 nominations by councillors from civil society	• 3 nominations by councillors from civil society	• 9–17 members nominated by the councillor and municipality from the residents, depending on population • 2–3 members from community development society
Designated responsibilities				
Planning	• Information gathering for plans • Identify the lapses in building regulation and implementing spatial planning • Formulate proposals on development schemes for the municipal area	• To grant administrative approval and financial sanction to the plans for municipal works • Redressal of common grievances of citizens, regarding municipal services	• Numbering of streets and premises, monitoring and supervising property tax collection,	• To identify the areas of priority and to take part in preparation of development plans in respect of the ward area • Prepare list of schemes for municipal plans (5 and 1 year plans) • Separate sections in policy for administrative and planning functions, including timeline of tasks
Role in Budgeting of projects	• Discuss budget plans and audit reports	• Make recommendations for budgets and sanction them	• Make recommendations for budgets and sanction them	None
Other responsibilities	• Formulate literacy programs • Assist in the public health centres • Prepare list for beneficiaries for various schemes • Provide assistance for social welfare programs		• Garbage collection, health immunization, Slum improvements, Citizens' grievance,	• To supervise and monitor civic services being provided in the area • To assist the Municipality in various works related to the ward concerned • Constitution of beneficiary committees
Participation levels				
Meeting and availability of information	• Regular meetings once in 3 months • Master Plan must include statement of community involvement	• Meetings once every month • Annual Ward Committee meeting not open to citizens nor can they access proceedings	• Meetings once every month	• Monthly meetings • 2 meetings with all residents annually • Annual Ward Committee meetings open to citizens

supporting devolution of powers. Some of the challenges evident are:

- Restricted autonomy for ward committees
  - Many projects need state government approval
  - Political pressures and perceived threats of erosion of powers
- Erratic selection process of ward committee members and insufficient civil society representation
- Lack of dedicated funding streams for projects
- Limited capacity to conduct participative practises of planning and limited platforms for citizen engagement

On the positive side, the legislative provisions made in the states of Kerala and West Bengal may be considered as model ones, with many provisions providing frameworks for institutional, financial and capacity building support[10]. The provisions that allow for a percentage of generated revenues to be redirected back for ward works create an incentivised model for the ward. The educational program run by Kerala has been extensive with trainings running in state, district and local levels[9].

4. Non-Institutionalised Initiatives

The historically top-down and high-level master planning approach for cities is typically been disconnected from smaller scale planning needs and the desired outcomes often stop short of successful implementation[22][1]. Along with evident gaps between Master Plan proposals on paper and its on-ground translation, the limitation of the broad stroke approach to address local needs are emerging as significant pitfalls in the planning process. Adding to this, the complicated mesh of intergovernmental agency coordination[23] makes it difficult to hold any single authority accountable, resulting in a sorry state of affairs on ground with citizens feeling helpless or apathetic to the situation. As a response from the end user, many programs and projects have been initiated to integrate citizen voice into existing planning process. While many of the projects mentioned below are citizen-led, projects such as Bhagidari in Delhi and LAP have been led by the government agencies. The Bhagidari scheme and the Local Area Planning (LAP) project of Municipal Corporation of Delhi, both have been categorized as non-institutionalized initiatives in this paper. The Bhagidari program was led by the then Chief Minister of Delhi and was never institutionalized and the program was discontinued after the completion of the minister's tenure. The USAID FIRE-D Local Area Planning process, similarly, did not become an institutionalized process. The cases discussed below look at the projects in the aspects of the methodology adopted, key players that made it possible and financing mechanisms concluding the on the positives and the learnings from them for effective participative processes.

4.1 City: Delhi

Context:

Delhi has seen a piecemeal planning approach. The restriction to recycle land (redevelop land) until the 2001 Master Plan meant that new development consistently happened outside of original municipal limits leading to unplanned sprawl. The city's severely constrained supply of land, coupled with its vague and broad Master Plan, created without population input, and single building code, has led to a significant difference between plan and reality. Also Delhi's direct connection to the federal government can be an impediment when it comes to managing day-to-day issues. The city municipal corporation has been inefficient in overcoming the shortcomings which have only become starker with the gradual increase of Delhi's population. The city has suffered with the increase of several urban issues, including water supply deficits and electricity theft.

4.1.1 Case 1: Local Area Planning (FIRE-D, USAID)

Starting point and developments:

Top-down approach. In order to deal with the inconsistencies between the Master Plan and reality, MCD started a reform process by the end of 2003. With USAID as its main partner, MCD looked into possible alterations of Delhi's bylaws that might soften those inconsistencies and produce policies closer aligned with local necessities and aspirations. By 2005, the project produced draft amendments to the bylaws and to the DMC Act, as well as guidelines for the preparation of local area plans. In that same year, the project was continued and local area pilot plans with input from local stakeholders were developed. By 2008, when USAID published a report on the project, the pilot projects were near delivery[24].

Lessons learned:

Lack of institutional capacity:

USAID identified a lack of capacity in both the government and the private sector[24]. The MCD had a small number of urban planners among its staff, while the consultants hired to implement the pilot projects

had little to no experience in such a complex process. In fact, most consultancy firms did not have the multidisciplinary team the process required, and were forced to assemble professionals from elsewhere, which was, in some cases, detrimental to the projects.

Challenges to LAP boundaries:

Each local area has its own characteristics that need to be taken into consideration when the determining LAP boundaries. Its density, built environment, land use,*etc*. should make an area somewhat homogeneous, so that issues are clear and unique, and there is no under- or over-representation of a group. Additionally, LAP boundaries have to conform to higher level plans (such as Delhi's Master Plan).

Data:

LAP requires data on an area's properties, population, services, infrastructure etc. These need to be accurate and up-to-date, as well as easily accessible and understandable that is, available in the form of statistics, charts, maps, *etc*. MCD's data was inaccurate and outdated, which demanded an effort on surveying the pilot areas for a more accurate diagnosis of the area's ailments and advantages[24]. One particular issue on which is hard to obtain information was property ownership.

LAP cannot substitute a Master Plan:

As mentioned above, LAPs have to conform to higher-level plans. If those plans are restricting or outdated there is little LAP can do to overcome those features.

Challenges of public participation:

Stakeholders can often concentrate in their own interests and overlook others' concerns. Urban settings, in particular, can present a complex quilt of stakeholders and competing interests. Hence, participation processes need to use tools that lead towards unity and consensus. The government also needs to be able to respond to citizens' concerns and commit to the results so that trust is built with users.

Greater political context:

As mentioned above, when the pilot projects started, the consultancy firms had to perform area surveys to produce updated and accurate data. However, simultaneously, the authorities started a policy of sealing and demolishing illegal constructions that made efforts for surveying any given area particularly difficult. Furthermore, buy-in from authorities is crucial to assure the project's credibility with citizens as well as assure the project in taken forward.

4.1.2 Case 2: Bhagidari Scheme

Starting point and developments:

Top-down approach. The Delhi government, with aid from a consultancy firm, created the program's concept and structure and launched it in 2000. Bhagidari sought to promote a partnership between government and citizens to improve life in Delhi, enlisting partners, or Bhagdars, to collaborate with government agencies on identifying and solving urban issues. Bhagdars were mainly representatives of resident welfare associations (RWAs) and bureaucrats from public utility agencies, but also members of market and industrial associations and authorized residential colonies[25]. Despite being a volunteer-based program, more than a thousand Bhagdars would join the program during the following decade.

While the program lacked planning features, it allowed for the improvement of services provision and the implementation of small urban improvement projects. Projects such as drainage systems and signage used funds from the My Delhi, I Care Fund, which allotted up to INR 50.00 lakhs for each of Delhi's revenue district. During its tenure, the program underwent a decentralisation process, with the creation of coordinators at the revenue district level. The administrative structure of the scheme also included a Bhagidari cell in the Chief Minister's office and nodal departments in the general administration department, which provided financial and administrative support.

Lessons learned:

Resistance to a new concept:

Bhagidari had to deal with resistance, both from government officials and citizens. Bureaucrats felt threatened by the perceived erosion of power, as well as, for some, the increased accountability that would shed light into and hinder corrupt practices[25]. At the same time, citizens were used to have communication with the government through channels for the redressal of grievances, instead of sharing responsibility in moulding and improving Delhi.

Elite capture:

Bhagidari has been accused of systematically excluding renters, squatters and low-income citizens in favour of middle-class property-owners[26]. The scheme only allowed RWAs to participate, although such bodies represent only a small percentage of residents (less than 25% in 2004, according to a government report). Additionally, the close connection the program fostered between participants created a parallel system of governance, granting those representatives unmatched access to government officials and shutting out other citizens. Furthermore, while participants who are granted such access see their projects advance, other par-

ticipants complain about the low implementation rate and the lack of accountability by lower level officials.

Failure to institutionalise:

The government that introduced Bhagidari was never able to institutionalise it. In fact, the program relied heavily on the political influence of then Chief Minister of Delhi, Sheila Dikshit. Hence, when a new political party came to power, the program did not continue, despite overall approval from citizens. Today, there is no active Bhagidari cell.

4.2 City: Bangalore

Context:

Like many other cities in India, Bangalore does not have a strong municipal government. In fact, despite the mandate by the 74th Constitutional Amendment for devolution of responsibilities, State agencies provide and regulate many of Bangalore's basic services (like water and electricity). There is a disconnect between citizens' aspirations and agencies actions, which has inspired several organizations to act. Below, case studies involving Janaagraha, Next Bangaluru and the Neighborhood Improvement Partnership Challenge are summarised.

4.2.1 Case 1: Janaagraha:

Starting point and developments:

Given this context, in 2001, Janaagraha, a non-governmental organization (NGO) was created to promote democratic participation as a means to improve the city. Janaagraha's first campaign, executed between December 2001 and May 2002, was built around the concept of participatory budgeting — despite a lack of institutional mandate for so. The NGO worked to involve citizens in the allocation of resources for local development at the ward level. Following, Janaagraha had a campaign focused on creating a "vision" for each ward with citizens' input between June and December 2003.

Lessons learned:

Issues with coverage:

Despite designing its first campaign to include participation from every spectrum of society, Janaagraha failed to reach to the urban poor[27]. The NGO later designed a specific campaign to cover that gap with mixed results. What is clear from this case and from the literature, however, is that the urban poor face greater challenges to access initiatives such as this one. There is a need of specific efforts to access them and include them in the participatory process.

Lack of institutional mandate or support:

The involvement of citizens, elected representatives and public administration was fundamental for the results described above. In fact, of the 15 wards Janaagraha identified as possible locations for the project, only 10 had representatives interested in it — hence only those areas participated in the project, with varying degrees of success. Furthermore, even when there are positive results, the lack of a formal mechanism for its recognition by the government apparatus may still prevent it from being implemented[12].

Citizens' interest:

Despite the lack of a formal mandate, more than 100,000 citizens took part in Janaagraha's campaigns over a two-year period. There is a clear desire — at least in a subset of the population — to improve the urban experience.

4.2.2 Case 2: NextBengaluru

Starting point and developments:

In 2009, under Germany's National Policy for City Development, the city of Hamburg received a project entitled Next Hamburg, aimed at creating a vision for the city through a collaborative process. Due to the success of its bottom-up approaches, the project was expanded to other cities in the world, under the realm of the NGO Next and local partners. In 2013, Next partnered with MOD Institute to implement Next Bengaluru. With two phases so far, one general about Bangalore, and another, more specific, looking at Shantinagar, Next Bengaluru is supposed to be an ongoing project.

Lessons learned:

Connection between participatory process and implementation:

Next Bangaluru produced an array of tangible solutions for urban improvement. These ideas, however, have not been further developed — there are no technical specifications or financial information. The project is ongoing, which could signify more details forthcoming. However, though Next Bangaluru so far has been successful in creating ideas and bringing people together, there has not been any infrastructural change on the ground.

Channels and tools for accessibility:

Next Bangaluru used several channels to reach citizens, allowing (theoretically) all to participate in the process of discussing the city's future. Additionally, the organization experimented with different tools for collecting and exposing ideas, making complex issues more approachable and the ensuing discussion accessible to all.

4.2.3 Case 3: The Neighbourhood Improvement Partnership Challenge

Starting point and developments:

Citizen engagement in neighbourhood planning:

In 2015, the Citizens for the City initiative was set up by United Technologies Corporation (UTC) to support community engagement for sustainable development. Under this initiative was set up the Neighbourhood Improvement Partnership challenge in the city of Bangalore to encourage citizen to engage with the city as problem solvers with local governments. The Challenge sought to select and financially support neighbourhood led sustainable civic improvement solutions to address the many problems faced by the city.

Lessons learned:

Apprehensions of engagement from the municipal corporation

Though the initiative and ideas put forth by the citizens have been widely appreciated amongst the government officials, the lack of set principles of citizen engagement led the official to take a less active role in the challenge. Also the limited engagement of local councillors/elected representatives in the wards in which these projects have been proposed was seen as possible hurdle in the successful implementation of these projects

Limited citizen capacity to formulate replicable and scalable solutions

While many of the robust communities were able to formulate workable neighbourhood solutions, a large majority lacked the capacity to analyse the problem to its root causality, leading to many of the proposed projects being myopic in their impact. The limited ability to recognise the type of skill sets required in the team also restricted their ability to propose implementable and financially viable solutions.

Successful model of private investment in city projects

The challenge paved the way in setting up a model of engagement for citizens, experts and investors to engage with the municipal corporation to implement neighbourhood scale projects.

4.3 City: Mumbai

Context:

In 2009, the Maharashtra State government introduced legislation that allows for cluster redevelopment in the State. Based on the redevelopment model followed in Hong Kong and Singapore, the Cluster redevelopment is a form of land development where principal buildings and structures are clubbed together on a site for redevelopment and a major portion of the site is left open for recreation and infrastructural facilities. Following, a large-scale project for redeveloping Bhendi Bazaar, a 200-year-old market area of Mumbai and home to some 20,000 people with precarious infrastructure, was put forward by a community group.

Starting point and developments:

Bottom-up approach. The non-profit Saifee Burhani Upliftment Trust (SBUT) was created by the Dawoodi Bohras community, an Islamic sect that comprises about 70% of the population of Bhendi Bazaar[28]. Their goal is to improve the infrastructure of the area, while keeping the bustling characteristics of a street market this size. In order to do so, SBUT had to acquire consent from at least 70% of the area population, which can be partially credited to the project's participatory approach.

Lessons learned:

"Homogeneous" communities:

As exemplified by the SBUT, buy-in for a project by communities bound by a common objective that arises of a homogeneity either political, economic, social or religious is usually easier to achieve. Homogeneous communities share desires/goals and share a sense of trust that puts them at an advantage from the very beginning of a participatory process towards a single agreed-upon outcome. In the present case it is suggested that the SBUT has taken up this complex and expensive redevelopment task as Bhendi Bazaar forms the religious headquarters for the Dawoodi Bohras, who constitute about 70 % of the population in the area[28]. Nevertheless, the apparent homogeneity may muffle dissonant voices, forcing them to acquiesce to the majority, as some accuse the Bhendi Bazaar project of promoting.

4.4 City: Pune

Context:

As in other cities of India, Pune has a macro-level development plan that does not translate well into the reality on the ground. In particular, Pune's development plan sets out goals based on the funds disbursed on projects, instead of their impact on citizens' lives.

Starting point and developments:

NGO Janwani advocates for better quality of life in Pune. One of their projects involved the concept of local area planning as a tool to achieve that objective. Over three months, the NGO worked in three areas of

Pune, trying to understand its mains issues and produce possible solutions.

Lessons learned:

Project Implementation:

While Janwani's project had no official connection to the government or local agencies[29], the NGO was able to present the results to elected representatives. The NGO is working towards including the projects in Pune Municipal Corporation's budget, at the will of the elected representatives - which illustrates the issue with a lack of a formal mechanism to translate a citizen's initiative in an official project by the local administration.

Building transparency

The Janwani Initiative has help build a lot more transparency in the functioning of the initiative with the overall municipal budget now being discussed in public forums and shared through media reports[30]. It has also made citizens aware of their rights

Exclusive process

The process has been successful only with a few sections of the society, namely the middle upper middle class citizens. Another major aspect to note is the exclusion of the local corporators in the process which have led to problems in implementation.[30]

From the non-institutionalised cases stated above is evident, the varied scales of citizen self-organisation to address issues city planning. Also evident are the levels of success of the initiatives based on the local government buy in and participation.

Programmes such as participatory budgeting in Pune and NIPC in Bangalore have paved inroads for integrating citizen voice in planning and exhibits a potential for scaling up, though limited by the lack of formal and institutionalised mechanisms and channels of engagement with local government. The unclear and less than transparent engagement process also limits the potential of sourcing private investment support, to fund neighbourhood scale civic projects, a need for many cash strapped city municipalities today.

The lack of successful participatory process is also accentuated by the inherent lack of capacity amongst citizen groups and government officials alike to engage in planning processes. This was an aspect particularly evident in the NIPC, USAID and Bhagidari programmes. Capacity building, transparent avenues of engagement for all involved emerge as key elements in shifting engagement from redressal model to participative solution finding followed by successful implementation.

5. Discussions

5.1 Devolution of Powers and Achieving Citizen Participation is an Incremental Process

In 1969, Sherry Arnstein wrote a seminal article, in which she introduced the concept of a "ladder of citizen participation[31]". Arnstein devised an eight-tiered ladder, having as a starting point, the notion that citizen participation is only possible and meaningful when there is redistribution of power. In the bottom two steps, there are methods that do not constitute participation — manipulation and therapy. The three middle steps are what the author entitled tokenism, where there is interaction with stakeholders, but not an actual redistribution of power. In this level, methods are informing, consultation, and placation. Finally, in the higher three steps, citizens display some power — through partnership, delegation of power, and citizen control.

Enabling true and effective citizen participation in an existing administrative set up is a complex process with challenges such as finding an amicable power and responsibility distribution framework, a building of additional capacity amongst both, government officials and citizens alike[24], ensuring fair civil society representation and enabling resources to support it. Decentralisation of power requires institutional, legislative and polictial support at varied levels of governance. Even with the considerable develolution of funds and extensive adult education and empowerment program in Kerala, the impact was considerably hampered by the inability of the system to convert vocalised concerns into implementable solutions. The Keralan model of implementation was on of 'action first, preconditions later' Reversing the order of conventional wisdom on decentralization, the LDF government earmarked the 35%–40% of funds for local self-government institutions instead of waiting for gradual building of administrative capacity[9]. This lead to many projects not seeing the light of the day and the under utilisation of the designated funding[32]. There is a need for a structured stagewise inplementation stategy for develotion of powers.

5.2 Building Trust to Enable Devolution of Powers

A general lack of clarity in roles and responsibilities in the process contribute to a perceived threat and aresistance in the devolution of powers in governance. Municipal agencies hold many of the functions recommended to be transferred to ward committees, and while transferring them could benefit residents with

Table 2. Stakeholders, participation methodologies and finance models adopted by the initiatives

	Participants involved	Methodology	Finance
Local Area Planning, FIRE-D USAID, Delhi	Lead partners: • Municipal Corporation of Delhi • USAID Other partners: • Local consultancy firms(hired by USAID) • Local stakeholders (groups not detailed)	The local area planning processes led by USAID had three main phases: • Data gathering and production (surveys and creation of maps); Participation to define each area limits and understanding • Data analysis; stakeholder involvement in the form of consultations to guide the work by consultants and assure their ideas and proposals were aligned • Proposals. so far has not included local input	USAID under the Indo-USAID Financial Institutions Reform and Expansion Project–De bt & Infrastructure Component.
Bhagidari, Delhi	Lead partners: • Initiative of the Chief Minister of Delhi • Resident Welfare Associations Other partners: • Market and Industrial Associations • Government and Public Utility Departments (Such as the Municipal Corporation of Delhi, Delhi Development Authority, New Delhi Municipal Council, Delhi Vidyut Board, Delhi Jal Board and Delhi Police and the Department of Environment and Forest) • Consultancy firms	• Membership workshops: Conducted three times a year, to introduce new Bhagdars to the scheme and train them • Thematic workshops: participants discuss specific issues in small groups to produce a solution by consensus • Review process: Meeting with RWA members in each revenue area to check status of projects	My Delhi, I Care Fund – governmental funds.
Janaagraha, Bangalore	Lead partners: • Janaagraha (NGO) Other partners • Citizens (strong middle class involvement) • Corporators • Bangalore Municipality Corporation (BBMP)	• First campaign (2002): Meetings in 65 wards and get all actors involved to negotiate local budgets. • Third campaign (2003): 5 workshops, bringing together over 2000 people in 10 wards to produce a ward vision and suggested projects, including technical and financial requirements. • Recent developments: Programs with focus on the urban poor. E-governance - allowing citizens to voice their concerns online and reach Metropolitan Agencies.	Ramanathan Foundation
NEXTBangaluru, Bangalore	Lead partners: • MOD institute Other partners • Citizens • Civic Societies • Activists	• Any citizen could send suggestions, either via their website or their local urban studio. This space held events, meetings, discussions, and workshops. • Through workshops in particular, the ideas from visitors and online suggestions were discussed and polished into possible projects. • Field trips or a cart was carried around and used to collect opinions from citizens to reach out to all populations	The German institution Robert Bosch Stiftung.
NIPC	Lead partners; • UTC Citizens of the city group Other partners • Resident Welfare associations • NGOs • CBOs/Civic Societies • Bangalore City municipality (BBMP)	• The model looked at engaging citizens as partners of change • The citizens could engage in the challenge through their local resident welfare associations or civil societies ensuring consensus and a broader and inclusive approach to problem solving. • The challenge invited ideas for across the city through a website conducting multiple capacity building workshops on formulation of ideas, projects, implementation and budgeting plans. • The selected teams would be provided with financial assistance to implement the project working in collaboration with the local government agencies	CSR funds of United Technologies Corporation
Bhendi Bazaar Cluster redevelopment	Lead partner: • Saifee Burhani Upliftment Trust (SBUT) Other partners: • Bhendi Bazaar residents (Bohras and otherwise) • Business representatives • Private Developers (?) • Government agencies	• Focus group discussions with all stakeholders.	Although current residents will occupy 80% of the project, the remaining 20% will be available for sale. Given the high real estate prices in Mumbai, those 20% should cover the project costs. SBUT will cover any shortfalls, through funds raised by the Bohras community.
Participative budgetting in Pune	Lead partners: Janwani Other partners • Citizens • Pune Municipal Corporation	• Surveys of the areas and dialogues with local residents and their representatives were conducted to identify "liveability[1] factors in areas, from physical structure to services, in order to better understand their issues and prepare local area plans.	Janwani has a number of donors and supporters, from government agencies to private companies and individuals.

swifter service, it is perceived as a threat that could harm coordination at the municipal level and raise costs.This state of mistrust lies just as much between government bureaucrats and elected representatives as with citizens and governmentalike[30]. Local area projects are limited to neighbourhoods and wards and are mandated to follow city master plans[24]. While citizen groups may bring in many skill and financial resources the intent of many projects inherently remains myopic in nature. As was the case with NIPC where citizens have been encouraged to develop solutions for problems faced in the neighbourhood. It is in the onus of the administration to vet such projects for viability and ensure the integration the protection of the underlyingprinciples of the master plan.

In parallel is the perceived threat of erosion of powers leading to cases where the effectiveness of decision making and impact of local are committees are significantly hampered by red tape, bureaucracy, and required approval from the State, with state governments tending to hold most relevant powers and exercising them through the Municipal commissioner.

5.3 Fair Representation is of Paramount Importance

While the roles and responsibilities and the powers that are legislated to the ward committees are significant, the objective of the CAA is diluted, if such committees don't serve citizen representation platform for a continued negotiation with the administration. A case particular to urban areas, is the reducing proximity of the citizen to the government due to the limitation of number of ward committees[33]. In greater Mumbai, ward committees represent 7.4 lakh population, 2 lakhs in Nashik and 33000 in West Bengal[7]. West Bengal and Kerala has been able to maintain one of the better populations to ward committee ratios. The West Bengal Municipal mandating a model of representation that varies with the changing ward population[10]. A case can be made here for alternate strategies to ensure good representation when in megacities such as Mumbai. Considering high and growing densities in the wards, the committees structure themselves can be made much more granular by the introduction of the CPL. In this case, the smallest unit of administration would be the Area Sabhas, from where representatives will be elected into the committee. Alternatively the 'Community development society (CDS) – Neighbourhood Group'[19] model in Kerala will provide a frame work for existing active civil groups to integrate into the formal decision making system.

The examples of citizen led initiatives from Bangalore and the ALMs from Mumbai exhibit varying competencies of citizens to build viable proposals. While citizens have the advantage of building solutions crafted for the neighbourhood the plans and proposals need to adhere to larger city and zonal plans and nominated members to the Committee help negotiate and ensure developing viability in solutions. There needs to be fine balance between the interest of the city and the interest of the neighbourhood and at the same ensuring a platform for citizen voice. A balance between nominated and the elected representatives and a mandated representation from all constituent stakeholders of the neighbourhood to be able to comprehensively address the diversity and complexity of different urban areas remains significant in this process.

While there needs to be strategies to ensure interests of all groups are protected and provided for, the given diversity of urban areas in Indian cities have led to an uneven representations of interests. There have been cases where the ward committees have been interpreted as platforms to protect the interests of primarily low income groups (Cases such as in Kerala[34] and Mumbai, Maharashtra) leading to citizens belonging to the middle income spectrum losing interest in the system and looking at alternate ways to engage with the government (Such as development of ALMs in Mumbai). To be fair, the needs and aspirations of different income groups may be very diverse, given the possible variations in service provision, socio-economic and cultural backgrounds and achieving consensualrepresentation of interests may be complicated. While Ward committees are constituted by administrative boundaries of a ward, sub-dividing planning areas within on the basis of common socio-culural and economic back drops with allocated budgets might help protect interests of all groups. These plans can then feed back into an overall ward development plan.

Another strategy that might help build more homogenised approaches planning for the neighbourhood is by clubbing homogenised interests. The Siliguri model has created subcommittees within the ward committee with focus areas such as conservancy, construction and health. Siliguri Municipal Corporation has had ward committees functional even before the 74th CAA. In its subcommittees one ward council member is made the convenor and additional population is drawn from the general population to supervise

developmental works and the everyday functioning of the concerned functions[10]. Beneficiary committees have been effective as well in the representation of low income and slum groups.

5.4 Enabling Resources and Support Systems

Building supportive frameworks that enable participative planning has been a gap that has not been addressed effectively by many states in the implementation of the 74th CAA. This an aspect that requires intervention not only both within the government but also within citizens. On this front, the provisions made by the state of Kerala in setting up of multiple institutional and legislative support systems remain one of the most elaborate efforts in the country. Citizen engagement is a complex process and while initiatives such as Bhagidari have tried to resolve this with capacity building workshops within the government and amongst citizens. One significant change essential is the shift in the nature of engagement with the government from purely that of redressal to one of collaborative solution building. Building viable solutions to neighbourhood level issues will help citizens to more effectively engage with ULBs. While initiative such as Bhagidari, The Kerala people movement and citizen led initiatives in Bangalore have provided good models to follow, citizen engagement itself is a complex process and local bodies may not have sufficient in-house capabilities to implement them. In such cases alternate strategies such as engaging academic institutions and other organisations to act as a mediatory will help effectively bridge the gap as has been proven effective in many cases. While Janwani in the Pune participatory budgeting imitative is one case example, the Kerala government has also looked at engaging institutions in capacity building drives as well.

The insignificant budgetary allocations have been a hindering factor for ward committees in exercising any real development responsibility. Limited budgetary allocations leave wards very little power and curtail their ability to address ground issues. In the case of the ward committees in Kerala, after the change of political leadership, a major portion of the funds initially allocated for local projects had been earmarked for state initiatives, leaving little for the committee to work with[32]. Strategies such as the provision by the Bengal state for the reallocation of a certain revenue percentage generated in the area, to the Ward committee for development works are effective models that will help incentivise ward level development works. While this model may incentivise development, such approaches may lead to prioritisation of only those projects that will contribute to increasing revenue of the area, over socially benefitting projects. The PPP model for civic interventions in Karnataka could be an alternative funding mechanism that may be adopted — as part of a municipal government initiative in Bengaluru allowed for private financing in local are civic infrastructure projects. On adhering to guidelines set up by the council to protect public interest, the model allowed the businesses to fund and implement infrastructure such as signage, street furniture, bus stops under the supervision of the local body. Models such as these if transparent will allow more citizen-led and funded projects in local areas. A similar model was followed by the Citizens led NIPC initiative and has proven successful as well. However, it must be noted that such PPP models can be effective in only bridging viability and cannot be expected to completely replace government funding.

5.5 Building Transparency Through Platforms of Active and Passive Engagement

While urban areas have master plans, there is little evidence of Local Area Plans (LAPs) supporting the planning process. LAPs have the potential to be effective platforms to enable participative local area planning for economic and social development through inclusive and transparent processes[35]. Like city master plans they hold the potential to be help plan a vision for the area and build strategies to help achieve the same by a clear process of budget allocations, prioritisation of projects and also help plan for additional resources that may need to be sourced.

Enabling multiple platforms of engagement enabling active participation will help build transparency by making information readily available. While e-governance platforms have proven to be very effective in cities across the world and India there have been many other technological platforms have been developed and are being used in the areas of collecting experience based data and allowing participation from different stakeholders. Technology tools have been designed to collect experience-based data about the living environment for both research purposes and to be used by planners. Tools have also been developed that enhance the participation of different stakeholder's processes along with allowing people to co-develop and customize them for participation in urban planning and community development, *e.g.*: Internet

forums in Espoo are being used as forums for participation. The web-based arena allows to translate the inhabitants' knowledge to a form that suits the planning procedures[36]. Movements such as open government and government 2.0 that look at encouraging open, collaborative technologies that enable easier collaboration between citizens and governments along with making available data for companies to be able to develop apps, websites and mashups for the benefit of the citizens[37].

However, the success of purely technology based engagement systems may be hindered by limited access and allow the participation from only specific sections of society. Hybrid models and on-ground engagement centres for events, works shops, providing for citizen feedback and ideas, will allow a more balanced percolation of the participative practises and dissemination of information. One of the successful models adapted by the Next Bengaluru project was setting up on ground and online interactive platforms to address the different levels of participation, given the less than homogeneous societal structure of most wards.

Effective participative planning practices can enable decentralisation of powers using multiple channels of citizen engagement, through institutionalised processes and citizen-led engagements. Ward committees and similar decentralised units of administration hold the potential to a seamless channel of direct engagement with the administrative and planning processes. They can ensure a fair representation of the ward and a fair distribution of resources, development is directed in consensus with citizens.

Devolution of power to ward committees have also been perceived as a threat that can harm co-ordination at municipal level and raise costs for administration. Participative processes may be potentially a waste of resources if the discussion is not considered seriously and is conducted in a tokenistic approach[38]. It may also run the risk of bad policy outcomes, if the discussion group do not fairly represent the community interests and voices, a fact resonating the significance of fair representation processes required in the constitution of ward committees. Participative planning processes are certainly an added cost to the government and the the question of whether the expense is better utilised in implementation is always in contention. However what needs to be taken into consideration building in a participative planning process reducing the probability of litigation, provides an opportunity for both the citizens and the government officials to be educated from each other on stances taken on specific issues, helps build trust and allay hostility and help in better policy and implementation decisions[38].

6. Conclusions

It can be argued that the process of building capacity for participative planning is an incremental one, similar to the analogy used by Sherry Arnstein and may form the basis of developing a constructive stage wise implementation strategy, starting with the lowest rung of building efficient interactive information dissemination systems. The development of powers and resources can be made available to committees incrementally, post evidence of competance in the different levels up the ladder, ensuring an impactful use of resources and a sustained implemetation.

Defining clear roles and responsibilities along with dissemination of information will help mitigate misunderstanding and perceptions of loss of power. There is also the pertinent argument that the real devolution of powers will require a reform of the urban governance structure and a localised decision making power structure (such as from office of the mayor) will help greater transparency and accountability[39].

The number of allowable ward committees and the representation per capita population, the selection and the composition, ensuring representation of diverse groups such as minorities, elderly, all genders and working sections are critical components in the devolution of power. Models that allow a granular representation such as the CPL or the Kerala CDS models may help overcome a widening citizen-administration distance. Fair representation of all interests through constitution of subject driven subcommittees can facilitate a more consensual development strategy for the area.

Financing models and capacity building still remain the enabling frameworks for the initial stages of participative planning implementation. While alternative funding models such as PPP should be made available, models such as that provided by the state of W. Bengal provide an incentivised model for area development. In the face of limited resources and capacity for participative planning, engagement of institutions to act as bridges between citizens and administration have proven to be effective and may help building in greater transparency and trust into the process. Different engagement models have proved successful in different urban areas for varied objectives. Strong citizen led initiatives also have definite

associated advantages. Often formed in attempts to bridge local issues, these groups have clear and consolidated mandates, are self-organised, motivated to take ownership of projects. They are naturally homogeneous in their composition and they hold the potential to source diverse skills sets from the neighbourhood skill pool. They also are able to leverage private resources and funding due to better accountability. Considering the complexity of the issue, city governments will need to make available different channels of engagement and participation such as being able to engage with such self-organised groups, amongst other things. These engagements will also essentially need to tie together into a comprehensive local area development plan and ensure optimal utilisation of all available resources. City governments should look at citizen engagement both through institutionalised structures such as ward committees and others such as citizen-led groups to act as active partners in the co-creation of the policy and planning process.

Conflict of Interest and Funding

No conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Appendices

Appendix A

18 major functions were to be granted to the ULBs by the 74th Amendment[40]

1. Urban planning including town planning.
2. Regulation of land-use and construction of buildings.
3. Planning for economic and social development.
4. Roads and bridges.
5. Water supply for domestic, industrial and commercial purposes.
6. Public health, sanitation conservancy and solid waste management.
7. Fire services.
8. Urban forestry, protection of the environment and promotion of ecological aspects.
9. Safe guarding the interests of weaker sections of society, including the handicapped and mentally retarded.
10. Slum improvement and up gradation.
11. Urban poverty alleviation.
12. Provision of urban amenities and facilities such as parks, gardens, and playgrounds.
13. Promotion of cultural, educational and aesthetic aspects.
14. Burials and burial grounds, cremations, cremation grounds and electric crematoriums.
15. Cattle pounds; prevention of cruelty to animals.
16. Vital statistics including registration of births and deaths.
17. Public amenities including street lighting, parking lots, bus stops and public conveniences.
18. Regulation of slaughterhouses and tanneries.

Appendix B

Adult education drive in the Kerala to support participatory process

To support the participatory process, Kerala carried out one of the most extensive adult education and empowerment programs in India's history[9]. Training occurred on three levels: state, district, and local.

The state level trainees, about 600 people, received nearly 20 days of training and were deemed Key Resource Persons. The district level trainees received 10-day s of training to become District Resource Persons. On the local level, more than a lakh people received at least five days of training. Through seven rounds of training, the program reached around 15,000 elected representatives, 25,000 officials, and 75,000 volunteers. Each round focused on how to carry out a specific planning activity that would be used, thus targeting the capacity to facilitate the participatory process[41].

Appendix C

Local Agenda 21

Agenda 21 addresses a lot of problems and solutions which are tied close to local activities and the participation of locals become significant for its success. Local authorities form the governance closest to the people and play a key role in the promotion of sustainable development. Local Agenda 21 aims at ensuring a better quality of life for everyone and looks at addressing economic, social and environmental issues at the local level through encouraging efficient practices. Implementation of Local Agenda 21 thus entail local authorities to enter into a dialogue with its citizen's local organisations and private enterprises to arrive at strategies for sustainable development through consultation and consensus.[4]

Appendix D

Note on Janwani methodology: surveys carried about in Pune:

Throughout 2014, Janwani developed a local area planning project in three neighbourhoods, chosen for being deemed representative of different areas of the city. Following, Janwani wished to understand what were the "liveability" factors in each of these areas, from physical structure to services, in order to better understand their issues and prepare local area plans. This step required surveys of the areas and dialogues with local residents and their representatives. Janwani also had meetings with citizens' groups. The data underwent a SWOT analysis through which a list of the issues to be addressed was prepared and later organized within a timeframe and prioritized. This step involved citizen participation to ensure Janwani was reflecting their views truthfully and to aid in prioritization. The resulting projects were to be submitted to government officials.

References

1. United Nations Development Program (UNDP), "Decentralisation in India Challenges & Opportunities," UNDP, New Delhi, 2001.
2. World Bank, "Social Development - Social Accountability E-guide," 2016. [Online]. Available: https://saeguide.worldbank.org/sites/worldbank.org.saeguide/files/documents/1_Participatory%20Planning.pdf.
3. United Nations, "Building Bridges through Participatory Planning - Part 1," Romania Foundation for local development (FPDL).
4. School of Planning and Architecture, "Alternative approaches to Masterplan," School of Planning and Architecture.
5. S. Connelly, "Public involvement in Local Agenda 21: the impact of local authority policy processes," University of Sheffield , September 2002.
6. A. Hamid, "74th Amendment: An Overview," *Centre for Civil Society Research Internship Papers*, 2004.
7. K. C. Sivaramakrishnan, Re-visioning Indian Cities: The Urban Renewal Mission, SAGE Publications, 2011.
8. M. S. George, "An Introduction to Local Self Governments In Kerala," SDS CAPDECK, Thiruvananthapuram, 2007, September.
9. T. T. Isaac and R. W. Franke, Local Democracy and Development: The Kerala People's Campaign for Decentralized Planning; Campaign for Democratic Decentralization in Kerala, New York: Rowman and Littlefeild Publishers INC., 2002.
10. TERI, "Enhancing public participation through effective functioning of Area Sabhas," the Energy and research Institute, July 2010.
11. I. BAUD and N. Nainan, ""Negotiated spaces" for representation in Mumbai:ward committes, advanced locality management and polictics of middle class activism," *Environment & Urbanization*, p. Vol 20(2): 483–499, 2008.
12. K. Sivaramakrishnan, Peoples participation in Urban Governance, New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company, 2006.
13. Institute of Social Sciences, People's Participation in Urban Governance - a comparative study of the working of wards committees in Karnataka, Kerela, Maharashtra and West Bengal, Concept Publishing Company, 2006.
14. K. Chamaraj, "articles:Citizen matters," 17 November 2014. [Online]. Available: http://bangalore.citizenmatters.in/articles/new-ward-committee-rules-bengaluru-no-power-to-citizens.
15. Namma Bangluru Foundation, "Study on the functioning of the Ward Committees in Bangalore," [Online]. Available: http://namma-bengaluru.org/PDF/Annexure.pdf.
16. BBMP, "Documents:BBMP Budget 2010, ward-wise special grants," 2010. [Online]. Available: https://www.scribd.com/document/37544765/BBMP-Budget-2010-Special-Grants-Ward-wise.
17. West Bengal Department of Municipal Affairs, "The West Bengal Municipal (Ward Committee) Rule, 2001," [Online]. Available: http://www.wbdma.gov.in/HTM/MUNI_Legislation_WBwordCommitteeRules_2001.htm.
18. U. K. Roy and M. Ganguly, "Integration of Top down & Bottom up approach in Urban and Regional Planning: West Bengal Experience of Draft Development Plans (DDP) and beyond," in *National Town & Country Planners Congress, Goa: India*, 2009.
19. M. Ramachandran, India's Urban Confusion: Challenges and Strategies, New Delhi: Copal Publishing Group, 2014.
20. Free Press Journal, "Form Mohalla Samiti on pilot basis: HC to IMC," 10 Jan 2015. [Online]. Available: http://www.freepressjournal.in/indore/form-mohalla-samiti-on-pilot-basis-hc-to-imc/515931.
21. Department of Municipal Affairs, Government of West Bengal, "Ward committee rules 2001," [Online]. Available: http://www.wbdma.gov.in/PDF/TheWB_WardCommittee_Rules_2001.pdf.
22. I. J. Ahluwalia, "Icrier:Urbanisation," [Online]. Available: http://icrier.org/Urbanisation/pdf/Ahluwalia_Planning_for_Urban_%20Development.pdf.
23. R. Aijaz, "Social Marginalisation in India and role of the State," *Observer Research Foundation Issue Brief*, p. 7, December 2015, Issue no. 118.
24. USAID, "Preparation of Local Area Plans: Pilot project for Delhi, India," The Commuities Group International(TCGI) in partnersip with AECOM, April 2008.
25. Delhi Government, "Bhagidari," [Online]. Available: http://delhigovt.nic.in/newdelhi/bhagi.asp.

26. D. Kundu, “Elite Capture in Participatory Urban Governance,” *Economic & Political Weekly EPW*, vol. xlvi no 10, 5 March 2011.
27. J. Harriss, “‘Participation’ and Contestation in the Governance of Indian Cities,” *Simons Papers in Security and Development*, p. 17, May 2010.
28. M. Goyal, “Economy:Infrastructure,” 09 Nov 2015. [Online]. Available: http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/economy/infrastructure/bhendi-bazaar-rs-4000-cr-makeover-of-indias-largest-ever-cluster-redevelopment-project-could-be-a-template-for-others/articleshow/49432897.cms.
29. Centre for Environment Education, “Participatory Budgeting in Pune:A Documentation of the Process undertaken by the Pune Municipal Corporation in 2006-07for the 2007-08 Municipal Budget,” Centre for Environment Education, August 2007.
30. S. Menon, A. Madhale and A. , “Participatory Budgeting in Pune: A critical review,” Centre for Environmental Education, August 2013.
31. S. Arnstein, “A Ladder of Citizen Participation,” *Journal of American Institute of Planners*, pp. No. 4,Vol. 35, pp. 216-224, July 1969.
32. K. Rajesh, “Participatory Institutions and People’s Practices in India: An analysis of Decentralisation experiences in Kerala State,” Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore, June 2009.
33. K. Sivaramakrishnan, Re-visioning Indian Cities: The Urban Renewal Mission, Sage Publications, 2011.
34. C. P. Mohanan Pillai, “Social Classes and Participation in Local Planning in Kerela: A Micro Level Study,” RESEARCH UNIT ON LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENTS, Thiruvanathapuram, 2016. February.
35. Ministry of Law and Justice, India, “Constitution of India: Amendment acts,” [Online]. Available: http://indiacode.nic.in/coiweb/amend/amend74.htm.
36. Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, “DIGITAL TOOLS IN PARTICIPATORY PLANNING,” Centre for Urban and Regional Studies Publications , Aalto, 2008.
37. M. Chernoff, “Resources:Open government,” [Online]. Available: https://opensource.com/resources/open-government.
38. R. A. Irvin and J. Stansbury, “Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is It Worth the Effort?,” *Public Administration Review*, p. 55, Jan/Feb 2004.
39. M. Idicula, “Opinion:Columns,” 23 August 2016. [Online]. Available: http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/columns/should-mayors-be-directly-elected/article9018213.ece.
40. D. Leena and A. Sharma, “Government by the people, Analysing 74th Constitutional Amendment Act 1992,” Hazards Centre, 2007.
41. T. T. Isaac, Campaign for Democratic Decentralisation in Kerala: An Assessment From The Perspective Of Empowered Deliberative Democracy, Centre for Development Studies and Kerala State Planning Board, 12 January, 2000.