
Article:
Williams, G.O. orcid.org/0000-0003-0293-5574, Omankuttan, U., Devika, J. et al. (1 more author) (2018) Enacting participatory, gender-sensitive slum redevelopment? Urban governance, power and participation in Trivandrum, Kerala. Geoforum, 96. pp. 150-159. ISSN 0016-7185

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.07.021

Enacting Participatory, Gender-Sensitive Slum Redevelopment? Urban governance, power and participation in Trivandrum, Kerala

Abstract

This paper looks at two governance challenges that sit behind global commitments to deliver 'cities without slums': under what conditions can participatory ideals be successfully transferred to housing redevelopment programmes, and under what conditions can participatory slum redevelopment trigger wider shifts towards inclusive urban governance? It does so by examining Indian national slum redevelopment policy and its implementation in Kerala's capital city, Trivandrum (Thiruvananthapuram). Kerala's track-record of participatory governance and the lead role given to its women-focused poverty alleviation mission, Kudumbashree, in implementing housing projects make it an ideal place in which to examine these questions, and their gender implications. Primary data focusing on two housing projects are used to contrast intended governance changes featuring female-centred community participation with their actual operation on the ground. Despite moves to foreground women's engagement, both projects suffered from shortfalls in institutional design, the inevitable administrative complexity of housing delivery, and resistance from local power brokers. Given Kerala's favourable starting conditions, these outcomes highlight the need for slum redevelopment to be based around a deeper analysis of power dynamics and the explicit articulation of an agenda for inclusion at a city-level if participation is to realise its transformative potential.

Key Words

Participatory Development; Gender; Urban Governance; Slum Redevelopment; Kerala (South Asia)

1. Housing, Gender and Participatory Urban Governance

This paper investigates the governance challenges inherent within the UN's Sustainable Development Goal 11, the headline target of which is to ensure "access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums" by 2030. This target demands radical improvement in the living conditions of over 828 million people currently in slums (UNDP, 2018), but as countries transform their housing agendas to reach it, a focus on upgrading physical housing stock potentially risks the creation of new forms of social and spatial marginalisation. The governance challenges addressed here are therefore those of making the journey towards 'cities without slums' a participatory one: under what conditions can participatory ideals be implemented successfully within housing redevelopment programmes, and under what conditions can participatory slum redevelopment trigger wider shifts towards inclusive urban governance? We look at the role of gendered power relations within both questions to highlight a key axis of marginalisation that slum redevelopment might either help overcome, or unwittingly reproduce.

These questions are of pressing importance in India, where a succession of national programmes have sought to address slum conditions from the late 1990s, and the problems of redevelopment-induced marginalisation have been widely recognised (Whitehead and More, 2007; Mahadevia and Narayanan, 2008; Coelho et al. 2012). A key moment in policy development was the flagship Jawaharlal Nehru

National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM), which promised both increased investment in slum redevelopment and greater community participation in the design and implementation of housing projects. Trivandrum, the State capital of Kerala,[1] is a useful context in which to evaluate this policy's effects on both of our governance challenges. Since the 1990s, Kerala's experiments with empowered, participatory governance have won international recognition (Fung and Wright, 2003), and more specifically it nominated Kudumbashree, its women-focused poverty alleviation mission, to coordinate implementation of JNNURM's slum upgrade programmes. These favourable conditions would suggest that any difficulties Trivandrum's slum residents face in participating in housing projects, or gaining a stronger foothold in urban governance, are likely to be magnified elsewhere. As redressing gender inequalities has been both a key target and a stumbling block for participatory initiatives in India, Kudumbashree's involvement provides a valuable test of how far participatory opportunities granted by policy makers may be transformative for women within slum upgrade programmes.

Our starting point is that conscious strategies by those in power to insert participatory spaces and mechanisms within governance practices should be subject to critical scrutiny (Cooke and Kothari, 2001). We focus on these 'invited' spaces (Miraftab, 2004)[2] because they help to illuminate the inherent tensions of designing participatory institutions that can address both underlying sources of marginalisation (here, gender-based), and the material and administrative complexities of the context in which governance change is sought (here, housing renewal). We see participatory initiatives as transformative when they contribute to substantive democratization, defined by Stökke as 'a process towards improved popular control of more widely defined public affairs on the basis of political equality' (2014: 263). Charles Tilly's work on durable inequality and citizenship provides two important insights that help analyse this transformative potential of participation within urban governance. First, it highlights the role of socially constructed categories in the reproduction of inequality. For Tilly, durable inequality persists through asymmetric power relationships, such as gender, and the categories they produce. These relationships provide the practices and meanings that justify exploitation, such as the naturalisation of women's roles as 'carers', and the hoarding of resources and opportunities, such as the naturalisation of men's roles as 'leaders' (Tilly, 1998; 2007; see also Williams et al. 2012). Participatory governance can be transformative to the extent that it challenges these identities, and the power asymmetries sustaining them.

Second, Tilly sees democratization as manifest in improvements in citizenship, 'the institutionalized quality of a subject's relation to government and its authority, which in turn exists in inverse proportion to the degree to which a subject's relations to government are mediated by categorical inequalities' (Heller and Evans, 2010). Institutional design for participation matters, because to some degree "associational life is 'artifactual' – that is, an artifact of how the state structures political and civic life" (Heller, 2009: 100). Deliberately crafted spaces for participation can be transformative insofar as they

[1] Throughout this paper, we use 'State' to refer to India's provincial units of government (such as Kerala, a State with around 23 million population), and 'state' to refer to structures of government in the abstract. Kerala's capital was officially renamed *Thiruvananthapuram* in 1991, but we retain here 'Trivandrum', reflecting common usage.
[2] Faranak Miraftab contrasts such invited spaces with 'invented' spaces, the participatory opportunities created through action from below: she associates participation's radical potential primarily with the latter.

provide subordinated groups with new avenues for political engagement and legitimise their treatment as full citizens within these (Cornwall, 2002, 2004; Williams, 2004 and Mohan, 2007). In relation to gendered inequality, this would involve both women's active engagement in these participatory spaces, but also challenges to patriarchal practices within them.

Our two research questions highlight the context-specific challenges of making participatory governance of slum redevelopment contribute towards substantive democratization. Our first question, *under what conditions can participatory ideals be successfully implemented within housing redevelopment programmes*, focuses on how these participatory spaces operate. Here, we pay particular attention to the ways in which women are positioned within them: how is women's participation being ensured, what roles are they given, and what gendered assumptions underpin the construction of these? We do so because debate around India's response to the problem of power inequalities within governance has often focused on seat reservations for women and other marginalised groups within representative bodies (Sharma, 2000; van Dijk, 2007). Whilst this 'place at the table' potentially enhances women's representation, it is *not* the same as a more fundamental rethink of urban policy and governance to address gender inequality: if gender mainstreaming is practiced in slum upgrading anywhere in India, Kudumbashree's involvement suggests that Kerala might be a good place to look for it.

Equally, this question highlights the challenging contexts in which slum upgrade takes place. Entrenched inequality and marginalisation, which are common enough social problems for much participatory development work, are complicated further by the porous and fluid boundaries of many 'slum communities', making the question of who is (or should be) participating particularly delicate. There is also spatial complexity: slum residents have multiple connections to the cities in which they are rooted, and slums are often located on land that is a valuable and/or rapidly appreciating resource, over which current residents frequently have contested and/or fragile claims. Furthermore, the substantive context of slum development is a particularly contentious and atomising topic for participatory planning, as it concerns housing, usually households' most valuable asset, and one within which core financial, livelihood and emotional choices and investments are embedded. Replacing people's homes inevitably creates losers as well as winners over an issue of critical significance to all participants, and it is therefore particularly difficult for participatory mechanisms to deliver consensus-based solutions.

If this first question focuses on practices within participatory spaces themselves, our second question - *under what conditions can participatory slum redevelopment trigger wider shifts towards inclusive urban governance* – adopts a broader perspective, locating the institutional design of these spaces within wider governance contests. From the late 1990s, a particular, and highly instrumental, form of citizen participation emerged in urban India in response to national neoliberal reform and attempts to turn its cities into engines for economic growth (Coelho et al., 2013; Weinstein et al. 2013). Forerunners of these governance changes included the Bangalore Action Task Force (Sami, 2013), and the coalition of actors promoting Vision Mumbai (Weinstein, 2014), both of which built support for city renewal through highly selective forms of 'public' participation. Alongside this, new representative bodies of middle class residents, Resident Welfare Associations, have grown in power in urban affairs (Harriss, 2009). Their support for urban redevelopment, based around aspirational images of a 'global' and sanitised city, has gentrified cities' political space and hardened attitudes towards slum dwellers (Ghertner, 2011).

Mumbai's deliberate bifurcation of new participatory governance mechanisms – the Advanced Locality Management Scheme for formal neighbourhoods, and the Slum Adoption Scheme for informal ones – is causing an equivalent change in the 'geometry of power' in favour of the former (Zérah, 2009).

This genealogy matters for our research, in part because leaders of these earlier experiments in sanitizing Mumbai and Bangalore went on to shape JNNURM nationally (Benjamin, 2008), but also because it indicates that the stakes over defining participatory urban governance are particularly high in contemporary India. JNNURM's reforms sought to transfer of power from States to cities (Sivaramakrishnan, 2011), establishing strong, formal, professionalised urban governance and side-lining the pre-existing patron-client relationships of 'political society' (Chatterjee, 2004). In practice however, they appear to have produced a new set of governance relationships that remain highly informal, but are more 'middle-class' in their values and participants. At the same time, JNNURM has accelerated the financialisation of urban space, creating economic pressure to displace slums from land that has become increasingly valuable real estate (Mahadevia and Narayanan, 2008; Searle, 2015).

JNNURM's attempts to promote participatory elements of slum redevelopment therefore raise profound questions, not only about the physical delivery of 'pro-poor' housing, but also about whether those currently living in slums can engage as citizens in the development of housing solutions. With much existing critical scholarship focusing on the growing power of elites and middle classes in urban governance, we investigate slum redevelopment to see how the associational voice of the poor (Auerbach, 2017) is changing: are JNNURM's participatory opportunities just tokenistic, or potentially something more lasting that can 'scale up'? A highlight on gender here links to wider debates about the realisation of the right to the city. In urban India, constructions of 'proper' female conduct and concerns around women's safety and freedom from sexual molestation often restrict women's movement in public space (Lama-Rewal, 2011; Yon and Nadimpalli, 2017), indicating that opportunities for participation can be curtailed by wider, gendered power inequalities. Equally, aggressive forms of masculinity are central to the operation of informal and patronage-based power (Blom-Hansen, 2005; Price and Ruud, 2010), and so we should expect constructions of gender to complicate any story of the losses and gains made though attempts to formalise governance arrangements. The gender (and class) positions of 'slum women', their ability to speak out, and the institutional conditions under which their voices can be heard are therefore of particular interest here.

To explore these questions, our paper deliberately draws together different sources of data and crosses spatial scales. We first outline the elements of JNNURM delivering slum redevelopment: Basic Services for the Urban Poor (BSUP) and the Rajiv Awas Yojana ('Rajiv [Gandhi] Housing Plan', RAY hereafter). Our sources here are national policy documents, and the handbooks and guidance notes provided for cities engaging with JNNURM, which together allow us to examine central government's intentions for low-income groups' participation within this process.

We then introduce Trivandrum, tracing the Kudumbashree Mission's role in BSUP and RAY, and exploring city-level responses to national policy. Our sources here include Trivandrum's JNNURM City Development Plan (TMC, 2006) and Slum Free City Plan of Action (DMG Consulting, 2014), but more crucially a series of 18 qualitative interviews (conducted 2016-17). These included the former mayors

and high-level administrators who established the governance structures within which JNNURM operated, and those responsible for project implementation within Trivandrum Corporation. These allowed detailed insight into the process of institutional design, where participatory ideals had to contend with the administrative and political complexities of the redevelopment projects.

Finally, we examine the in-situ working of these mechanisms for community participation. Here, we focus on two particular redevelopment initiatives: an inner city 'slum' that was one of Trivandrum's flagship BSUP projects; and a fishing community at the city's southern edge that was a pilot project under RAY's more intensive requirements for community engagement. For our inner city site we drew on extended qualitative research (2013-17) including intensive oral history work, interviews and participant observation of BSUP's implementation. Our engagement with the RAY site has been more recent (2016-17), but again included repeated site visits, informal discussion and a series of 16 qualitative interviews within the community, including those shaping the project and those affected by it. These allowed in-depth understanding of how 'invited spaces' for community participation actually operated, and of local women's engagement with them.

2. Community Participation in Indian Slum Upgrade – Empowering and Gender-Inclusive Policy?

JNNURM offered 65 'mission cities' (including Trivandrum) the opportunity to access considerable central government funding, conditional on City- and State-level governments agreeing to co-fund projects and to undertake a prescribed range of urban governance reforms. With an initial budget of over US$6Bn, Basic Services for the Urban Poor (BSUP), implemented by the national Ministry for Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, both heralded a step-change in ambition for housing the urban poor and intended to ensure that urban poverty alleviation was prominent in this reform agenda. It embodied a broad underlying vision of what slum upgrade should achieve, namely to provide seven core entitlements of "security of tenure, affordable housing, water, sanitation, health, education and social security" (MHUPA, 2009). Although it did not directly fund social services, BSUP projects were required to show convergence with other service providers (MHUPA, 2009; see also Chatterjee, 2013), thus pushing cities to develop integrated responses to slum upgrade going beyond housing provision in isolation. In this initial phase, community participation was primarily addressed as a governance issue: BSUP's reforms required State-level governments to institutionalise participatory city governance by establishing public meetings, Area Sabhas, at a neighbourhood level.[3] Participation featured less strongly in JNNURM's own operational guidelines: citizens were expected contribute to the City Development Plans, which provided an overview of city-level investments in both BSUP and infrastructure, but this was poorly implemented and weakly enforced (Raman, 2013). There were also no specific requirements for community involvement in housing projects themselves.

[3] States were required to pass a Community Participation Bill that established Area Sabhas, equivalent to the Gram Sabhas (village committees) of rural India, in which all local people of voting age could participate. Each neighbourhood (defined as the area served by a single polling booth) would in turn elect representatives to participate in a Ward Committee, chaired by the city's (directly elected) Ward Councillor, thereby linking up local structures of representative and participatory democracy (Coelho et al, 2013: 28).

From 2011, an expanded JNNURM-II gained increased funding, and was extended to all Indian cities (Planning Commission, 2013). At this point, the Rajiv Awas Yojana (RAY) replaced BSUP as the vehicle to deliver low-income housing, and included an enhanced set of conditions designed to 'lock in' pro-poor elements of urban reform. Cities therefore had to ring-fence at least 25% of their own budgets for programmes for the urban poor, reserve a minimum proportion of housing within private developments for low income groups, provide lease rights for long-term slum dwellers, and develop municipal teams for urban poverty alleviation and slum development. They were also required to produce a Slum Free City Plan of Action to address the rehabilitation of existing slums and to boost housing access for the urban poor. These plans required a 'whole slum' perspective throughout, linking consideration of livelihoods, social services and community assets to the delivery of affordable housing. Pro-poor elements to JNNURM[4] were thus stepped up, and community participation was made integral to RAY projects:

Community should be involved at every stage, from planning through implementation and post-project sustenance, necessitating that the designing of slum development is done with people's participation, which will lead to community ownership and sustainability of the scheme.

(MHUPA, 2013a: p.11)

This statement of intent was backed up with a specific set of guidance notes (MHUPA, 2013b) which required cities to orchestrate community participation through their RAY Technical Cells, the administrators responsible for project implementation at city-level. RAY cells were to establish (either themselves, or through the appointment of a lead NGO) structures for participation encompassing community-based organisations in all slums in the city. These community organisations were in turn given a series of active roles: collecting (or at least verifying) the data for the Slum Free City Plan of Action; identifying community needs within specific redevelopment plans; monitoring the construction process; and finally contributing to ongoing operation and maintenance of all assets created in collaboration with the city government.

Approaches to participation within the national framing of JNNURM therefore begin to provide some initial answers to our two central questions. City Development Plans' 'city visioning' exercises, where JNNURM drew most directly on previous experiments such as the Bangalore Action Task Force, have been elite-focused 'chandelier consultations' (Coelho et al, 2013) eclipsing meaningful and inclusive citizen participation. 'The public' here was engaged selectively and instrumentally, providing legitimation for what remained, essentially, technical and top-down planning (Raman, 2013). As we get closer to individual housing projects themselves, however, a more complex picture begins to emerge as JNNURM evolved. Whilst BSUP only insisted on the establishment of Area Sabhas within governance reforms, RAY pushed forwards a vision of 'active citizenship' (Robins et al., 2008) in housing delivery. Its expectations that 'slum communities' engage in collective planning, data collection and project oversight were ambitious, and largely glossed over the tensions inherent in bringing participatory

[4] Alongside these progressive elements, there were other more worrying signs: central government funding per housing unit was significantly reduced between BSUP and RAY, and reforms also included elements which were directly supportive of private sector real estate interests, such as speeding-up development approval.

practices to housing delivery. Those gaining housing were also represented as being responsible for project success through their community organisations' ongoing duties in operation and maintenance, but also through their direct financial input. Beneficiary contributions to construction costs, which increased from 10% under BSUP to 25% under RAY, were explicitly explicitly justified as giving slum dwellers a meaningful stake in their own rehousing (MHUPA, 2013a).

Importantly too, this was a set of participatory roles which were gender-blind, and thus risked heightening (or at least reproducing) existing gender inequalities. Khosla (2009) argues that gender concerns could have been mainstreamed within JNNURM's implementation, making good on the Ministry of Urban Development's commitment to creating 'gender fair' cities. The opportunities here included producing gender-disaggregated data on housing needs and project outcomes, and engaging community-based organisations in slum redevelopment, networked at a city level, to represent the interests of women in city planning. In practice, however, national BSUP and RAY guidelines still implicitly constructed slum dwellers as human resources to be mobilised, and as 'communities' where internal power inequalities, gender-based or otherwise, were ignored. To explore the possibilities and limitations of this policy framing on the design and practice of community participation within slum upgrade, we turn to Kerala.

3. Enacting Slum upgrade in Trivandrum

3.1 Embedding Participatory Slum Projects within Urban Governance

Kerala's response to JNNURM sought to capitalise on its previous history of decentralisation and innovation in participatory governance, and to ensure pro-poor housing projects through good institutional design. Kerala has led other States in implementing India's Constitutional requirement for city-level, elected local governments, and as a result, Trivandrum has a well-established Municipal Corporation. This has directly-elected Ward Councillors, who elect the city Mayor, who in turn nominates Councillors to serve on seven standing committees dealing with different aspects of city administration. Alongside this representative democratic system, Kerala is also famous for its experiments with participatory governance, beginning with the People's Planning Campaign of the mid-1990s (Thomas Isaac and Franke, 2000; Thomas Isaac and Heller, 2003). One legacy of this is its Ward Committees, a range of civil society representatives tasked with discussing local development priorities to inform their municipalities' annual expenditure plans (Plummer and de Cleene, 1999; George, 2006). Additionally, in the late 1990s, Kerala established Kudumbashree, its State Poverty Alleviation Mission, which took a female-centred approach to tackling poverty, summarised in its slogan as 'Reaching out to families through women and reaching out to the community through families'. The upper levels of Kudumbashree, led by a senior Indian Administrative Service officer, provide a dedicated unit to implement national and State-specific poverty alleviation initiatives, where its grassroots involves mass participation. By March 2017, Kudumbashree had enrolled over 4.3 million women across the State into 277,000 neighbourhood groups (http://www.kudumbashree.org: accessed 10/11/2017) that undertake savings, credit and microenterprise activity, and provide a conduit for anti-poverty programmes to reach households directly. The groups also elect representatives of federated bodies: Area Development Societies at the Ward level, and Community Development Societies at the level of the municipal or rural

council.[5] These federated bodies deliberately mirror local administrative boundaries, enabling their elected women leaders to be closely involved in local governance (see Williams et al. 2011).

JNNURM housing projects were placed under the leadership of the State Kudumbashree office to reinforce their pro-poor and participatory intentions. The State office was supported by a city-level BSUP (later RAY) Cell of hand-picked administrators with appropriate technical skills[6] to support housing delivery, an area of activity new to Kudumbashree. In a deliberate attempt to break existing patterns of kick-backs between private-sector developers and engineers, the contractors eligible to undertake the projects were strictly limited to approved NGOs. The Government of Kerala robustly argued that its Ward Committees exceeded JNNURM requirements for community participation (former Secretary, GoK Local Self-Government Department: interview, 16/01/16), but established a Community Development Committee (CDC) for each housing project with membership linked to existing participatory institutions of the Municipality (the Ward Committee) and Kudumbashree (the Ward-level Area Development Society) to ensure community oversight of project implementation. The intentions of the Government of Kerala were clear: Kudumbashree's 'ownership' would place a broadened understanding of poverty alleviation at the centre of housing projects, and the CDCs were to provide a mechanism for beneficiaries' mobilisation and voice in project delivery (Figure 1). Both pre-dated the expanded expectations of community participation present in RAY, and consciously sought to avoid a narrow focus on the physical delivery of housing units.

[Figure 1 to be placed here]

Kerala thus supported and anticipated the participatory ideals developing within JNNURM nationally, but its institutional response to the complexities of slum upgrade also faced three key challenges: the constraints of JNNURM as a programme; the limitations of Kudumbashree's power within city governance; and local struggles over scheme implementation. The first of these centred around the need to comply with the detailed stipulations of a nationally-defined programme, which imposed time pressures for planning and delivery of upgrade projects that foreclosed opportunities for community engagement.[7] Thus, despite all its experience through the People's Planning Campaign, Trivandrum's City Development Plan was criticised by external assessors for its limited community input (ASCI, 2006). Similarly, the selection and planning of individual BSUP housing projects sought 'quick wins': Trivandrum's City Development Plan based its BSUP component around four slum communities whose potential for redevelopment had already been identified, and these were speedily included in a first

[5] Elections were formalised following a by-law of 2008. Because Trivandrum is so large, its Kudumbashree groups are federated into four Community Development Societies, each representing groups from a quarter of the city's 100 wards.

[6] These included two officers with social development backgrounds to ensure community mobilization and engagement with the projects, plus an engineer, planner and manager of the projects' information system, (Interview BSUP/RAY Cell member, 04/06/16), staffing that was considerably expanded under RAY.

[7] A range of respondents – from former Mayors through to members of the BSUP/RAY Cell – articulated this time pressure. The need for housing projects to pass a long and detailed process of scrutiny in New Delhi (see also **Williams et al., 2018**) contributed to this sense of urgency, but there was a wider sense that Trivandrum was in competition with other JNNURM cities for limited national funding, and therefore needed to draw down these resources whilst it could.

tranche of BSUP project sites put forward for national government approval. Throughout BSUP, sites for rehousing continued to be identified centrally by the council, rather than through community consultation, a process which Trivandrum's former Mayor described as being driven by limited land availability.[8]

Second, routing BSUP projects through Kudumbashree, rather than the Government of Kerala's Departments of Urban Affairs or Local Self-Government, was having mixed outcomes. Much of Kudumbashree's previous capacity-building work had focused on smaller municipalities and rural councils, where its established presence within District administration and strong local networks of federated women's groups meant there was support for it as 'a citizen-based body working in collaboration with the municipalities' (former Kudumbashree CEO, interview, 17-01-16).[9] Kudumbashree did not enjoy the same standing within Trivandrum Municipal Corporation, however: the structure of its federated women's groups in the city needed reform; it did not have the same track record of co-delivering anti-poverty programmes with city government; and the Corporation was a much more powerful entity in itself, with its Mayor out-ranking Kudumbashree's CEO in terms of official status. It was therefore somewhat politically isolated:

The District Panchayat [Council] and the Mayor are two power centres inside the same District. So you align with one, which means you're not with the other.

(former Kudumbashree CEO, 17-01-16)

This weaker position meant that Kudumbashree could not 'steer' the Corporation from above, leaving the city-level BSUP Cell as its main route to shape housing projects. This group brought new skill-sets, focus and commitment to project delivery, but also sat apart from the established relationships between administrators and Councillors within the rest of the Municipal Corporation. As a result, they had particular difficulties in working with the Corporation's Engineers, on whom they were dependent for technical sanction of housing projects. To resolve some of these tensions, and keep projects moving forwards, a core committee was established, consisting of the Mayor and the Chairs of the city's standing committees alongside BSUP staff. By meeting regularly, the committee was an effective trouble-shooting mechanism for political and administrative difficulties, and ensured the Corporation's commitment to project implementation. It also left BSUP Cell members in no doubt about the boundaries of their remit, and the need for them to work under the Corporation's oversight:

[8] Intense competition might have been expected among Ward members seeking to direct housing schemes and their resources towards their own areas. National policy banned use of central government funds to purchase land, however, limiting projects to Government or Corporation-owned land, thus stopping any such fights before they started. As the ex-Mayor wryly noted, 'If they are arguing, I will ask them "Do you have land?"' (Interview, 19/01/16).

[9] In parallel, Kudumbashree was also implementing the Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme, BSUP's 'sister' programme for smaller municipalities. She described these municipalities' established relationship with Kudumbashree, along with the technical simplicity of what were smaller-scale housing projects, as allowing genuine, direct community input to design and building processes.

We are not the decision-making body, we only help the Corporation people, we can only give suggestions to the people. We can give our expertise, we can give our comments periodically to the people in the Corporation… [via] the core committee, and finally Corporation council can decide the final decision, the Mayor and other elected members.

BSUP Cell member, interview 06/06/16

Finally, issues of institutional ownership and control at a city level were mirrored locally by struggles over authority and legitimacy in scheme implementation. In earlier slum upgrade programmes, Kerala's Ward members had controlled the selection of housing beneficiaries, a powerful position they were unlikely to cede willingly in the name of widening community participation. Kudumbashree's federated structure of elected women representatives was also not fully operational in Trivandrum at BSUP's inception, with its local leaders often drawing legitimacy through their connections 'upwards' to political parties, rather than 'downwards' through their representation of grassroots members. Local politicians, in turn, had no interest in the Area and Community Development Societies becoming strong, independent representative bodies for women. Furthermore, the Community Development Societies, although theoretically the apex representatives of Kudumbashree groups within the city, were not given a role in BSUP programme delivery. As a result, when grassroots Kudumbashree women were called on by the BSUP Cell to perform important work in project implementation, such as carrying out surveys of residents and drawing up lists of potential beneficiaries, they did so without support or back-up from senior women within their local organisation.

3.2. From Institutional Design to Delivery: A Central Trivandrum Slum

These tensions were all clearly illustrated in a central Trivandrum BSUP project we observed first-hand between 2013 and 2017, one of the city's first projects put forward to national government for approval. Developed by a prominent architectural NGO in the city, its plan involved low-rise apartment blocks, a community hall, and workspaces for microenterprises, all built using environmentally low-impact and economical construction methods. Trivandrum Corporation and Kudumbashree fought hard to ensure these innovative and pro-poor elements were supported by New Delhi, and the scheme ultimately won Trivandrum a national design award. The NGO sought community buy-in to the redevelopment through consultation meetings, but these focused on explaining its own near-finalised plans. These recognised important gendered realities – such as the predominance of home-based working among women – but were essentially designed for, rather than with, the local community.

Implementation began in 2008 and proved problematic, with long delays, high cost over-runs and ongoing contests over housing allocation. In part, these problems stemmed from the fact that community engagement with the project was itself being 'improvised': a Community Development Committee was not initially established, and instead the city leant on an established Ward-level Kudumbashree leader, herself a resident of the slum, to deliver consent for the project's progress. Her legitimacy was challenged by rival political factions within the slum, and by current and former Ward Councillors of the area, who wished to control the process of flat allocation. We were able to observe at first-hand the intense and sometimes violent contestations within the community that resulted (see **Williams et al., 2015**) as residents activated linkages with rival political parties to press claims for flats,

or to stall the project's progress. In response, the Kudumbashree leader organised a march on Trivandrum Corporation's headquarters: backed by a crowd of residents, the core of which were women from the community's Kudumbashree neighbourhood groups, she was able to gain an audience with the Mayor to argue for the project's speedy implementation.

To play this public role, the local Kudumbashree leader used very particular opportunities relating to her personal history of political activism, and to the identities ascribed to this slum and the women who lived there. BSUP Cell members openly described the slum as a place of organised crime, impossible to work in without the support of community members (interviews 31/07/13; 06/06/16). Related to this notoriety, frequent family breakup and movement of residents into and out of the community made its residents difficult to classify for the key task of allocating flats to non-landholding 'households' - official terminology that poorly matched the fluid social conditions of the locality. The women in the area were described as rough and rude, a directness that was necessary for their day-to-day survival in the absence of stable/supportive male partners, and contrasted strongly with social norms of compliant femininity valued in 'polite' Malayalam society, and which have sometimes been reproduced through Kudumbashree itself (see Devika and Thampi, 2007; Devika, 2016).

The Kudumbashree leader thus had the double-edged inheritance of being a 'slum woman' – the licence to speak out bought at the cost of her 'unrespectable' status – and in addition, had standing locally and within the Corporation through her leadership of anti-drugs and anti-alcohol campaigns some 10 years previously. Her position as a Kudumbashree Area Development Society leader had cemented her ability to provide a much-needed bridge between the slum and the Corporation offices for this project, and was central to the gender-sensitive concessions she was able to win through her activism. BSUP flats were being issued in the name of female household members, and when absentee male relatives made speculative claims on these, they were rebuffed by being vociferously and publicly shamed by the leader and her supporters. When we interviewed her in 2013-14, however, she was, approaching burn-out from trying to build community consensus against a backdrop of verbal and sometimes physical threats. Her efforts were also being undermined by former and current male Ward Councillors, who were quick to belittle her as a woman, and therefore lacking 'real' authority. Residents contrasted her vociferous conduct of meetings unfavourably with the quiet control of the slum's former male councillor, conveniently ignoring that his calmness came in turn from his control of local thugs who would enforce his will (see **Williams et al., 2015**).

Official BSUP data (accessed 31/01/17) confirmed that this project's cost- and time-overruns were typical of other in-situ redevelopment sites, some of which had been abandoned altogether due to technical difficulties or irresolvable local conflicts. It therefore usefully illustrates what BSUP was able to deliver on the ground in Trivandrum. A dedicated NGO and BSUP Technical Cell produced good design *on behalf of* poor communities, but this was clearly not a community-led process. Kudumbashree women were actively involved in project implementation, but often in limited and contentious roles, and largely reliant on their own political connections for support, rather than the organisation's own federated structure. The BSUP experience therefore illustrates the difficulties of implementing participatory intentions within the complex and contested area of housing delivery, problems that

continued as the expectations of participation and community ownership were further extended under RAY.

3.3. From BSUP to RAY: enhanced participation?

Trivandrum had one of only a handful of RAY pilot projects that gained national approval before the programme closed to new schemes in 2015, making it an important case in which to explore the high-point of JNNURM's participatory vision. As noted above, RAY expected community participation throughout the redevelopment process, and in response, Trivandrum stepped-up the capacity of its RAY Cell, which at its peak had 22 members. The Cell undertook two sets of activities in parallel: producing a Slum Free City Plan of Action; and implementing the pilot housing project itself, which aimed to rehouse over a thousand households in a fishing community at Trivandrum's southern edge.

National RAY guidelines for producing a Slum Free City Plan of Action required extensive primary data collection, identifying all current slums and categorising them for appropriate courses of intervention. Trivandrum met this challenge through a consultation and research process that RAY Cell members described as substantially improved from that underpinning the BSUP's City Development Plan. After initial scoping research in over 400 potential slum sites, they worked with 170 slum communities, holding public meetings in each with the help of the Ward member to describe RAY's purpose. An intensive 18-month period of engagement with each cluster followed, with RAY Cell members establishing Cluster Development Committees, consisting of one male and one female representative for every 20-30 households, and engaging local Kudumbashree women to undertake a household survey to investigate social conditions in each community. The surveys' results were shared through a series of public meetings, locally verifying beneficiaries for rehousing, and also debating and agreeing upon the form of intervention RAY should make. The survey work was undertaken quickly through the mass-enrolment of Kudumbashree women, but again did not involve the Community Development Societies that were these women's apex representative bodies (interview with CDS Chair, 03/06/16). The consultants producing the draft Slum Free City Plan of Action had used this data to produce a disappointingly narrow technical document (DMG Consulting, 2014). Nevertheless, RAY Cell members were convinced that the mobilisation achieved through this research process would have produced a greater sense of community ownership of future housing projects had they been able to continue beyond the programme's withdrawal in 2015 (RAY Cell focus group discussion, 16/01/16).

RAY Cell members also described community involvement in planning the pilot housing project as qualitatively different from those under BSUP. Fishing communities in Kerala have suffered historically from poverty and low social status (Kurien, 2000), which was true of the project's target population. For the RAY team, however, the community had the advantage of being less transient and more homogenous than the inner-city slum, being a Muslim settlement within which a single mosque was a strong presence. Women within this community faced a different but equally disempowering legacy from those in the inner-city slum: traditionally, they had largely been confined to their homes and had no voice in community affairs. In contrast to Christian fishing communities elsewhere in the city, where women were active in processing and trading the catch, women here also had limited paid employment, although some participated in tailoring work.

To engage members of the community in the project, mobilisation activities preceded formal planning exercises, and involved health camps, youth employment training and a drawing competition run through local Kudumbashree children's forums (*bala sabha*) to envisage their ideal future home. Designs for the harbour-side site followed, proposing land pooling and low-rise apartments to deliver a compact site layout that allowed room for community facilities. These were debated with the community and reworked, with the final design including multi-use public space that could meet the needs of fishermen (net drying and storage), local micro-entrepreneurs (market space) and children (a safe playing area) at different times of the day. Health and education facilities were also to be built, and the plan envisaged a local textile company setting up a workshop in the community to boost female employment. As a result, the project not only embraced RAY's aspirations for a holistic approach to slum upgrading, but won national awards for design and community engagement.

3.4 The RAY Pilot Project: From Participatory Ideals to Compromised Practice

The shortfall between this innovative design and the part-completed site we visited in 2016-7 was dramatic. Land-pooling and re-blocking had failed: as a result, only 80 housing units had been completed, but had taken up a disproportionate area of the site. Flats were under construction at the harbour edge, but the land on which they were being built was subject to ongoing dispute, and hopes of delivering the award-winning public space or community facilities had disappeared. The effects on the community were also profound. Delays meant that some families had already been in temporary accommodation for over a year, with no moving date in sight. Those who had been re-housed were faced with increased beneficiary contributions, large and unexpected bills for service reconnections,[10] non-functional septic tanks, and had even had to construct their own surface water drains. As these problems escalated, those living in the site's remaining informal housing were increasingly reluctant to move.

Explanations for these outcomes could, in part, be found in the complexities of the project itself. Although planned by the trusted architectural NGO engaged in the BSUP project, construction had been handed over to a larger contractor because of the project's scale, and technical difficulties had compromised the original design.[11] The failure of land pooling, and the wider lack of responsiveness to beneficiary needs were, however, also indicative of the limited scope for community participation to shape project outcomes, despite starting conditions that should have been much more conducive to participatory success than those in the city-centre BSUP scheme. The RAY team had strongly supported initial community mobilisation, and established a Community Development Committee at the project's inception which had been given responsibility for a series of ongoing tasks. These included identifying beneficiaries and checking the quality and timely delivery of construction work, and RAY cell members stated that all decisions requiring community input were routed through the CDC. The CDC's female

[10] Beneficiary contributions had increased from INR 40,000 to 55,000, and service reconnection charges of INR 11,000 (approximately US$ 620, 850 and 170 respectively). The latter should have been reimbursed by the Corporation but no households had received full compensation: compounding this, their piped water was non-potable, so they were additionally paying for tanker-delivered water at INR 5/litre (field interviews 3-7/06/16).
[11] Boundary changes placed the community within Trivandrum's city limits, and therefore subject to strict Coastal Zone building regulations that reduced the maximum permitted height of apartment blocks. With the city committed to delivering 1032 housing units, this problem was 'solved' by using land allocated for public space.

convenor was also a strong Kudumbashree activist: a former vice-president of the Ward's Area Development Society, she had narrowly missed out on becoming Ward Councillor in the 2015 Trivandrum Corporation elections, when the Ward's seat was reserved for female candidates.

Participation had begun well, with local Kudumbashree women conducting the survey to determine scheme beneficiaries. The female convenor had ensured that this survey had been undertaken properly, and had a good understanding of the CDC's intended role. In practice, however, its work in monitoring project implementation had been interrupted by the project contractor, who had fenced-off the site, complaining that CDC visits were disturbing construction work. Rather than its intended monthly meetings, the CDC had not met for over a year at the time of our fieldwork, and instead of voicing community interests in the project, it had become subservient to key power-brokers in the area:

I don't know if we have any power. You know, the CDC members elected initially are not members in the CDC now. People keep on changing in the Committee. These are political selections. People who stand with the [ex-]Councillor get slowly made to be part of the CDC. Now it is all their people, so they decide it on their own.

Female CDC Convenor, interview 02/06/16

To understand how the intensive mobilisation work undertaken by RAY cell members had been so short-lived in its effects, we need to look at power relations within the community. The figure of the (former) Ward Councillor had loomed large over this pilot project from the outset. He had been instrumental in bringing the pilot project to the area, organising a background survey which allowed speedy drawing up of the initial project plan, and promising to ensure that it did not suffer the intra-community conflicts that had plagued the inner-city BSUP project. He was also instrumental in 'resolving' the land issues facing the project at planning stage, having secured a verbal agreement from the local Mosque Assembly that they would withdraw their claims over part of the land on which housing was to be built, and installing its leader as the CDC's male convenor. This agreement had fallen apart in practice, and land pooling appears to have been just a 'fix' to gain project approval: the first phase of the project had simply built houses for households already holding land titles on their existing plots (these included some of the Councillor's relatives), sacrificing space for community facilities as a result.

Despite these failures of delivery, the former Councillor controlled adjustments to the beneficiary list, swapping around 100 of the original 1032 names put forward through the Kudumbashree-led survey. RAY Cell members clearly had some unease about this process, noting that 'we could only hope that it has happened democratically and judiciously', whilst at the same time recognising that they had limited power to shape events as he 'had enormous influence over many CDC members' (interview 06/06/16). For his part, the former Councillor claimed that his personal links to a national politician had brought the RAY project to the community. In reality, project selection had been made by at a city-level (RAY Cell Member interview, 07/06/17), but the Councillor's ability to display his day-to-day control over the project alongside these high-level 'connections' was undoubtedly consolidating his power and furthering his own political career.

With the Mosque Assembly and the ex-Councillor backing the project wholeheartedly, it was hard for individuals to voice concerns about implementation to authority figures. Even at the height of the project's community mobilisation phase, RAY Cell project members noted that they would always inform the ex-Councillor of their intended visits (RAY Focus Group, 16/01/16), thereby reinforcing his status within the community as a critical gatekeeper. Within this relatively conservative, single-faith community, speaking out against its male authority figures would inevitably have been difficult, but excluding the Kudumbashree Community Development Society from project implementation made this still harder.[12] This removed an institutional link that could have supported local Kudumbashree women active within the CDC, or provided a parallel female-centred mechanism through which informed individuals, such as the Female CDC convenor, could report project irregularities. As a result, 'consensus' on the RAY project's implementation was being manufactured through local power dynamics. For the RAY Cell, by now reduced to a skeleton staff, this at least enabled the project to continue to move forwards. Any efficiency gains, however, were being bought at the expense of both RAY's participatory ideals, and the project's most needy beneficiaries:

At the initial stage, when a class [i.e. project consultation meeting] was conducted we have been told that we have every right to comment on the houses they were making for us… They said that if we have money and want a specific change or extra fitting, we would be able to add it. But when they started the project, they didn't even listen to our basic demand. One woman met with an accident during the demolition of her house for the project. She was bedridden for six months. She has asked to fix a European style toilet facility for her and she said that she would bear the cost. They didn't allow that. They said that they cannot change the plan now. They were saying that the construction is uniform in nature and they can only stick with it.

Female CDC Convenor, interview 02/06/16

4: Explaining the shortfalls of participatory slum redevelopment

Trivandrum's BSUP and RAY housing projects had the preconditions for participatory 'success'. National policy sought empowered city-level governance and community involvement within housing delivery, aims Kerala supported through pro-active institutional design drawing on its history of participatory governance and Kudumbashree's presence. In practice, however, the city-centre BSUP project was delayed and contentious, and the RAY Pilot Project had widely deviated from its holistic community plan, problems that were echoed in other BSUP sites across the city. A simplistic explanation of these shortcomings would blame local-level political interference: party-political rivalry drove conflict over beneficiary selection in the city-centre slum, and the Ward Councillor's near-monopolistic hold over the fishing community was insulating the RAY project from local-level scrutiny altogether. With the projects offering highly-subsidised housing, incentives for graft and political capture certainly existed, but a more careful analysis needs to understand *why* the participatory spaces envisaged were relatively easily

[12] When asked about participation in the survey, the Community Development Society's Chair expressed her anger and frustration: "I have asked the RAY Cell not to do any survey without our consent and involvement when we had a training programme. But they directly go to the Councillor for the survey. So we have called [RAY Cell member] and asked about it. He talked to us so rudely, so we stopped talking to them." (Interview, 03/06/16).

undermined. Here we raise three important factors: the administrative complexity of housing projects themselves; the shortcomings of Kerala's institutional design; and the differences between Kudumbashree leadership and a fully-developed project of gender mainstreaming. Taken together, these provide important insights into the paper's underlying questions about participatory slum redevelopment and its wider implications for inclusive urban governance.

Starting with administrative complexity, national policy ambitions to make beneficiaries responsible participants in housing projects, and to provide 'downward accountability' to slum communities via NGOs or existing community-based organisations were only a part of the story of BSUP and RAY implementation. All JNNURM projects, including those for low income housing, required coordination of national and State funding, and were locked into complex processes of technical and administrative sanction at city, State and national levels. As noted above, community engagement in project planning faced significant time constraints, and in response Trivandrum had committed the skills and resources of its RAY Cell to project design. Its success in working within these limitations came in winning design awards and one of the first (and ultimately the only) half-dozen RAY pilot projects nationally. However, it was harder to fast-track the ongoing complexities of technical approval, funding release and transfer involved in project delivery, all slow processes that could be completely log-jammed if disaffected residents sought court injunctions to stop construction. As a RAY Cell member noted, the resulting delays, although entirely understandable within an INR 0.8 billion (US$ 12 million) construction project, dissipated momentum built up at the planning stage:

The gap between the preparation of the [project bid documents] and the community participation in it, and the implementation of the projects affects the enthusiasm of the community. They lose interest in it eventually. If that happens, it automatically leads to the draining away of the sense of ownership among the community and it's brought down community participation. I think that is what had happened here… ***I am sure that if we had implemented the project in a timely and effective way, there would have been an effective participation from the people****.*

(RAY Cell member, interview 07/06/16, emphasis added)

This statement reverses the causality envisaged by RAY policy documents, in which community participation *drives* successful scheme delivery, but in doing so it highlights an important underlying truth: that ongoing and tangible progress is essential to the maintenance of community engagement, and yet is almost impossible to engineer in projects of this complexity, involving multiple scales of political and administrative oversight.

Second, the Government of Kerala had sought an institutional design that would mitigate these problems as far as possible, with Kudumbashree's leadership intended to 'lock in' the pro-poor and participatory intentions of BSUP and RAY. This design's Achilles' heel came in the weak connections between the three different elements of Kudumbashree: executives in its District and State offices; technical specialists in the City BSUP/RAY cell; and its federated groups of grassroots women members. Although the Kudumbashree CEO could see the wider transformative potential of community engagement in housing projects, the BSUP/RAY Cell faced pressure from the administrative demands of

housing project implementation noted above. Ideas emanating from the State Mission and transferred to the women's membership via the BSUP/RAY were therefore almost inevitably transformed through the lens of bureaucratic necessity: Kudumbashree women were enrolled as grassroots collectors of data, and mobilisers of the community, largely to provide 'inputs' to schemes beyond their control. Project-based Community Development Committees, with 50% female membership and the Kudumbashree Area Development Society Chair as a designated member, could have challenged this bureaucratisation through active linkages to Kudumbashree's federated women's groups. Kudumbashree's apex representative groups in the city, its Community Development Societies, were, however, completely removed from BSUP/RAY implementation, undermining a potential avenue to support grassroots women's engagement and to independently voice concerns about scheme implementation to Kudumbashree's executive officers. Without these connections, the Community Development Committees were politically isolated, and less able to counterbalance the power of Ward Councillors.

Third, it appears that Kudumbashree was chosen to lead BSUP/RAY implementation because its existing strengths (community mobilisation, mass enrolment of women) matched the *instrumental* needs of housing project delivery, and not to transform gendered power relations. Elements of gender mainstreaming envisaged by Khosla (2009) could have been implemented locally: actions such as collecting gender-disaggregated data on housing needs and delivery could have resulted in setting projects gender-specific targets alongside New Delhi's existing 'gender blind' measures (such as total project cost and number of dwelling units produced). The local Kudumbashree leader in the inner city slum did improvise her own understanding of gender-sensitive beneficiary selection, but any such opportunities were individually hard-won rather than institutionally supported. In the absence of an explicitly articulated gender agenda for the projects publicly backed by Trivandrum Corporation and the Kudumbashree executive, Kudumbashree women were positioned as undertaking community *service* rather than leadership roles, thus reinforcing existing gender identities. This in turn left existing practices of patronage unchallenged, and made it easier for existing local bosses to marginalise knowledgeable, critical women such as the Community Development Committee convenor in the RAY pilot project.

These difficulties illustrate the wider governance challenges inherent in making a participatory transition towards 'cities without slums'. Where slum redevelopment projects do create 'invited spaces' for beneficiary participation, their transformative potential exists in their ability to address underlying sources of marginalisation and provide subordinated groups with new avenues for political engagement in which they are treated as full citizens. Whilst Trivandrum has not fully realised this potential, its experience of institutional design provides insights that transcend its specific context.

In response to our first question, *under what conditions can participatory ideals be implemented successfully within housing redevelopment programmes*, we have to first recognise the constraints under which housing projects operate. The scale of developments, multiplicity of actors involved, and intense competition over housing allocation made these projects complex and highly contentious, with participatory and inclusive ideals always being hemmed-in by time pressures and administrative demands set by national government. What was needed in response was a deeper analysis of how different forms of power work within complex institutional spaces for participation. Recruiting a skilled project cell within city government, using approved NGOs as contractors, and establishing a community-

based body (the CDC) to oversee implementation were all intelligent and pragmatic responses to the challenges of planning pro-poor projects quickly, whilst reducing scope for corruption and recognising the importance of community voice. This institutional design was, however, insufficient in itself to overcome the tougher problem of sustaining community engagement and oversight throughout the process of project implementation. Better design could have helped communities navigate the inevitable bureaucratic delays of complex projects, and resist attempts by existing power-holders to assert their own control over both housing allocation and community participation more widely. In this instance, closer connections between Kudumbashree's executive, technical staff and women's representatives would have strengthened community oversight that was genuinely participatory and remained responsive to gendered housing needs.

Transformative participation must also address the power asymmetries existing within the 'invited spaces' created by this institutional design. Here, an important first step in moving beyond bland policy invocations of 'community ownership' is the recognition of difference. Actually existing leadership in these communities is often highly male-centred, with informal authority backed by violence. 'Slum women' face multiple exclusions, and asserting themselves within these spaces carries significant personal costs and risks. Strong individuals might play on their identity to extract gender-redistributive concessions, as happened within the central Trivandrum slum, but a more lasting challenge to these asymmetries is more likely to come from continued and explicit articulation of values of equal citizenship, and ongoing support of more collective and de-personalised forms of control over housing projects.

In response to our second question, *under what conditions can participatory slum redevelopment trigger wider shifts towards inclusive urban governance*, the broader contextual challenges again need to be recognised. India's increased attention to slum redevelopment is occurring alongside processes of economic and political gentrification, experienced through the liberalisation of real estate markets, and the growing domination of urban political space by middle-class (or elite) values and aspirations. If the associational voice of the urban poor is to be strengthened under these conditions, attention again needs to be paid to both avenues for political engagement and underlying sources of marginalisation. With regard to the former, Trivandrum's JNNRUM experience indicates how difficult it is for the participatory opportunities offered within individual housing projects to be sustained, but also suggests that this is not necessarily the result of existing city- or State-elites conspiring to shut down the participatory spaces envisaged by national policy makers. In contrast, the Government of Kerala consciously sought to link housing projects to the legacy of the People's Planning Campaign, but this political will needed expression within more imaginative institutional design. Building city-level opportunities for connection and exchange between grassroots participants in different housing projects could have strengthened local capacities for democratic oversight of individual instances of redevelopment, and provided a possible route to 'scale up' to city-wide mobilisations for affordable housing, pro-poor urban policy, or community empowerment.

Transition towards inclusive urban governance also requires recognition of underlying power asymmetries in the framing of urban policy. The gender-blindness of the housing interventions proposed nationally in India, combined with the stifling inflexibility of central government approval and

monitoring processes, meant that these were likely to reinforce existing gender inequalities in housing delivery. Installing a women-based organisation as the lead agency for slum redevelopment programmes helped to contain some of the problems of housing delivery in Trivandrum, but did not result in gender mainstreaming as envisaged by Khosla (2009). Mixed results in this particular instance should not hide the fact that policy space *does* exist for cities to debate national housing programmes, and to insert and enact more progressive values within them. If participatory slum redevelopment is to be in any way transformative, it has to go beyond providing a 'place at the table' for representatives of marginalised communities, especially when they are facing the trauma of being re-housed. This in turn requires explicit articulation of an agenda that challenges their bases of exclusion, and coordinated action to support this at a city-level.

Bibliography

Arputham, J and Patel, S (2007) An offer of partnership or a promise of conflict in Dharavi, Mumbai? *Environment and Urbanization* 19(2): 501–508.

ASCI (Administrative Staff College of India), (2006). City Development Plan – Thiruvananthapuram: Appraisal Report. (Submitted to the Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India under JNNURM). Accessed on line at: http://jnnurm.nic.in/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/TMC_AR1.pdf [Access date 04/08/2016]

Auerback, AM (2017) Neighbourhood Associations and the Urban Poor: India's Slum Development Committees. *World Development* 96 119–135

Benjamin, S. (2008) Occupancy urbanism: Radicalizing politics and economy beyond policy and programs. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32(3), 719–729

Blom Hansen, T (2005) Sovereigns beyond the State: On Legality and Authority in Urban India. In Blom Hansen, T and Stepputat, F (eds.) *Sovereign Bodies: Citizens, Migrants and States in the Postcolonial World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP: 169-191.

Chatterjee, P (2004) Are India's cities becoming bourgeois at last? In *The Politics of the Governed: Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World*. New York: Columbia University Press pp. 131–148

Chatterjee, Sudeshna (2013) Analyzing the Impact of JNNURM Funded Slum Redevelopment Projects on Children Across India. Action for Children's Environments/ Bernard van Leer Foundation, May 13, 2013. Accessed online at https://issuu.com/bernardvanleerfoundation/docs/analyzing_the_impact_of_jnnurm_fund (Access Date 16/05/16)

Coelho, K, Kamath, L and Vijaybaskar, M (2013) *Participolis: Consent and Contention in Neoliberal Urban India*. New Delhi: Routledge.

Coelho, K Venkat, T and Chandrika R (2012) The Spatial Reproduction of Urban Poverty Labour and Livelihoods in a Slum Resettlement Colony. *Economic and Political Weekly* 47 (47-48) December 1st: 53-63.

Cooke, B and Kothari, U (2001) *Participation: The New Tyranny?* New York: Zed Books.

Cornwall, A (2002) Locating Citizen Participation. *IDS Bulletin* 33(2): 49-58

Cornwall, A (2004) Spaces for transformation? Reflections on issues of power and difference in participation in development. In Mohan and Hickey (eds.) *Participation: from tyranny to transformation. Exploring new approaches to participation in development*. London: Zed Books. 75-91

Devika, J (2016) The 'Kudumbashree Woman' and the Kerala Model Woman: women and politics in contemporary Kerala. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies* 23(3): 393-414.

Devika, J and Thampi, BV (2007) Between 'empowerment' and 'liberation': the Kudumbashree initiative in Kerala. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies* 14(1): 33-59.

DMG Consulting Pvt. Ltd, (2014) *Slum Free City Plan of Action Trivandrum: Final Report*. Unpublished: for Rajiv Awas Yojana.

Fung, A and Wright, E (2003) *Deepening Democracy: institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance*. London: Verso.

George, S (2006) "Trends in Urbanisation and Urban Governance in Kerala". In P Balan and M Retna Raj (eds.) *Decentralised Governance and Poverty Reduction Lessons from Kerala*. Thrissur, Kerala: Kerala Institute for Local Administration. pp 98-191.

Ghertner, D A (2011) Gentrifying the State, Gentrifying Participation: Elite Governance Programs in Delhi. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research. Volume* 35(3): 504–32.

Harriss, J (2009) Compromised Democracy: observations on popular democratic representation from Urban India. In Törnquist, O Webster, N and Stokke, K (eds.) *Rethinking Popular Representation*. New York: Palgrave: 161-178.

Heller, P (2009) Making Citizens from Below: India's Emerging Local Government. In G. Bland and C.J. Arnson (Eds.) *Democratic Deficits: Addressing Challenges to Sustainability and Consolidation Around the World* (pp.85-103).

Heller, P and Evans, P (2010) Taking Tilly South: Durable Inequalities, Democratic Contestation, and Citizenship in the Southern Metropolis. *Theory and Society*, 39(3-4): 433-50.

Khosla, R (2009) *Addressing Gender Concerns in India's Urban Renewal Mission*. New Delhi: United Nations Development Programme (India).

Kurien, J (2000) The Kerala Model: the central tendency and its 'outlier'. In G Parayil (ed.) K*erala: The Development Experience – reflections on sustainability and replicability* (178-197). London: Zed.

Lama-Rewal, ST (2011) "Women's Right to the City: From Safety to Citizenship." In Marina, F (ed.) *Urban Policies and the Right to the City in India: Rights, Responsibilities and Citizenship*, 31–38. New Delhi: UNESCO.

Mahadevia, D and Narayanan, H (2008) Shanghaing Mumbai: politics of eviction and resistance in slum settlements. In D Mahadevia (ed) *Inside the Transforming Urban Asia: Processes, Polies and Public Actions* (549-89). New Delhi: Concept.

MHUPA [Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India] (2009) *Modified Guidelines for Sub-Mission on Basic Services to the Urban Poor (BSUP)*. Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM). Government of India, New Delhi.

MHUPA [Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India] (2013a) *Rajiv Awas Yojana: Scheme Guidelines 2013-2022*. Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM). Government of India, New Delhi.

MHUPA [Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India] (2013b) *Rajiv Awas Yojana: Guidelines for Community Participation 2013-2022*. Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM). Government of India, New Delhi.

Miraftab, F (2004) Invited and Invented Spaces of Participation: Neoliberal Citizenship and Feminists' Expanded Notion of Politics. *Wagadu: Journal of Transnational Women's and Gender Studies*. http://web.cortland.edu/wagadu/.

Mohan, G (2007) Participatory Development: From Epistemological Reversals to Active Citizenship. *Geography Compass* 1(4): 779-796.

Planning Commission, Government of India (2013) *Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012–2017) Volume II: Economic Sectors*. New Delhi: Sage.

Plummer, J and de Cleene, S. (1999) *Community Learning Information and Communication: Case Study Kerala People's Planning Campaign Trivandrum*. Working Paper 106: GHK Research and Training, London.

Price, P and Ruud, AE (2010) *Power and Influence in India: Bosses, Lords and Captains*. New Delhi: Routledge.

Raman, NV (2013) The Messy Practice of Participation: Lessons from the City Development Plan (CDP) Review in Chennai. In Coelho, K, Kamath, L and Vijaybaskar, M (eds.) *Participolis: Consent and Contention in Neoliberal Urban India*. New Delhi: Routledge. 276-297.

Robins, S, Cornwall, A and von Lieres, B (2008) Rethinking 'citizenship' in the postcolony. *Third World Quarterly*, 29 (6): 1069-1086.

Sami, N (2013) Power to the People? A Study of Bangalore's Urban Task Forces. In Shatkin and Vidyarthi (eds.) *Contesting the Indian City: Global Visions and the Politics of the Local*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell: 121-144.

Searle, L (2015) Conflict and Commensuration: contested market making in India's private real estate development sector. In Shatkin and Vidyarthi (eds.) *Contesting the Indian City: Global Visions and the Politics of the Local*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell. 65-90.

Sharma, K (2000) Power and Representation: Reservation for Women in India, *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 6 (1): 47-87.

Sivaramakrishnan, KC. (2011). *Re-Visioning Indian Cities: The Urban Renewal Mission*. New Delhi: Sage.

Stökke, K (2014) Substantiating urban democracy: the importance of popular representation and transformative democratic politics. In Parnell, S and Oldfield, S (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook on Cities of the Global South*. 257-69.

Thomas Isaac T M, Franke R W (2000) *Local Democracy and Development: The Kerala People's Campaign for Decentralized Planning*. New Delhi, Leftword.

Thomas Isaac T M, Heller P(2003) Democracy and development: decentralised planning in Kerala. In A Fung and E O Wright (eds.) *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. New York: Verso pp 77–110.

Tilly, C (1998) *Durable inequality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tilly, C (2007) Poverty and the politics of exclusion. In: Narayan, D and Petesch, P (eds.) *Moving out of Poverty: Cross Disciplinary Perspectives on Mobility*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 45–76.

TMC [Trivandrum Municipal Corporation] (2006). *City Development Plan*. Unpublished: for JNNURM. Accessed online via: www.jnnurmmis.nic.in/toolkit/ [Access date 04/08/2016]

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), 2018. *Sustainable Development Goal 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities*: http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals/goal-11-sustainable-cities-and-communities.html (Accessed 29/01/18).

van Dijk, T (2007) Reservation in India and Substantive Gender Equality: A Mumbai Case Study *International Journal of Diversity in Organizations, Communities and Nations*, 7(5): 27-42.

Weinstein, L (2014) 'One-Man Handled': Fragmented Power and Political Entrepreneurship in Globalizing Mumbai. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38(1): 14-35.

Weinstein, L, Sami, N and Shatkin, G (2013) Contested Developments: enduring legacies and emergent political actors in contemporary urban India. In Shatkin, G (ed) *Contesting the Indian City: global visions and the politics of the local*. Oxford: Blackwell. 39-64.

Williams, G (2004) Participatory Development: Tyranny, Power and (Re)Politicisation. *Third World Quarterly* 25(3): 557-578.

Whitehead J and More N (2007). Revanchism in Mumbai? Political Economy of Rent Gaps and Urban Restructuring in a Global City. *Economic and Political Weekly* 42(25) June 23rd: 2428-2434.

Williams G, Aandahl G and Devika J 2015. "Making space for women in urban governance? Leadership and claims-making in a Kerala slum" ***Environment and Planning 'A'*** **47(5) 1113-1131.**

Williams G, Omankuttan U, Jagajeevan, Devika, J 2018. "Planning a 'slum free' Trivandrum: housing upgrade and the rescaling of urban governance in India". ***Environment and Planning 'C'*** **DOI: 10.1177/2399654418784305**

Williams G, Thampi B V, Narayana D, Nandigama S, Bhattacharyya D (2011) Performing participatory citizenship: politics and power in Kerala's Kudumbashree Programme. *Journal of Development Studies* 47: 1261–1280.

Williams G, Thampi B V, Narayana D, Nandigama S, Bhattacharyya D (2012) The politics of defining and alleviating poverty: State strategies and their impacts in rural Kerala. *Geoforum* 43: 991–1001.

Yon, Alicia and Nadimpalli, Sri Pallavi (2017) Cities for whom? Re-examining identity, to reclaim the right to the city for women. *Australian Planner* 54(1): 33-40.

Zérah, Marie-Hélène (2009): Participatory Governance in Urban Management and the Shifting Geometry of Power in Mumbai. *Development and Change*, 40(5): 853-77.