

Cities of Delhi – Conference

Session II – Processes & Institutions

26 August 2015

India International Centre, New Delhi

Processes in informal settlements

Processes

- Eviction and Rehabilitation (JJC's)
 - Demolition (Sonia Gandhi Camp)
 - Resettlement/ Relocation (Savda Ghevra)
 - In situ upgradation (Ekta Vihar)
 - In situ redevelopment (Kathputli)
- Regularization (UACs)

Institutions

- DUSIB
 - Previously, Slum & JJ Department
- Land Owning Agencies
 - Union – DDA (Function of Master Planning), Railways, CPWD
 - State – DUSIB, PWD, DJB
 - Local – North, South & East MCDs

Processes in informal settlements

Rehabilitation of JJs

- No successful case
- DUSIB sub-ordinate to LOAs
 - Not the ultimate land owner
- No single, comprehensive policy document detailing process

Regularisation of UACs

- Promised time and again
- Arbitrariness of selection
 - PRCs
 - “Regularised”
- “Eligible for regularisation” = not regularised

EVICTIION AND REHABILITATION - JJC_s



Process for Eviction and Rehabilitation

- Multiple LOAs
 - DUSIB – Nodal agency, limited powers
- Lack of single, clear policy document

Due Procedure for an Eviction by a Delhi Government Agency

1. Requirement of Land on which a JJC is situated
2. Survey of Households in the JJC by DUSIB and LOA
3. Decision on Eligibility for Relocation by DUSIB
4. Release of List of Households Found Eligible for Relocation by DUSIB
5. Distribution of Possession Letters
6. Completion of obligations by LOA
7. Notice for Eviction
8. Service Provisioning

Addressing institutional challenges

- Meaningful participation
 - Consensus on paper, little on the ground
 - Develop capacity to engage with residents – DUSIB, DDA
- DUSIB and LOAs
 - Autonomy and authority
 - Policy awareness among LOAs on their obligations and actions
- Transparency
 - Land requirement for “public purpose”
 - Disclosure of eligibility status
 - Adequate notice period

Regularisation of UACs

- What is regularization?
 - Individual or settlement level process?
- Link between regularized status v. development works
- Land
 - Ownership: Public/ private
 - Change in land use: DDA's responsibility
- Lack of Transparency
 - Selection
 - Timelines

Addressing institutional challenges

- Commitment to completing process
- Benefits of regularisation
 - “Development works” clarified
 - Individual titles to be issued
- Coordination among levels of government
 - DDA
 - GNCTD and its agencies
 - MCDs
- Transparency

Analysis: Rehabilitation and Regularisation

- Reformist measures and processes have reproduced exclusion
 - Eligibility and selection criteria exclusionary
 - Resettlement colonies
 - Location – delinking housing and livelihoods
 - Lack of services until years later despite MPD → ‘planned slums’
 - In-situ approaches – lack of participation
 - Upon regularisation, unauthorised colonies still not integrated

Conclusion

- Systemic coordination failures due to multiple government agencies
- Clear problem of agency objective: DUSIB & DDA
- Legislators not making policy: limited to acting as intermediaries
- Weak feedback loop: few institutionalised opportunities and spaces where citizens can participate