



National Conference

FUTURE OF URBAN SANITATION IN INDIA

Localising Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Secondary Cities

Date: 27-28 February 2020
Venue: Hotel Royal Plaza, New Delhi

Background

Government of India launched Swachh Bharat Mission (SBM) – Urban on 2 October 2014 to accelerate the universal sanitation coverage in Indian cities. One of the objectives of the Mission was 'elimination of open defecation'. This entailed providing access to toilet facilities (construction of sanitary latrines – Individual Household Latrines – IHHL and Community and Public Toilets – CT&PT). It also entailed operation and maintenance of these facilities to maintain their functionality, including effective Faecal Sludge and Septage Management (FSSM) to ensure safe containment, emptying, collection, transportation, treatment, and safe disposal. The Government of India adopted the National Policy on FSSM in February 2017 which provided a clear guideline to the cities for planning, operations and maintenance of faecal sludge and septages. Since then several state governments have also formulated their own FSSM policies and guidelines. Simultaneously, behaviour change initiatives needed to continue through participation of communities and key stakeholders to ensure that these sanitary facilities are used regularly.

Under SBM-U, toilet facilities have been created at a massive scale across the country. Till October, 2019, a total of 60,96,135 IHHLs and 5,61,298 CTs/PTs have been completed. In all over India, a total of 3,992 towns have been declared Open Defecation Free (ODF). In Rajasthan 90.10% (173) cities, in Uttar Pradesh 97.60% (650) cities and in Bihar 82.79% (101) cities have been declared as ODF¹.

Solid Waste Management (SWM) in India gained a major policy and regulatory momentum in 2000 with the enactment of Municipal Solid Waste (Management and Handling) Rules, 2000 by the Ministry of Environment and Forest, Government of India. These rules defined the steps to be adopted by all Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) for SWM. The SBM-U provided a significant impetus to collection, segregation, transportation and processing of SWM. In continuation with SBM's thrust, Solid Waste Management Rules 2016 replaced the Solid Waste (Management and Handling) Rules 2000. In addition, Swachh Survekshan, launched in 2016, underlined SWM as a key component for ranking of cities. Guidelines for community engagement covered aspects of SWM.

Since 2014, a total of 80,100 Municipal Wards (94.77% of all the Municipal Wards) have adopted 100% door to door collection solid waste. Of these, a total of 60,833 Municipal Wards now practice 100% segregation of solid waste. The Government of India has also introduced a Garbage Free City (GFC) star rating system to encourage the cities to strive for improving the SWM services.

In summary, over the last six years the Indian cities with the support from the Central and State Governments on one hand and the community-based organisations, civil society, academic and research institutions, media and other stakeholders on the other hand, have made significant improvement in sanitation services including access to toilets, scientific treatment of solid and liquid waste management, and involving citizens in the operation chain of sanitation services.

This significant positive achievement is not without the share of its challenges. The biggest challenge is the sustainability of the positive gains from this massive programme. The sustainability of the enhanced urban sanitation services will be contingent upon sustained citizen

¹ <http://sbmodf.in> as accessed on 9 December 2019

participation and behaviour changes along with enhanced capacities of ULBs and the capacities of city-level institutional ecosystem in which these ULBs operate. The role of civil society to continue to raise awareness among communities, providing technical assistance to the ULBs, as well as holding the institutions accountable are crucial. Last but not least, the ability of ULBs to leverage and converge resources from various national programmes particularly, Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Renewal (AMRUT), Smart City Mission (SMC), and Jal Shakti Mission.

Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA) has been implementing “Engaged Citizens Responsive City (ECRC)” project in Ajmer, Rajasthan; Jhansi, Uttar Pradesh; and Muzaffarpur, Bihar with the support from the European Union. The objective of the project was to enhance the participation of urban poor in planning, implementation and monitoring of urban sanitation services. Over the last four years, ECRC project has fostered numerous innovative practices to engage citizens with a particular focus on the urban poor in bottom-up participatory planning based on authentic data generated by the communities; it has extended critical support to the ULBs for effective implementation of SBM and AMRUT programmes; and generated valuable knowledge with regard to sustained behaviour changes in the communities.

The Conference

The National Conference on Future of Urban Sanitation was an effort to identify solutions to the challenges of sustainable, inclusive and participatory management of urban sanitation services in the next decade. The specific objectives of the Conference were:

- Showcasing scalable innovative solutions from across the country to address the challenges of inclusive urban sanitation services;
- Creating a learning and knowledge platform by bringing together policy makers, researchers, experts, and practitioners on inclusive urban sanitation services;
- Informing and influencing policies and institutions to enhance the impact of urban sanitation programmes.

A special objective of the National Conference was

- *Developing consensus on a framework, methodology, and mechanism for localising Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Indian cities with a particular focus on SDG 11.*

The National Conference brought together policy makers, researchers and practitioners across governments, ULBs, parastatals, civil society organisations (CSOs), academia, media, corporate social responsibility (CSR) programmes, resource providers and representatives from the communities to gain insights on future of urban sanitation in India which is inclusive, participatory, and sustainable.

Day 1: 27 February 2020

Inaugural Session



Dr Kaustuv Kanti Bandyopadhyay, Director, Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), New Delhi welcomed the delegates and introduced the conference background and objectives.

Lead Anchor, Dr Rajesh Tandon, Founder- President, Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), New Delhi

The national conference was inaugurated by listening to the experience of people involved in programme management and delivery. It was also a great privilege for participatory researchers to be able to engage with SBM, and see how participatory methodologies can be adapted on a large-scale national effort. Through methods like local level sanitation, and urban sanitation agenda, urban sanitation can be made more sustainable. The need of the hour is to strive for sustainable and inclusive sanitation over the next five years, especially while involving different stakeholders at the local level. The GOI has also made an effort over the recent years to propose more adaptive and inclusive urban policies like AMRUT and SBM.



Special Address, Shri Parmeshwar Iyer, Secretary, Department of Drinking Water and Sanitation, Ministry of Jal Shakti, Government of India



There can be many lessons to learn across the urban-rural divide from sanitation (especially SBM). This programme was personally championed by the PM in his first independence speech, as a mundane topic for open defecation and the dignity of women. Over the last five years, people's participation has really been brought to the fore. This programme also focused mostly on behavioural change, although many toilets have also been built. There also needs to be cohesion at all levels of governance, in order for it to succeed. There

were four key lessons to be learned from the first phase of SBM: political leadership and championship of this cause, public financing (government needs to invest more in public sanitation, because there is a more than 400% return on it; more than 1 lakh crores), partnerships (multi stakeholder engagement with CSOs, social media, philanthropic organisations, etc), and people's participation (support and participation of the public in the form of Jan Adolan plays a crucial role). In the new phase of SBM, there are 4 verticals approved by the Union Cabinet—sustaining ODF India, solid waste management (organic waste is used as an alternative fuel, such as Bio CNG), eliminating the use of single use plastic by 2022, liquid waste management (grey water, which is wastewater from kitchens and bathrooms), and faecal sludge management (cleaning septic tanks and decentralizing faecal sludge treatments and plants). One possible solution is to use wastewater for agriculture.

Shri Manahar Zala, Chairperson, National Commission for Safai Karmacharis



It is important to generate awareness about the Labour Act, and to be aware of the dangers to sanitation workers and sewage workers. A number of women also work in this field, and face sexual harassment, difficulty receiving contractual leave and availing maternity leave, inflexible timing, no training, and lack of washrooms and changing rooms. Our organisation has visited many states, to generate awareness about the Labour Act and the Prohibition of Employment as Manual Scavengers Act of

2013, and to perform health check-ups for sanitation workers. It is important to work towards the

future of the most downtrodden sections of society, for the betterment of lower caste sanitation workers.

Inaugural Address

Shri Hardeep Singh Puri, Hon'ble Minister, Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA), Government of India

We normally tend to underestimate the rate and growth of urbanisation in India. By the time we reach the 2030, India will have an urban population close to 600 million people, representing 40% of the population. Our definitions of urban space are still influenced by the post partition rhetoric revolving around agriculture. Between 2004 and 2014, the expenditure incurred in urban infrastructure is 175 thousand crore. Urban investment became highlighted from June 2015, when there was a six-fold increase in



urban expenditure. The urban sector will contribute about 70% of GDP, 75% of total tax revenue, and 70% of the jobs created in India, by 2030. It is essential to prepare for that, and urban development cannot be conceptualised without taking urban sanitation into consideration. The main difference between the previous initiatives and the current initiatives is that the latter is embedded in corporative federalism, that is, these initiatives are a collaborative result between the state and central governments. These policies are succeeding because they are qualitatively designed around citizen participation. Nearly 1400 cities have been certified ODF+, and nearly 500 cities have been certified ODF++. However, even the best drainage system cannot make up for a lack of behavioural change. The success of localising SDGs will be achieved by progress at the lowest tiers of urban governance (unless ULBs have both technical abilities and the means of self-financing, SDG 11 cannot be easily achieved), and participatory citizenship. Additionally, in order to ban the practice of manual scavenging, outlawing the practice cannot work alone. It is important to help sanitation workers by providing protective gear, adding clauses to contracts, upholding strong laws, and aiding in social upliftment. Localising sustainable development in secondary cities is also quite important. In situ slum rehabilitation, beneficiary construction, affordable housing and partnership, and credit links are the four verticals under PMAY. The construction of permanent housing is merely the beginning, since the urban economy will grow further by 2022, and the PCI is quite low, therefore, the state has to provide a benign framework for the conceptualisation and implementation of SDGs. At the heart of urban mission like HRIDAY, AMRUT, PMAY, sanitation is the important issue. The success of these missions in terms of number, behavioural changes, and policy changes also brings up fresh challenges.



Technical Session 1

Accelerated Behaviour Change and Citizen Participation for Sustaining Open Defecation Free (ODF) Indian Cities

The Government of India has come up with a graduated framework and protocol for declaring a City, a Municipal Ward, A Work Circle with either ODF or ODF+ or ODF++ status.

- *A city / ward can be notified/declared as ODF city/ ODF ward if, at any point of the day, not a single person is found defecating in the open.*
- *A city / ward / work circle can be notified/declared as SBM ODF+ city/ SBM ODF+ ward/SBM ODF+ work circle if, at any point of the day, not a single person is found defecating and/ or urinating in the open, and all community and public toilets are functional and well maintained.*
- *A city / ward / work circle can be notified/ declared as SBM ODF++ city/ SBM ODF++ ward/ SBM ODF++ work circle if, at any point of the day, not a single person is found defecating and/ or urinating in the open, all community and public toilets are functional and well maintained, and entire faecal sludge/ septage and sewage is safely managed and treated, with no discharging and/or dumping of untreated faecal sludge/septage and sewage in drains, water bodies or open areas.*

As more than 4000 cities have been certified as ODF, the challenge will be not only to maintain the ODF status but also to strive for graduating from ODF to ODF+ and ODF++ status. Several studies have pointed out that a large number of neighbourhoods in many of these cities and are still vulnerable to open defecation and urination. The ability of these cities to maintain ODF status and gradually moving towards ODF++ can be accelerated with sustained behaviour change and meaningful citizen participation.

The ECRC initiative of PRIA and many other initiatives by civil society organisations, municipalities, state and national governments are valuable sources of knowledge about how to accelerate effective behaviour change and strengthen citizen participation.

This session focussed on the following questions:

- What enables enhanced citizen participation and ownership of sanitation programmes with a special focus on the urban poor?
- What enables accelerated behaviour change among citizens and other stakeholders including the municipalities for inclusive and sustainable sanitation?
 - How to strengthen civil society in the cities to build synergies with municipalities for inclusive and sustainable sanitation?

Chair: Dr. Kamal Kar, Chairman, CLTS Foundation, Kolkata



The public needs to undergo a collective behavioural change for sanitation policies to be effective.

Dr. Anshuman Karol, Senior Programme Manager, Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), New Delhi



- PRIA is working in the field of citizen participation for the last 30 years. It aims to create spaces in urban areas for citizen participation to enable its strengthening.
 - There is a need to have citizen led data generation in order to bridge the gap between the demands of the public and supply by the municipalities.
 - The ECRC Project covered all wards, informal settlements in the cities of Ajmer, Muzaffarpur and Jhansi and created a database from the same.
- The aim of the project was to build capacities up to the last person in the ward and to engage with stakeholders based on a bottom-up approach. The SIC Forum in Ajmer is an example of how it was carried out.

Dr. Renu Khosla, Executive Director, Centre for Urban and Regional Excellence (CURE), New Delhi

- The general public doesn't use community toilets because of issues like erratic water supply, time restrictions, poor accessibility and poor hygiene, and hence they prefer open defecation.
- The mind-sets of the municipalities regarding the general public need an overhaul. The planning and implementation needs to be decentralised up to the local level as the 'one size fits all' policy doesn't work. The decision making process should be democratised by including the local conditions and representatives.



Dr. Rumi Aijaz, Senior Fellow, Observer Research Foundation, New Delhi



To accelerate behaviour change the following should be done:

- To identify a group from within the planned settlements or slums. This group should be given capacity building training to become responsive and responsible.
- Empower the communities and functionaries by creating an environment of dialogue and consultation.
- Strengthening grey areas within the existing system by resolving issues of grievance redressal and two-way communication with the authorities.

Questions and Answers

a. How can local bodies be made more accountable?

Renu Khosla: The concept of accountability for local bodies is a challenging task because the elected representatives have a one-sided approach to the issue of sanitation. The local public is not consulted with regards to procurement and execution; instead they are only seen as receivers of a 'one-size-fits-all' approach.

b. Is there a legal framework available for the local public to raise questions?

- c. How to enable individual level behavioural change that is affected by the notions of caste-based purity and pollution?

Renu Khosla: The notion of purity and pollution is a more rural phenomenon. In the urban areas, more than purity and pollution it is the bad condition of the toilets that prevents their usage and needs to be addressed immediately.

- d. Are there any awareness/ training available for the Youth to become cleanliness champions? Since the youth plays the role of a bridge between the old and new.



Technical Session 2

Developing Local Capacities for Inclusive and Sustainable Sanitation Services

Addressing the massive sanitation challenges in India requires substantive focus on developing appropriate capacities at the local level. Capacities need to be developed at the individual, institutional and societal level for building systems as well as perspectives, knowledge, awareness, and skills. Considerable efforts have been made by the national and sub-national governmental and non-governmental institutions to develop technical capacities of ULBs in the areas of toilet (household, community and public) constructions, faecal sludge and septage management, and solid waste management.

A robust capacity development programme needs to be built upon the existing capacities at the local level in order to sustain and utilise the new capacities and assess the outcomes. Despite many well-intended efforts two main challenges need to be addressed systematically. Much of the capacity building efforts have been supply driven and these targeted the techno-bureaucrats in the ULBs. These supply driven efforts fell short of developing local capacity building eco-system involving the expertise available in academia, civil society, and other private organisations. Moreover, a substantive capacity gap has been left almost unattended is that of the elected councillors. There have been numerous instances where elected councillors – the main decision makers in the local democratic governance structure – have not received any serious orientation or training.

The ECRC initiative of PRIA has adopted an innovative and multi-stakeholder approach to capacity building at the local level. It created learning opportunities for elected councillors, municipal staff, sanitation workers, urban poor communities, academic institutions, other professional associations such as traders and market associations, lawyers associations, doctors

association, etc. This novel approach fostered local capacities through hands-on approach resulting in enhanced participation and ownership at the neighbourhood and city levels.

This session focussed on the following questions:

- How to develop, nurture, and strengthen local capacities for sustainable and inclusive sanitation services? How to involve and utilise the expertise of local academic institutions, civil society groups and relevant private organisations?
- Who all needs capacity development support and what kind of capacities?
- What are the most appropriate and effective capacity building methods for various target groups? How to measure the outcomes of capacity development initiatives?



Chair: Ms. Meenakshi Dewan, CEO, India Sanitation Coalition, New Delhi

Ms. Anju Dwivedi, Senior Researcher, Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi



Ms. Anju discussed about the experiences of project Nirmal implemented in two smaller cities of Odisha. Under the project, Centre for Policy Research (CPR) and Practical Action helped the ULBs in city sanitation planning. Considering the important role of the state Government, it was engaged from the beginning of the project. Lack of staff and lack of understanding of complete sanitation value chain among elected representatives are some of the issues being faced by the local bodies of these cities. It was observed that budgeting is not a thought-through process and ULBs were facing challenges in raising resources. Corporate Social Responsibilities (CSRs) are evolving but ULBs are not able to tap it effectively due to lack of capacities. Contracting and Contract management is another area of concern related to Faecal Sludge and Septage Treatment Plants (FSTP) at Angul and Dhenkanal. It is said that 'Seeing is believing'. CPR helped the Government officials to get exposure to international and national experiences. Communities in cities are key stakeholders in the sanitation. Ward committees have potential to emerge as local champions. Similarly, it is very important to engage with the women councillors. At each level, there are

capacities that need to be enhanced through different methods. Equal weightage should be given to all stakeholders from capacity augmentation perspective.

Shri Murali Ramisetty, Regional Convenor, South Asia, Freshwater Action Network South Asia (FANSA), Hyderabad

Mr. Murli mentioned about the initiative– ‘Saaf Hyderabad Shandaar Hyderabad’ by The Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation (GHMC). He further elaborated upon essentials for capacity building of municipalities:



- How to initiate the capacity building at the municipalities. The minutes of meetings of municipalities show that there is hardly any focus on capacity building.
- Without addressing the gaps in infrastructure and human resources, it is difficult to see the results. There is a need to focus on ULBs as organisations.
- Impacts of trainings are generally not even discussed.
- The findings of the accountability systems like audits etc. should be linked as inputs to the capacity building initiatives. Other stakeholders should demand for accountability.

He further discussed about important areas for capacity building:

- The plans should have a component (sub-plan) on equity or inclusion. It is often seen that there is no focus on equity and inclusion in budgets
- For engaging citizens, institutional processes are required. Follow ups are important to build the trust
- For augmenting services to the poor, it is important to find out who are the people who are excluded from the sanitation services. What kind of interventions is required to reach to the marginalised people? How will the monitoring of these programmes take place?
- The ULBs should take leadership in institutionalizing processes. The attention should be paid on how to manage multi stake holder partnerships with mutual accountability
- Capacity building around technical aspects is also needed for ULB's staff. Pit Toilets are usually made in wrong areas where people eventually are not able to use them
- Capacity building of may stakeholders in sanitation e.g. RWA, slum federations, CBOs, youth, right activists is required
- The capacity building process should be a collaborative and co- creation process. Classroom training has given limited results. Use of participatory methods should be promoted
- The capacity building should not only focus on technical skills but both technical and adoptive capacities should be built. Peer learning and peer support have worked well contextual to the capacity building

Mr. Depinder S. Kapur, Team Lead & Senior Domain Expert, Sanitation, National Institute of Urban Affairs (NIUA), New Delhi



Mr. Kapur started his presentation by recalling old days in development sector, when capacity building was not much prevailing in the discourse and on- job learning was in practice predominantly. He explained that capacity building is different at different levels. It is different for a network, for a programme and for a project. He gave the overview of initiative of Sanitation Capacity Building Platform (SCBP) at National Institute of Urban affairs (NIUA) and elaborated upon its genesis, timelines, the present initiatives and the next generation of capacity building work. SCBP is a platform for

capacity building, which covers capacity building at national level, technical support to state Government and Urban Local Bodies, policy framework & research, stakeholders engagement, institutional capacity strengthening and private sector. The Platform started with platform building and advocacy in 2016 gradually started scaling up from 2017. Till 2020- 22, the platform is envisaged to emerge as a Centre for Urban Sanitation at NIUA. Under SCBP, 15 training modules, 12 research studies and 10 technical reports have been developed. Over 2000 Government officials (ULB/ state) have been trained on FSSM, partnership with over 10 NFSSMA partners has been forged. Providing technical support, advocacy, and contributing to the international Platforms are some of the key outputs of the SCBP initiative.

Questions and Answers

- Pit latrines are causing contamination of ground water at places where the ground water levels are higher. Many ULBs are not aware about this. The design of twin- pit is sometimes not being adhered to. There are a lot of capacity gaps
- What after the training? We need to build the capacity at the upper level. It should be in system. Training of the decision makers should take place
- Around 60% STPs are not functional. How are we addressing them?
- The entire training and capacity building work in India is supply-driven. There is a need to look into the Human Resource Development (HRD) systems of ULBs in India
- Can we call 'capacity building' as 'approach building'? If the approach changes, then the civil society and the government will be on the same page



- We should look at ULBs as learning organisations. Learning is necessary to change the behaviour of ULBs

Technical Session 3

Healthy Workplace for Sanitation Workers (with a special focus on women sanitation workers)

The sanitation workers in a municipality are probably the most important human resources for providing sustainable and inclusive sanitation services to the citizens. The occupation of sanitation work is intrinsically integrated with caste in India. This link earmarks sanitation as the sole concern of just one caste – the Scheduled Castes, and among them Valmikis. An even wider gap of injustice appears on disaggregating the Valmiki community by gender. Women sanitation workers (specifically lower caste women) in a country in which patriarchy still thrives, live and work under the double burden of labour.

A plethora of national level laws, policies, and programmes have been implemented through the years to protect sanitation workers of the Scheduled Caste community. Some of the most significant acts are The Protection of Civil Rights Act, 1955, The Employment of Manual Scavengers and Construction of Dry Latrines (Prohibition) (EMSCDLP) Act, 1993, and Prohibition of Employment as Manual Scavengers and their Employment (PEMSR) Act, 2013 by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment. Schemes and programmes offered by multiple public commissions and corporations such as the National Commission for Safai Karmacharis (NCSK), National Safai Karamchari Financial Development Corporation (NSKFDC) and Swachh Bharat Mission (SBM) address the socio-economic and working rights of sanitation workers. Despite these numerous developmental and legal interventions, there continues to exist multi-layered systemic gaps, which keep the communities of sanitation workers in socio-economic marginalisation and deprivation.

A participatory research with the women sanitation by PRIA under ECRC initiative found a strong association between caste, lack of education, and lack of professional agency for women sanitation workers across cities. Often hired as contractual and outsourced workers, they suffer further vulnerability due to lower compensation with no benefits whatsoever. Employers showed lack of any accountability towards their physical and mental health. Awareness among the women sanitation workers about laws, policies or schemes that are meant to protect them and their rights is very low.



This session focussed on the following questions:

- What kind of interventions and accountability mechanisms should be in place to translate the laws, policies and schemes for safeguarding sanitation workers?

- What are the most effective ways to enhance awareness of sanitation workers about laws, policies, schemes and institutions responsible for their welfare?
- What additional interventions are required to address the special needs of women sanitation workers?

Chair: Dr. Indira Khurana, Director, Research and Innovation, Safai Karamchari Andolan, New Delhi

Ms. Shashi Shikha, Senior Programme Officer, Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), New Delhi

Shashi spoke about how the key focus on Sanitation workers and the will to make their working conditions better seems to have been missed out not only in terms of the political leadership but also public financing in the schemes and policies. She emphasised that in the centre of all initiatives resides the people, thus there is a need to realise that this main link of people is missing in all the policies present. Furthermore, she highlighted the need to acknowledge that there are various



other kinds of sanitation workers other than the manual scavengers for example, septic tank cleaners, sweepers, drain cleaners, solid waste management.

Under ECRC, the main focus of the study was on women sanitation workers. It was seen that most of the sanitation workers were contractual workers. These workers did not have many facilities such as paid leaves etc. Within them, women are far more vulnerable with the absence of like a maternity leave either. This is something that is common knowledge among the people. Shashi touched upon certain occupational health hazards; both mental as well as physical. The physical ones are due to the lack of the protective gears, first aid kits, medical insurance while the mental health includes depression and the humiliation faced by the workers due to the lack of dignity held by others for their work. A special focus was also on the lack of menstrual products for the women workers.

Shashi then discussed the indirect policies present for the sanitation workers. With the specific caste of the sanitation workers, there are certain indirect policies which are applicable for them. It was seen that the women had no awareness about these policies. Almost 70% of them are illiterate. The ULBs have not put in any effort to make them aware of the schemes present. Another prevalent theme is the touch-based discrimination faced by the sanitation workers. There is also a certain belief that it is an unskilled labour. This is a wrong thought since there is a certain kind of expertise that is not recognised and needs to be acknowledged.

Shashi further spoke about the streets being the workplace of the sanitation workers. There was an absence of internal committee to address sexual harassment faced by them, a lack of maternal leave, of public toilets, of drinking water and further the lack of recognition of the multiple burden of work that fall upon their shoulders.

Discussing the findings of the study, she elaborated on the recommendations that have been put forth by the team. These include: identification of all categories of sanitation workers at the city and county level, making the workplace gender sensitive, design enabling contracts and provide them with a copy of a written contract, implementation of an adult literacy programme for the workers, etc.

Shashi further shared an interesting work undertaken under this study: the diversity assessment of the three municipalities. It showcased the skewed balance of gender in the three cities. It was also seen that interestingly no women in the supervisors role or upper designation. This needs to be changed.

While it is often thought that education is one of the means of breaking the class-caste barrier, this may not be true as deep intersection of class-caste and gender is prevalent. She shared how the children of the sanitation workers who are educated still fall back to the sanitation work only. The only difference remains that they do so through the private players.

Shashi points out that there are many different schemes and policies which present but there is a need to build a convergence between them and make the workers aware about this for there to be a success. Further, there is a need to recognise the multiple burdens of work in the women workers, there is a need to talk and write about it.

Shri Bejwada Wilson, National Convenor, Safai Karmachari Andolan, New Delhi

According to him, Scavenging is a caste-based occupation which causes exploitation and caste discrimination is the biggest reason for the practice being widely prevalent. He said that our prime demand should be that all the sanitation workers should come under the purview of the Labour Law. Once they become the permanent employees of the Urban Local Bodies, then all the other demands of the sanitation workers like- minimum wages, better working condition, medical aid etc. will be covered.



Mr. Wilson shared that according to the Supreme Court Judgement, the sanitation work cannot be given on contractual basis. However, this is very much prevalent today. We should work towards ensuring that the sanitation workers get permanent jobs. If the professors in universities,

the members of parliament or the members of the state legislative assembly cannot be hired on a contractual basis, then the sanitation workers should also not be hired on contractual basis at all.

Talking about the National Level Sanitation programs like SBM, he said that even after the completion of six years of Swachh Bharat Mission, dry latrines continue to exist in our country. Dry Latrines should either be demolished or converted, but neither is happening at present. Speaking against manual scavenging, Mr. Wilson said that carrying and cleaning human excreta is a curse on humanity in India.

He asserted that, “we allow this exploitation systematically. We have to stop this”. Since they don’t come under the Labour Law, we have no data of the sanitation workers dying on the streets. He concluded by saying that sanitation is linked to caste in India. Also, most of the sanitation workers are women. Without addressing the issue of caste and patriarchy, we cannot bring a transformative change.

Questions and Answers

It was pointed out by Mr. Wilson that the main demand of the sanitation workers was not that of a pay hike, rather it was that of timely payment of their salaries. He stated that without their salaries, they were required to rely on loans from money lenders to fulfil their daily needs, which further pushed them to the problem of indebtedness as the interests on the loans were high.

While the main perception that lies with people is that manual scavenging should be abolished, an anecdote was shared by a participant wherein he stated that in some places, the women sanitation workers stated that the officials should not “kill their jobs” as it was the only source of livelihood for them. The reality remains that without the work as a sanitation worker, the women remained helpless as there lay no other occupations for them to turn to. This anecdote reflected upon the caste problem prevalent in the society and the need to change our mindset.



Technical Session 4

Convergence of Public Programmes for Sustainable Water and Sanitation Services

The Government of India since 2014 has launched a host of mission oriented new urban programmes. These include Swachh Bharat Mission (Urban), Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Renewal (AMRUT), Smart Cities Mission (SCM), Heritage City Development and Augmentation Yojana (HRIDAY), Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (Housing for All-Urban), Deen Dayal Antodaya Yojana – National Urban Livelihood Mission (DAY-NULM), National Skill Mission, Jal Shakti Abhiyan, National Mission for Clean Ganga, among others. A closer look indicate that Water and Sanitation is a common thread in all of these programmes.

In the recent past, some efforts have been made to converge resources and capacities among various programmes. For example, a guideline is in place to seek convergence between SBM and DAY-NULM and National Skill Mission for providing skill development support to the sanitation workers. Another example includes where most Smart City proposals have included city-wide solutions to waste management. A number of cities have also used AMRUT resources for waste water management. These convergences are much desirable and require a systemic approach and empowerment of municipalities. The municipalities with appropriate capacities and holistic perspective should be able to leverage resources from various public programmes. A greater devolution of decision making authorities to elected councils of municipalities will enable them to become more transparent, accountable and participatory.

The session focussed on the following questions:

- What kind of framework, planning and governance should in place at the city level for better convergence of various public programmes?
- What conditions must be developed and nurtured in the municipalities for better convergence among various public programmes? How to ensure accountability of municipalities towards the citizens?
- How to enhance the capacities of municipalities for better local decision making? What roles the national and state governments play for effective convergence?

Chair: Mr. Nabaroon Bhattacharya, Urban Expert

A number of smart city programmes deal with urban improvement; however, when we talk about making cities liveable, the foremost thing to come to mind is urban environment, including the availability of water and sanitation.



Mr. V K Madhavan, Country Head, WaterAid India



The challenges facing us include significant inequity in urban areas. There are at least 42% of notified slums, and 62% of slum dwellers live in non-notified slums. We have a significant population that is denied access to services because of their location of residence. Another myth is that basic services must not be high cost, because the price difference of these services is much higher when offered by private suppliers. Connectivity to city supply determines the cost that people pay for their services, such as water. A large

number of people pay a significant chunk of their income for access to water. There is also overdependence on ground water. 50% of domestic water requirements are roughly met by ground water, even though there is no technical support available to regulate this supply. The market for bottled water in India from 2002-2017 was 9000 crores, which implies a significant trust deficit, where we do not believe that the state can provide us with clean and reliable water. Most wastewater is also not treated before being released into existing water bodies, which in turn pollutes someone else's water supplies. Furthermore, only a third of the population in urban India has access to sewer networks. The rest of the population does not have any place to dispose of their faecal matter in an appropriate manner. One of the specific things that need attention is that, do we need smart cities, or do we need basic cities? The idea of a smart city necessarily invokes the use of technology, and this means that other basic services get left behind. For instance, investment in metros ignores bus services. By and large, the bureaucracy and ERs run cities and are not accountable to the populace. There is no capacity building, accountability, service standards, and transparency. It is important to possibly look at a different institutional structure, by looking at utilities in every town, by seeking transparency in utilities, and by building capacity.

Dr Suresh Kumar Rohilla, Senior Director, Water Programme & Academic Director, School of Water and Waste at Centre for Science and Environment, New Delhi

There are no cities with constant water supply, and sewage treatment poses a challenge as well. It is also a challenge to enforce safety measures, including septic tanks. It is important to have due consultation processes in designing policy programmes for better convergence of urban services. In the case of rapid missions, there are mostly programmes relating to build, form, and network of services. It is also important to consider pollution and the environment while designing infrastructure. The role of



communities in cities has been reduced greatly since the independence, despite the fact that ground water is a locally available, community owned resource. The network and designing of service provision is the same for big and small cities, despite their needs and resourcing being completely different. The planning and design aspect of water has not been decentralised; these designs are made by the state government, rather than the ULBs. There are centralised systems even in small and medium cities. Municipalities lack the capacity to regulate and plan such services, and more capacity building is needed for convergence in water and sanitation schemes.

Professor Kajri Mishra, Dean, Xavier School of Human Settlements, Bhubaneswar



Most urban services are handled majorly by one or two departments. They rely on external, short term consultants, who are responsible for troubleshooting problems and providing services. There is no capacity building, or building a knowledge base within the organisation. There are absolutely no capacities in the smaller cities; the state government usually controls programmes from the state capital, with very little contact or contextual understanding from the ULBs. There are many SHGs in the composting and waste management effort; however, there is no

growth to the capacity in smaller cities. This makes solid waste management difficult. There is little inter-departmental liaison. Programmes themselves are very limited, and do not con

Day 2: 28 February 2020

Special Session

Localising Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Secondary Cities

The adoption of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and New Urban Agenda (NUA) usher a new opportunity for making cities sustainable, resilient, and inclusive through appropriate planning and governance. Localisation refers to the process of adapting, implementing, and monitoring the SDGs at the local level. Nearly all the SDGs have targets that will depend on local government action, including SDG 11. Localisation is the process by which local authorities and local stakeholders will adapt and implement these targets within cities and human settlements.

SDG 11 - Making cities sustainable means creating career and business opportunities, safe and affordable housing, and building resilient societies and economies. It involves investment in public transport, creating green public spaces, and improving urban planning and management in participatory and inclusive ways.

The National Urban Policy Framework (NUPF) adopted by the Government of India in 2018 synergises with SDGs and NUA and provides a comprehensive framework for improved planning and governance for the cities. It upholds the principle of Cooperative Federalism by offering significant role for the state government and devolution of authorities to cities for better local governance. As SDGs, NUA and NUPF provide premium on participation and engagement of stakeholders, it is imperative for citizen associations and civil society organisations to extend critical support and contribute to the development of State Urban Policy Frameworks and localising SDGs.

This session focussed on the following questions:

- What are the practical ways for engaging various stakeholders at the state and city levels for defining the framework for State Urban Policy Framework and Localising SDGs?
- How the cities and states contribute to the Voluntary National Review mechanism in a more transparent and accountable manner? What new capacities are required?
- What kind of city-wide as well as neighbourhood (Municipal Ward) level planning and governance best contribute to fostering participation, transparency and accountability?

Chair and Moderator: Dr RajeshTandon, Founder-President, Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), New Delhi

The theme of the day is localising SDGs in the context of Indian cities. There are a number of issues that have bearing on localising, which will be discussed today. Sanitation must be a priority, if economic growth matters and inclusive urbanisation is not possible if sustainable sanitation is not taken into consideration. This implies that investment in sanitation needs to be seen as an economic priority. 8-10% of total economic output per city is the economic contribution of informal settlements. The NUPF emphasised unified leadership of the city, as well as the need for

strengthening decentralised local decision making capacity. Therefore, while people's participation is important, commensurate mechanisms in urban spaces do not exist. There is very little mechanism in urban spaces for people's comprehensive participation in, and engagement with political matters. Increasingly, sanitation work is often contracted and outsourced (refer to women sanitation workers' experience), and it is unlikely that we will find a skilled and committed workforce, unless sanitation is treated with dignity.



Sustainable behavioural change requires the use of participatory research, and also entails acknowledgement of people's knowledge and their perspective, and respecting them before asking them to change. There is a tendency in policy frameworks to not have respect for people's perspective. Most of the government schemes focus on a top down approach which has a dismissive nature. Additionally, rapid urbanisation in the country is no longer restricted to million plus cities, and therefore, the phrase 'secondary city' seems to imply that metropolitan cities are the primary concern, even though urbanisation is a common phenomenon everywhere. Thus, calling them "secondary" implies that we will continue to pay attention to a primary class of cities.

There is a need for catalysing and supporting local action, because investment in small and medium towns remains unutilised over the past 5 years, because the ULBs do not have the capacity to utilize those funds, and invest in local planning.

Mr Raimund Magis, Deputy Head, European Union, Delegation to India and Bhutan, New Delhi



The EU is deeply concerned with urbanisation and sustainability, especially as regards EU-India relations. Urbanisation has been somewhat neglected in the past decades, and has recently come to notice. Therefore, the EU-India partnership is driven by the same values, and interest in the same issues. Some of the urban initiatives undertaken in India are sanitation, smart city cleaning, transportation, etc. The EU-India relationship is characterised by partnership and corporation.

The partnership of the EU and India on the theme of urbanisation has been one which is driven by interests of both the parties. For India, the partnership is to reinforce the efforts of drives, programmes, etc they are taking up and for the EU, there is a need to succeed in India to meet the global targets as in India is a place where the global future is exists. Sustainable solutions require working with all stakeholders, and include answering social as well as technical problems.

Prof. O. P. Mathur, Senior Fellow, Institute of Social Sciences



Dr. Mathur spoke on SDG 11, mainly, because it is a very complex mission. Over the past 3 years, if we look at what has happened globally and in India—the MoSP has developed a framework of 60 indicators indicating where progress is headed with respect to SDG 11. The main four indicators for this are—the number of houses constructed under PMAY, proportionate to the people who need housing, urban population, waste collection, and waste collection. If we juxtapose the main missions that have

taken place with the ministry targets and indicators, there is a strong disconnect. This can be revealed by looking at the structure by which these missions have been carried out. One important way of taking these missions forward is by looking at the guidelines of these missions, but a far more credible approach would be to look at the activities being proposed by the states under the mission documents, and what the ministry's response is to these proposals. Another important thing is examining what is happening on the ground. There are at 300-400 activities that have taken place under these 6 missions. If we focus on the states of India using Prof Mathur's indicators, we can see gaps, progress, and blockages in the implementation of SDG 11. The

conclusion to be drawn from Prof Mathur's study is that there is a sustainability gap, and the rate of growth in the implementation of these activities and investment needs to be increased, in order to achieve and implement SDG 11. The budget that has been allotted in 6 missions has also decreased as compared to 2017. The budget has focused on two relevant topics for sustainability—water and sanitation. Roughly, the budget only spends a rupee a day on SDG 11, if we incorporate the expenditure on water and sanitation. There is currently an overload of provisions and programmes. For instance, the ULBs have not been fully granted independence and responsibility. More capacity is needed for localising and carrying out the implementation of SDG 11. NITI Aayog is working on a vision document, for 2035 and going forward to 2047. There are 27 captures in this document, one of them being about urbanisation. Urbanisation arose from a limited perspective, but there seems to be a growing understanding of looking at the system of cities and the role they have to perform in contributing to economic growth. Our cities should be productive, resilient, sustainable, inclusive, and liveable, as per NITI Aayog. There are many stakeholders at the local level, and the governance at the local level is not concentrated, and there is no understanding on how we can bring them together.

Prof. Amitabh Kundu, Distinguished Fellow, Research and Information System for Developing Countries (RIS)



An overly statistical approach does not include experiential and reported data on the ground. Only 82% of people who have toilet facilities are actually using them, as per official data (this contradicts the official position that India is ODF free). Even in the ODF villages, 6-7% of the villages have slipped out of that category. While the country may not have reached its ODF target, the improvement from a 39% to a 60-70% is a commendable achievement. Focusing on the issue of urban sanitation, and taking into account the

lack of progress in urban sanitation, the concern of the informal settlements (especially in middle tier cities, which are increasing in number and size rapidly), is very poorly addressed (in the context of SDG 11, which calls for inclusive development). In India, only one-third of urban households are connected to a sewerage system, while others use pit latrines and septic tanks. The smartest solutions here are not necessarily going to be found in the frontiers of technology, and can also be found in the institutions of governance, community mobilisation, and support systems. Global standards are not sufficient in the developing world, and need to include local knowledge and reporting. There is often a lack of coverage of urban services, with respect to urban slums.

Upscaling of solutions is difficult. It needs to be recognised that scaling up of the principles is important but what we see in the present day is the scaling up of projects. This is the mistake that

we are making. There is a need to treat each site as different rather than imposing the same mechanism in each place. This requires an in-depth knowledge of the local contexts, and solutions must be specific to the contexts within which they are enacted (high level of specificity).

Ms. Shikha Srivastava, Head, Urban Habitat and Migration, Tata Trusts

Ms Shikha spoke how the work in the urban space is fairly new for TATA Trust. Tata Trust's work has consciously been in smaller towns, because a lot of emerging problems related to urbanisation is happening in smaller towns in the country. Their learning has been that in engaging with ULBs and primary urban stakeholders, it is important to remember that the priorities are more short-term (procurement, clean ups, visits, and events). The best way to work with them is to plan work around their priorities,



rather than discussing SDGs. For instance, there can be resistance to working on solid waste management, when the ULBs are focused on the Swachh Sarvekshan. Therefore, the entry point was to encourage the ULBs to set and carry out the process of cleanliness, and to institutionalize it. These ULBs also lack capacity and resources, and can often be understaffed. It is important to work around these gaps, and at the same time work to strengthen these gaps. It is important to not superimpose solutions from bigger cities in smaller towns, because the communities and ULBs are more likely to come up with better solutions. For instance, when it comes to SDGs, it is important to raise awareness, which includes empowering people to participate in the development process. There is a need to treat the local community as equals and demystify the process of achieving these goals for them. There is a need to reach out to the communities who are most affected with the plans and help them understand them- it is only then that they will be able to supplement it. There is a need to integrate the intervention to achieve goals with the local priorities.



Ms. Mukta Naik, Fellow, Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi

- 23.9 percent of youth work in non-farm activities. What happens to the people who move out of farms?
- When we study migration patterns, the long-term migration is generally captured as statistics. The short term and seasonal migration are not taken into consideration
- Contrary to the common beliefs, migration also occurs in non-infrastructural corridors

- In Kishangarh, 'In migration' is taking place. 'Out migration' can also be found in elite youth. 'Return migration' is another type of migration that is seen. Different rural- urban entanglements also play a role in how the city is perceived by the migrants
- If SDG 11 has to be achieved, then it is important to study migratory patterns so that we can understand what the people need
- The transformations are embedded in social and cultural being. Some of the elements obstructing the transformation are:
 - Weak, centralised and top down planning structures of local government are unable to respond to local needs
 - Economic and spatial planning is not linked
 - Local capitalists are influential actors (twin investment in business and philanthropy, political influence)
 - Independent civil society is weak and unlikely to act as counter
 - State intervention is necessary to move up value chain and capacity to enforce regulation
 - Low awareness/ attention to migration/ diversity issues
 - The difference of public investment in metro and non-metro cities is very high
- For localizing SDGs, small cities need institutionalised structures for participation like workers collectives, ward committees, resident welfare groups, temple committees, caste-based associations etc. where ideas about urban improvements can be discussed, resources can be crowdsourced and initiatives can be implemented.

Shri Jagadananda, Mentor and Co-Founder, Centre for Youth and Social Development, Bhubaneswar



- Mr. Jagadananda started his deliberation by sharing his experience related to cleanliness efforts in the neighbourhood located in Bhubaneswar city and his experiences as State Information Officer of Odisha state
- He emphasised that there is a big difference between policy rhetoric and policy practice/reality
- He discussed the Citizens Report Card initiative of Bhubaneswar Municipal Corporation, where the citizens participated whole heartedly. It emerged out that participation is only possible when citizens lead the monitoring
- Ward Sabhas envisaged in 74th Constitutional Amendment Act never became a reality. Participation is possible only when feedback is institutionalised and transparency is ensured
- For ensuring inclusivity, the National Voluntary Review Process which comprises the mechanisms through which progress with respect to the SDGs is being measured at both national and international level, need to be strengthened. The effective implementation of the SDGs is dependent on their incorporation into all relevant national frameworks

- It is important to identify vulnerable communities and amplifying their voices through their own hopes and aspirations
- The question remains, how do you strengthen participation instruments and accountability mechanisms?

Questions and Answers

- A comment that arose from the participants of the workshop upon the need for differential designs due to each city being different. The participant stated that while each one of us as a development practitioner knew the solutions, there is a hesitation in the implementation of the said solutions due to political reluctance. Referring to the discussions held in day 1, the participant also mentioned that city wide master plans which are based on sound technical analysis, should not be entirely discarded. At the very least, the technical analysis undertaken while making the master plan should be retained as it reflects the best possible residential area.
- Differential design sets are required to deal with the sanitation problems. e.g. the sanitation plan for the hilly terrain will be different from the sanitation plan of a plain area



- There are real problems in localizing SDGs especially for an implementing organisation. To institutionalize citizens' participation is something that we should discuss
- When we talk about localizing SDGs, we need to talk about localizing data. How to make this happen?
- The lowest level of data generation takes place only at the district level and not at the ward level. How to engage with citizens when the data generation doesn't happen at the ward level?

Comments from the Session Chair Dr. Rajesh Tandon

- How to bring inputs from bottom and also from top, and harmonize both?
- There is a need to identify indicators locally. Some of the initiatives for localizing SDGs may be in the form of preparing local SDG notes and engaging media for dissemination. Local voices, local solutions and local priorities should be institutionalised. Without working at the local level extensively, local solutions will not get priority anywhere.
- Urban mindsets have been privatised where they look for private solutions for public challenges. Everyone is looking for privatised solutions
- Local actions require local facilitation/ intermediation. We need extensive facilitation capacity. How it can be built? Who are these local facilitators and where they will come from?



PROGRAM AGENDA

Day 1: Thursday, 27 February 2020

09.00-09.45 Registration

09.45-10.45 Inaugural Session

Welcoming the Delegates

- Dr Kaustuv Kanti Bandyopadhyay, Director, Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), New Delhi

Lead Anchor

- Dr Rajesh Tandon, President, Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), New Delhi

Special Address

- Shri Parameswaran Iyer, Secretary, Department of Drinking Water and Sanitation, Ministry of Jal Shakti, Government of India

Inaugural Address

- Shri Hardeep Singh Puri, Hon'ble Minister, Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA), Government of India

Vote of Thanks

- Shri Depinder S Kapur, Team Lead & Senior Domain Expert, Sanitation, National Institute of Urban Affairs (NIUA), New Delhi

10.45-11.00 Tea/Coffee

11.00-12.15 Technical Session 1

Accelerating Behaviour Change and Citizen Participation for Inclusive and Sustainable Urban Sanitation Services

Chair

- Dr. Kamal Kar, Chairman, CLTS Foundation, Kolkata

Panellists

- Dr Anshuman Karol, Senior Programme Manager, Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), New Delhi
- Dr Renu Khosla, Executive Director, Centre for Urban and Regional Excellence (CURE), New Delhi
- Dr Rumi Aijaz, Senior Fellow, Observer Research Foundation, New Delhi

Open Discussion

Closing remarks by the Chair

12.15-01.30 Technical Session 2

Developing Local Capacities for Inclusive and Sustainable Urban Sanitation Services

Chair

- Ms Meenakshi Dewan, CEO, India Sanitation Coalition, New Delhi

Panellists

- Shri Murali Ramisetty, Regional Convenor, South Asia, Freshwater Action Network South Asia (FANSA), Hyderabad
- Shri Depinder S Kapur, Team Lead & Senior Domain Expert, Sanitation, National Institute of Urban Affairs (NIUA), New Delhi
- Ms Anju Dwivedi, Senior Researcher, Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi

Open Discussion

Closing remarks by the Chair

01.30-02.15

Lunch

02.15-03.00

Technical Session 3

Healthy Workplace for Sanitation Workers (with a special focus on women sanitation workers)

Chair

- Dr Indira Khurana, Independent Researcher and Consultant, New Delhi

Panellists

- Ms Shashi Shikha, Senior Programme Officer, Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), New Delhi
- Shri Bejwada Wilson, National Convenor, Safai Karmachari Andolan, New Delhi

Open Discussion

Closing remarks by the Chair

03.00-04.45

Technical Session 4

Convergence of Public Programmes for Sustainable Water and Sanitation Services in Indian Cities

Chair

- Mr. Nabaroon Bhattacharya, Urban Expert

Panellists

- Shri V K Madhavan, Country Head, WaterAid India, New Delhi

- Dr Suresh Kumar Rohilla, Senior Director, Water Programme & Academic Director, School of Water and Waste at Centre for Science and Environment, New Delhi
- Prof Kajri Misra, Dean, Xavier School of Human Settlements, Bhubaneswar

Open Discussion

Closing remarks by the Chair

04.45-05.00 Tea/Coffee

Day 2: Friday, 28 February 2020

09.30-01.00 Special Session
Localising Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Secondary Cities

Moderator

- Dr Rajesh Tandon, President, Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), New Delhi

09.30-11.00 Round 1 Discussion

Panellists

- Mr Raimund Magis, Deputy Head, European Union, Delegation to India and Bhutan, New Delhi
- Prof Om Prakash Mathur, Senior Fellow, Institute of Social Sciences, New Delhi
- Prof Amitabh Kundu, Distinguished Fellow, Research and Information System for Developing Countries (RIS), New Delhi
- Ms Shikha Srivastava, Head, Urban Habitat and Migration, Tata Trusts, New Delhi

Open Discussion

11.00-11.15 Tea/Coffee

11.15-12.40 Second Round Discussion

Panellists

- Ms Mukta Naik, Fellow, Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi
- Shri Jagadananda, Mentor and Co-Founder, Centre for Youth and Social Development, Bhubaneswar

Open Discussion

Closing remarks by the Chair

01.00-01.10 Vote of Thanks

01.10 Lunch

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

S. No.	Name	Affiliation
1	A.Das	Ramky Foundation
2	Abhishek Gupta	Jamia Millia Islamia
3	Aditi Arora	SPA
4	Aditi Sharan	UNNATI
5	Ajeet Akash	SPA
6	Ajith K. Kailath	Ansal University
7	Akshay Agrawal	NIUA
8	Akshay Ranjan Thorat	KIT, Kohlapur
9	Aman	PRIA
10	Amar Preet Kaur	Waste Warriors Society
11	Amitabh Kundu	RIS
12	Amrit	PRAG
13	Anil Roy	CEPT University
14	Anisha Singh	BBC Media Action
15	Anjaney	ISPD
16	Anju Dwivedi	Centre for Policy Research
17	Ankit Jain	Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs
18	Anshuman Karol	PRIA
19	Areeba Khalid	PRIA
20	Arun Kumar	Apnalaya
21	Arundhati Maiti	School of Planning and Architecture
22	Arya Dev	UN Global Compact Network, India
23	Asad	Agha Khan Development Network
24	Ashish	ICLG
25	Baksheesh Sachar	UNICEF
26	Barsha Poricha	CURE
27	Barun Kumar	Ramky Env. Eng.Ltd.
28	Bhanu Pratap Sharma	Indus University
29	Bhupendra Singh Bisht	National Centre for Good Governance
30	Debendra Kumar Das	Independent Researcher
31	Deepak	TV 100
32	Depinder S. Kapur	National Institute of Urban Affairs
33	Dhanashree Gurav	Shelter Associates
34	Dileesha	Lady Irwin College
35	Dipak Dash	Times of India
36	Gaurav	PRAG

37	Govind Kumar	SPA
38	Hardeep Singh Puri	Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs
39	Harleen Kaur	ICUC Consultants and IPCA
40	Hephzibah Lakhanpal	HFH India
41	Hitesh Vaidya	NIUA
42	Hrudananda Mohanty	Practical Action
43	Indira Khurana	Independent Consultant
44	Jagadananda	CYSD
45	Joochi Khushbu	FINISH Society
46	Jyoti Dash	NIUA
47	K K Pandey	Indian Institute of Public Administration
48	Kajri Mishra	Xavier University, Bhubaneswar
49	Kamal Kar	CLTS Foundation
50	Karan	PRAG
51	Kathyayini Chamaraj	CIVIC, Bangalore
52	Kaustubh	NIUA
53	Kaustuv K. Bahdyopadhyay	PRIA
54	Lijin Idicula	BBC Action Media
55	Manahar V. Zala	National Commission for Safai Karamcharis
56	Manish Thakre	Save the Children
57	Manjua	Civil Service Organization
58	Manjunath	ICWA
59	Meenakshi Dewan	India Sanitation Coalition
60	Megha Datta	Geospatial Media
61	Mehak Tiku	Urban Design Research Institute
62	Mercy Nirmal	World Vision India
63	Mohd. Noor Alam	Multiple Action Research Group
64	Monika Bahl	Sustainable Urban and Industrial Development Cluster, GIZ
65	Mukesh Kaushik	Dainik Bhaskar
66	Mukta Naik	CPR
67	Murali Ramisetty	FANSA
68	Nabaroon Bhattacharjee	Independent Consultant
69	Namrata Jaitli	Save the Children
70	Nandini Bhattacharya	
71	Nandita Sengupta	
72	Narendra	CMSR Consultants
73	Nayanika Guha	PRIA
74	Nikita Popat	Urban Management Centre
75	Nipun Channa	Navodaya Times

76	Om Prakash Mathur	Institute of Social Sciences
77	P K Anand	RIS
78	Padmaja Nair	Independent Consultant
79	Parameswaran Iyer	Ministry of Jal Shakti
80	Pawan Daniel	World Vision India
81	Poonam	ETV Bharat
82	Prabal Bhardwaj	Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs
83	Pragya	UNICEF
84	Pramod Sehgal	Habitat for Humanity India
85	Pratap Raval	CoEP, Pune
86	Priyanka Jaiswal	CLTS Foundation
87	Proma Jha	IANS
88	Rachit	WASH Institute
89	Rahul Mankotia	Centre for Science and Environment
90	Rajasvi Gandhi	PRIA
91	Rajesh Singh	YUVA India
92	Rajesh Tandon	PRIA
93	Ramasamy Krishnan	SNEHA
94	Ramesh	Sahara
95	Ramesh Yadawar	PRIA
96	Ranjan Kumar Singh	Nidan
97	Ranjana Singh	NCG
98	Ravi Shankar	VPS College
99	Renu Khosla	CURE
100	Richa Bhardwaj	Tata Institute of Social Sciences
101	Ritu Thakur	ICLEI South Asia
102	Rumi Aijaz	Observer Research Foundation
103	Sachin Chaturvedi	RIS
104	Samuel Sathya	JNU
105	Seema Awasthi	ICUC Consultants and IPCA
106	Shahid Siddiqui	
107	Shamika	Rg (Media)
108	Sharath Babu	Indian School of Public Policy
109	Shashi Shikha	PRIA
110	Shikha Srivastava	Tata Trusts
111	Shoba	World Vision India
112	Shobhita Rajagopal	Institute of Development Studies
113	Shouvik Datta	European Union
114	Shreya Chand	Geospatial Media
115	Shubhangi Singh	PRIA

116	Sneh Kumar	TV 100
117	Sophia Joseph	Habitat for Humanity India
118	Soumya Ashok	The Indian Express
119	Sreenandini Banerjee	Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs
120	Stephan Juturu	Delhi University
121	Sujoy Mazumdar	UNICEF
122	Sukrit Nagpal	SEWA BHARAT
123	Sumana Chatterjee	Sustainable Urban and Industrial Development Cluster, GIZ
124	Sumitra Srinivasan	PRIA
125	Sunny George	KILA
126	Supradeep	SPA
127	Suresh Kumar Rohilla	Centre for Science and Environment
128	Trishubh Singh	SPA
129	Uday Shankar Singh	Vishwa Yuvak Kendra
130	Usha	Journalist
131	V K Madhavan	WaterAid India
132	Vardhaman Sakhlecha	Paperman Environmental Solutions
133	Vijay K K	Delhi University
134	Vikas Jha	IRRAD
135	Vikash Singh	PRIA
136	Vinita	SPA
137	Yacob Zacharia	LOGIN