CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0. Overview of the Chapter
This chapter discusses the review of literature works done by other scholars. The review of literature is broadly classified into various categories based on the objectives. They are: studies related function of Urban Local Bodies with particular reference to Metropolitan Cities in India and abroad, Good Urban Governance and Metropolitan Governance Framework, Metropolitan Governance models, Institutional framework & Reforms and Initiatives, Metropolitan Spatial Planning Framework and followed by Metropolitan Service Delivery Framework.

2.1. Function of Urban Local Bodies with particular reference to Metropolitan Cities in India
The Article 40 of the Constitution of India provides that the State shall take necessary steps for organize and endow them with powers and authority to enable them to function as units of local self-government. The Local Self Governments i.e., Rural Local Bodies and Urban Local Bodies are the subject of the State List and are thereby governed by State Statutes, or for Union Territories, by the Union Parliament. The Historic evolution from the British era, the first municipal mechanism created during British rule was the Municipal Corporation introduced in Madras (Chennai today) in 1688, which was followed by municipal corporations in Bombay (Mumbai today) and Calcutta (Kolkata today) by 1762. Subsequently, Lord Mayo's Resolution of 1870 called for the introduction of an elected President in the municipalities. The current form and structure of municipal bodies are based on Lord Ripon's Resolution on local self-government adapted in 1882.

Statutory provision for creating a municipal unit is available in two forms.

- First, by statute that provides for the establishment of a municipal authority, as for instance in the form has taken for the Bombay Municipal Corporation Act in 1888, the City of Nagpur Corporation Act of 1948 and the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act of 1957.
• The other route is through statutory provision empowering State Government creation. The Bombay Provincial Municipal Corporations Act of 1949 and the Gujarat Municipalities Act of 1964 are both examples of the latter. Generally, these statutes confer significant control and supervisory powers on the state government. In this context, it can be said that they are creatures of state government.

Mukesh P. Mathur Dr. (2005)4, all municipal acts in India provide for functions, powers and responsibilities to be carried out by the municipal government. The Municipal Acts specify 31 obligatory functions and 23 discretionary shall be performed by Urban Local Bodies in India.

• **The obligatory functions include:** supply of pure and wholesome water; construction and maintenance of public streets; lighting and watering of public streets; cleaning of public streets, places and sewers; regulation of offensive, dangerous or obnoxious trades and callings or practices; maintenance or support of public hospitals; establishment and maintenance of primary schools; registration of births and deaths; removing obstructions and projections in public streets, bridges and other places; and naming streets and numbering houses etc.

• **The discretionary functions include:** laying out of areas; securing or removal of dangerous buildings or places; construction and maintenance of public parks, gardens, libraries, museums, rest houses, leper homes, orphanages and rescue homes for women; and public buildings; planting and maintenance of roadside and other trees; housing for low income groups; conducting surveys; organizing public receptions, public exhibitions, public entertainment; provision of transport facilities with the municipality; promotion of welfare of municipal employees etc.

---

After the enactment of **74th Constitution Amendment Act, 1992**\(^5\) provided the Twelfth Schedule which listed the functions of urban local bodies along with their planning, regulation and development powers. The Constitutional amendment provided for the setting up of Metropolitan Planning Committees (Article 243ZE) to prepare the draft development plan in every Metropolitan Area. Similarly, District Planning Committees (DPC) were established by Article 243ZD to consolidate and co-ordinate planning coordinated by district panchayats for rural areas and municipalities for the urban areas. The Constitutional amendment also mandated the holding of Ward Sabhas (assembly) to elicit the preferences of the people for public services and to develop planning from the grassroots level. However, none of these requirements were really observed in practice until the Planning Commission mandated the setting up of the DPCs based on the recommendations of the **Committee on Grassroots Planning (India, 2005)**\(^6\). The Constitution (74\(^{th}\) Amendment) Act, 1992 provisions, provides a basis for the State Legislatures to guide the State Governments in the assignment of various responsibilities to municipalities and to strengthen municipal governance. Accordingly, several State Governments have amended their Municipal Acts/Laws/Legislations so about to bring these in conformity with the Constitutional provisions.

In this context, **The Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation (MoUD&PA), Government of India**, has developed a Model Municipal Law (MML) in 2003 to guide States to enact municipal legislations (box 2)\(^7\).

\(^{5}\) *The Constitution (Seventy-Fourth Amendment) Act, 1992*


\(^{7}\) *Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation. Government of India. October 2003*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Box 2: Salient Features of Model Municipal Law (MML)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constitution and Government</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Executive powers vested with Empowered Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Five-year term for Mayor/Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision for wards and ward committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Functions classified in terms of core, assigned by government, and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dissolution of elected council only after review by a committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-election of dissolved council within six months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State government to prepare municipal accounting manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Municipalities to prepare annual balance sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision for appointment of a Municipal Accounts Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision for appointment of chartered accountants as auditors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capital and revenue heads to be separated out in municipal accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Separate accounting heads proposed for water supply, roads, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual subsidy and environmental status reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual inventory of municipal properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comprehensive debt limitation policy by state government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enabling access to capital markets and financial institutions for capital investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Revenue Generation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Property tax (PT) assessment system on area or capital value basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision for self-assessment system for PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unique property numbering system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reference to implementation of SFC’s recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Environmental Infrastructure and Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participation of private sector, NGOs, and CBOs in delivery of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service charges to reflect O&amp;M and capital costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision to meet the Hazardous and Bio-medical Waste Handling Rules of MoEF, GOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision to meet the Solid Waste Handling Rules of MoEF, GOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State-level regulatory commission on municipal services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Representation to municipalities on District/Metropolitan Planning Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision for implementation of development plans by Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easy planning approvals to small-sized buildings designed by architects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This Municipal Law can serve as an illustrative example as to how, based on a given set of policy postulates, with its various dimensions, and the consequent legislative scheme, the legal framework may be developed which may be adapted and adopted by any State Government based on its own choices from the several policy options and facilitate adoption of a State-specific policy agenda, which together with the “Municipal Law” may help any State Government in reinventing municipal government, to respond to the challenges of the decades ahead. This initiative is expected not only to enhance the capacities of ULBs to leverage public funds for development of urban sector but will also help in creating an environment in which ULBs can play their role more effectively and ensure better service delivery.

The recent study done by Prof. Chetan Vaidya (2009) in four states, namely Rajasthan, Bihar, Orissa and Sikkim have prepared their municipal laws on the lines of MML and many others are in process of amending their laws. The Rajasthan Municipalities Ordinance 2008 has introduced some very innovative features that should help empower ULBs in the State (box 3).

**Box 3: Rajasthan Municipalities Ordinance 2008**

The Rajasthan Government promulgated the new municipal law on September 26, 2008. It is mainly based on Model Municipal Law. It also has many enabling provisions to implement various reforms under JNNURM like: (a) transferring various functions to ULBs, (b) introducing tax on land and buildings on unit area basis, (c) forming Area Sabha for community participation, (c) establishing MPCs and DPCs, (d) making Town Planning a municipal function, (e) introducing rainwater harvesting, (f) encouraging PPP, (g) introducing improved accounting, (h) introducing public disclosure, (i) setting up SFC and implementing its recommendations, etc. There are also some very innovative enabling provisions for issue of municipal bonds, comprehensive debt limitation policy, setting up a municipal service cadre, etc. The Ordinance also divided various municipal functions into core, government assigned and other functions. However, water supply and sewerage is not identified as core function but a state assigned function.

Some of the literature reveals for functions performed by the Metropolitan Cities in India, the functions are enlisted in State list as well as in the concurrent list of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution. The functions overlap not only between the State government and municipal bodies but also between the Central government and the

---

municipal bodies.\(^9\) The overlapping problem is particularly acute in the capital cities of the States where the overlapping functions between the State government and the Municipal Corporation makes the system opaque.

The study done by (Mathur 2009)\(^10\), in Delhi, the overlapping problem is even more acute as all the three levels of government – Centre, the Union Territory of Delhi and three municipal bodies – the Delhi Municipal Corporation, New Delhi Municipal Committee and Delhi Cantonment divide the powers among them in confusing ways.

2.2. Good Urban Governance and Good Urban Governance framework in Metropolitan Urban India

| “People came together in cities in order to live. They remain together in order to live the good life” and |
| “A city should be built to give its inhabitants security and happiness” |
| Aristotle |
| Let’s strive to achieve it! |

2.2.1. Origin and Growth of Good Governance

The term ‘Good Governance’ was coined by the West for Third World Countries. The Development aid to Third World countries in Post –Cold War era has given rise to the western concept of good governance entering the vocabulary of public administration since the 90s. Rousseau and Thomas Paine stressed upon Rule of Law, inherent to constitutionalism as the minimum criterion for liberal democratic governance. As John Stuart Mill said, ‘one criterion of the goodness of a government is the degree in which tends to increase the sum of good qualities in the governed’. Karl Marx equated good governance with governance where it is replaced by self-regulation. According to him, as long as there are antagonisms between the individuals and the groups, humanity cannot enjoy real freedom.


The word ‘good’ is derived from the word ‘God’ which means an ability to distinguish between right and wrong, just and unjust, fair and foul, right and wrong, and moral and Immoral. Bentham described it as the greatest good of the greatest number while in India we believe in ‘Sarva jana hitaih, Sarva jana sukaiah’ which implies welfare of all and happiness of all.

2.2.2. Concept of ‘Governance’

The etymological root of the terms ‘governance’, ‘government’, ‘governor’, or ‘governance’, lies in the Latin word ‘gubernare’, which means basically the steering of a ship. The Concise Oxford English Dictionary defines governance as the ‘act or manner of governing’ and ‘the office or function of governing’. Governance here is not only confined to political governance but would include all types of governance, such as, international governance, national governance state or provincial governance or local governance. It is recognized that governance is about how an organization steers itself and the process and structures that are used to achieve its goal. Government refers to the machinery and institutional arrangements of exercising the sovereign power for serving the internal and external interests of the political community, whereas governance means the process as well as the results of making authoritative decisions for the benefit of the society.

The term “governance” has been increasingly used in urban politics, public policy, and public administration to signify activities related to public purposes that are undertaken jointly by multiple actors, including those “beyond government,” or at the very least beyond the organizational boundaries of a single government to govern is to rule with authority, to keep under control. The World Bank’s earliest definition referred to governance as ‘the exercise of political power to manage a nation’s affairs’ The definition of governance used by the World Bank is “…the manner in which power is exercised in the management of country’s economic and social resources for development and emphasizes economic policy and management”.
The World Bank (2001)\textsuperscript{11} has identified three distinct aspects of governance:

a) the form of political regime;

b) the process by which authority is exercised for managing a country’s economic and social resources for development and

c) the capacity of government to design, formulate and implement policies and discharge functions.

The term “governance” originally referred only to the classical sense of government. Today, governance describes the organization and administration of regional authorities and institutions on various spatial levels, as well as the corresponding processes of decision-making, cooperation, and exertion of influence (OECD 2001)\textsuperscript{12}.

Governance refers to ‘governing practices’ (Pierre and Peters, 2000)\textsuperscript{13} that seeks “to develop new patterns of relation between diverse social actors (the public sector, business organisations, multilateral organisations, the voluntary and community sectors etc.) in an attempt to build greater ‘systemic capacity’ for collective action in the face of ‘cross-cutting’ and ‘wicked’ policy problems”

Kaufman et al. (2000:12)\textsuperscript{14} conceives governance as, “consisting of the traditions and institutions that determine how authority is exercised in a particular country. This includes the process by which governments are selected, held accountable, monitored, and replaced; the capacity of governments to manage resources efficiently, and formulate, implement and enforce sound policies and regulations; and the respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them”.


Stoker (2000)\textsuperscript{15}, had evaluated “Governance involves working across boundaries within the public sector or between the public sector and private or voluntary sectors” Pierre and Peters (2005)\textsuperscript{16} define four activities of governance: Goal definition (articulating a common set of priorities for society), coherence (consistency and coordination), steering (finding ways of achieving goals) and accountability. Governance can be defined as the interactions among structures, processes and traditions that determine how power and responsibilities are exercised, how decisions are taken, and how citizens or other stakeholders have their say. Fundamentally, it is about power, relationships and accountability: who has influence, who decides, and how decision-makers are held accountable.

Governance is thus interpreted as a coordination process consisting of formal, institutional mechanisms and a plethora of strategic alliances and informal mechanisms that all contribute to the management of metropolitan areas. Far from the traditional model of a command and control government, it is now recognized that metropolitan governance is a consensus building mechanism of extraordinary complexity (Lefevre C. 1998)\textsuperscript{17}. The identification of the decision – making actors, agencies, coalitions and power-groups and their relative influence and interaction is essential to understand metropolitan dynamics.

Governance refers to manner in which power is exercised in the management of country’s economic and social resources for development (World Bank 1992:3)\textsuperscript{18}. Governance means the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented). Governance can be used in several contexts such as corporate governance, international governance, national governance, metropolitan governance and local governance. Governance thus is about organizing public action beyond the state and supervising, co-coordinating and steering a network of actors to

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{15} Stoker, Gerry (2000). "Urban Political Science and the Challenge of Urban Governance". in: 
\end{flushright}
produce certain outcomes. It is about bringing together all relevant actors in order to effectively and efficiently implement certain measures and services.

**Gualini, 2001**¹⁹, has interpreted Governance is in general terms – a notion that deals with the reframing of both ‘formal’ and ‘working’ relationships between ideal types of social order in realizing governing effects:

A. Governance as a concept for the analysis of state action (governance as form of social self-regulation instead of hierarchical government):


C. Governance as a concept for the analysis of the social order of economic systems (social and institutional embeddedness of economic systems)

**Aedrian Leftwich**²⁰, who has already been referred to above, gives three defining features of good governance:

- to promote open market-friendly and competitive economy;
- democratization; and
- improvement of human rights record.

In 1992, the World Bank’s document Governance and Development said, ‘Good Governance is central to creating and sustaining an environment which fosters strong and equitable development and it is an essential complement to sound economic policies’. While saying so the document identified three aspects of governance:

- the form of political regime;

---


the process by which authority is exercised in the management of country’s economic and social resources; and

• the capacity of governments to design, formulate and implement policies and, in general to discharge government functions.

In essence, to The **World Bank**, Good Governance consists of:

1. Political accountability;
2. Regular elections to legitimize the exercise of political power;
3. Participation by various social, economic, cultural and professional groups in the process of governance
4. Rule of Law;
5. Independency of judiciary;
6. Bureaucratic accountability;
7. Freedom of information;
8. Transparency;
9. Efficient and effective administrative system; and
10. Co-operation between government and civil society.

**Kaufmann, Kraay and Zoido-Lobton (1995:5)** who have elaborated a series of indicators to evaluate the quality of government focusing on political realities. These are grouped into six clusters.

1. Voice and accountability (encompassing the political process, political rights and civil liberties);
2. Political stability;
3. Government effectiveness (the quality of services and of the civil services),
4. Regulatory quality;
5. The rule of law and
6. Control of corruption.

The **UNDP** defined as: “The exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country’s affairs at all levels. It comprises the mechanisms, processes and

---

institutions, through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences”\textsuperscript{22}. In the urban context, Habitat has created a Campaign for Good Urban governance, which stresses the need for inclusion (of stakeholder groups) and improved management. The good governance is likely to include:

- equity in the way in which resources are allocated;
- efficiency in the way in which services are delivered and managed;
- transparent and accountable decision-making processes; and
- security from environmental disasters, crime and the adverse effects of poor management decisions.

A similar, useful perspective on public governance is Governance is the process through which institutions, businesses and citizens’ groups articulate their interests, exercise their rights and obligations and mediate their differences\textsuperscript{23}.

The \textit{UNCHS (2001)}\textsuperscript{24}, recognizes that “Good Urban Governance not merely a matter of efficient management; it also has political dimensions related to democracy, human rights and civic participation in decision making process”. This definition emphasizes the values, standards and process, as well as the institutions by which citizens and governments interact. The Governance, also, goes beyond urban management, which is primarily concerned with the delivery of urban services in an effective, efficient, responsive, equitable, and accountable manner (\textit{Aprodicio A Laquian, 2005})\textsuperscript{25}.

Good governance is, among other things, participatory, transparent and accountable. It is also effective and equitable. And it promotes the rule of law. Good governance ensures that political, social and economic priorities are based on broad consensus in society and

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{United Nation Development Programme (UNDP).} (1997). \textit{Governance for Sustainable Development}. New York. policy document UNDP.


\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Aprodicio A Laquian (2005).} \textit{Beyond Metropolis – The Planning and Governance of Asia’s Mega-Urban Region}. The Johns Hopkins University Press. Hampden Station. Maryland.
that the voices of the poorest and the most vulnerable are heard in decision-making over the allocation of development resources. Good urban governance, however, has a broader connotation and includes aspects relating to democracy, participation and accountability. The following constitute the basic principles of urban governance.

2.2.3. Key principles of Good Governance based on the UNDP as follows

a) Legitimacy and voice: Participation – all men and women should have a voice in decision-making, either directly or through legitimate intermediate institutions that represent their intention. Such broad participation is built on freedom of association and speech, as well as capacities to participate constructively. Consensus orientation – good governance mediates differing interests to reach a broad consensus on what is in the best interest of the group and, where possible, on policies and procedures.

b) Direction: Strategic vision – leaders and the public have a broad and long-term perspective on good governance and human development, along with a sense of what is needed for such development. There is also an understanding of the historical, cultural and social complexities in which that perspective is grounded.

c) Performance: Responsiveness – institutions and processes try to serve all stakeholders. Effectiveness and efficiency – processes and institutions produce results that meet needs while making the best use of resources.

d) Accountability: Accountability – decision-makers in government, the private sector and civil society organizations are accountable to the public, as well as to institutional stakeholders. This accountability differs depending on the organizations and whether the decision is internal or external. To enhance public accountability of decision makers in government, the private sector and community organization in all areas (political, fiscal and budgetary). Transparency – transparency is built on the free flow of information. Processes, institutions and information are directly accessible to those concerned with them, and enough information is provided to understand and monitor them. Fairness: to provide equal opportunities for all citizens to increase their welfare and rule of Law.
e) **Fairness:** *Equity* – all men and women have opportunities to improve or maintain their wellbeing.

*Rule of Law* – legal frameworks should be fair and enforced impartially, particularly the laws on human rights.

‘Urban governance is the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, plan and manages the common affairs of the city. It is a continuing process through which conflicting and diverse interests may be accommodated and cooperative action taken. It includes formal institutions and informal arrangements and the social capital of citizens.’

Governance can be categorized to have three groups: economic, political and administrative. It encompasses all three aspects defines the good urban governance, these processes and structures that guide the political and socio-economic relationships.

**Gaudin (1999)** suggests identifying governance through three concrete characteristics:

1. Co-operation between various public and private stakeholders,

2. The relationships among who are organised through continuous interactions and form multi-polar networks, and

3. Where the rules of the game are negotiated independently from the traditional institutional hierarchies.

A distinction is often made between ‘government’ and ‘governance’. Government is generally identified with the state or the organization that is legally empowered to govern or rule and performs a set of functions aimed at promoting the security and welfare of the people. Governance is a broader concept and is viewed in terms of “the relationship between civil society and the state, between rulers and the ruled, the state and society, the government and the governed.”

---

26 United Nation – Habitat describe the Urban Governance.

The table is structured according to Van Waarden's analytical elements (1992)\textsuperscript{28} and shows those categories where 'statism' (government) shows different characteristics from 'issue networks' (governance). The features setting apart governance from government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Actors</td>
<td>very limited number of participants mainly state agencies</td>
<td>high number of participants public and private stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>No consultation, no co-operation in formulation of policies and implementation issues</td>
<td>Consultation, possible co-operation in policy-implementation narrow policy issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Closed boundaries involuntary membership, low frequency and duration of interaction.</td>
<td>Extremely open boundaries voluntary membership, extremely low frequency and duration of interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Convention of interaction</td>
<td>Hierarchic authority, interlocking leadership, adversial interactions / conflictual relations, informal contacts and secrecy.</td>
<td>Horizontal consultation, intermobility, consensus on technocratic norms / cooperative relations, extremely informal contacts and openness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Distribution of power</td>
<td>high autonomy of state or society (steered organizing ) / state dominant, no capture of state by societal interests and no balance or symbiosis between actors.</td>
<td>Low autonomy of state or society (self-organizing) / diffuse domination of state by societal interests, balance or symbiosis between actors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.4. Good Governance in India

Kautilya, in his treatise Arthasastra, propounded the trait of good governance by the ruler-king as follows: ‘In the happiness of his subjects lies his happiness, in their welfare his welfare; whatever pleases himself he shall not consider as good, but whatever pleases his subjects, he shall consider as good’.

U.S. Agarwal says, ‘The tests of good governance lie in the goals and objectives of a government; in its policies and programmes, and the manner of their execution, in the results achieved and, above all, in the general perceptions of the people about the quality of functioning of its various agencies, their attributes and behaviour towards the public, their sincerity, honesty and commitments towards public duties. It is also important to see that there is no undue concentration of power’.

O.P. Minocha in his article ‘Good Governance: New Management Perspectives’ has suggested following four Ts and Four Ds.

- Four Ts – Technology up gradation (introducing information technology); incorporating modern techniques of management and to ensure effectiveness and efficiency; capacity building of public institutions, i.e. training of civil servants; and transparency and openness in public organizations.
- Four Ds- empowerment of citizens in general and vulnerable sections in particular (decentralization); empowerment of grass-root functionaries (delegation); dispersal of political –administrative power (democratization), and privatization, contracting out and removing delays and rigidity in public organizations (debureacratisation).

The Government of India with the UN-Habitant -United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS) in September 2001 launched National Good Urban Governance Campaign. The National Good Urban Governance Campaign identifies the symbiotic relationship between decentralization, transparency and civic engagement as a key policy objective for transforming cities into inclusive spaces of decision-making. There are frequent references in the campaign document available on its web site about involving citizens as stakeholders in decentralized decision making and implementation of
programmes and projects. The campaign document states that, “civic engagement has enormous potential to promote transparency, accountability, equity, and more mature and wholesome city functioning. It can thrive in a city in several ways such as participation in policy formulation, resource allocation, service delivery and monitoring, civic education and poverty alleviation. Nothing can build consensus and a deepening of true democracy better in a city than civic engagement” (Government of India, 2001).

As a follow up it is being launched in the States and at local levels, where interactive discussions are envisaged among the local bodies, civil society, service providers and other stakeholders. The campaign proposes that good urban governance is characterized by the following interdependent and mutually reinforcing norms:

- **Sustainability** in all dimensions of urban development.
- **Subsidiarity** of authority and resources at the closest appropriate level.
- **Equity** of access to decision-making processes and the basic necessities of urban life.
- **Efficiency** in the delivery of public services and in promoting local economic development.
- **Transparency and Accountability** of decision-makers and all stakeholders.
- **Civic Engagement and Citizenship**
- **Security** of individuals and their living environment.
2.3. Metropolitan Governance Framework in Metropolitan Urban India

2.3.1. Concepts of ‘Metropolitan Governance’

Metropolitan governance, as it has come to be known, is however, not limited to formal institutions. There is multiple definition of the term: Rhodes (1996)\(^{29}\) has identified six. In general, governance involves multiple stakeholders, interdependent resources and actions, and shared purposes and blurred boundaries between the public and private, formal and informal, state and civil society sectors. This undoubtedly requires a greater need for coordination, negotiating and building consensus (UNCHS 2000).

Metropolitan Governance is consensus building mechanism of extraordinary complexity (Lefevre 1998)\(^{30}\). The identification of the decision - making actors, agencies, coalitions & power groups and their relative influence and interaction is essential to understand metropolitan dynamics.

The principles of Good Metropolitan Government listed by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD 2001) are both process oriented (Cities for Citizens, Coherence in policy, Coordination, Participation, Flexibility) and substantive (Endogenous development, Efficient Financial Management, Particularity, Social Cohesion, Subsidiarity and Sustainability). The World Bank (2001) study mainly focuses on:

a. Spatial and jurisdictional coordination, (vertically through the hierarchy), between overlapping jurisdictions, between contiguous authorities and between local authorities
b. Functional coordination (for instance: land use and transportation planning, between modes, between traffic management and policing).
c. Operational coordination (between public and private enterprise, between many companies)


The first, Regional Governance describes a combination of government and network based negotiating systems that integrates actors of different levels of action. This regional process- and issue-orientated self-steering structure is based on voluntary participation but it should be at the same time capable of producing binding decisions (Furst, D., 2002).31

“Metropolitan governance” is not a scientifically settled term, yet (D.F. Norris 2001, 534)32. It understand by combination of mechanism of self-government for metropolitan regions which are to enable the issue oriented cooperation and patterns of conflict resolution between actors of different logics of action (economic, political and associative). Governance in that sense is more than regional cooperation of actors. Rather it is a mixture of government and net-work based negotiating systems and capable of producing binding decisions.

The study of spatial planning and regional governance in key European cities report lessons that may have positive implications for effective governance in Asian cities, particularly Metro Manila (Albrechat, et.al (2003).33 These are:

1. Strategic spatial planning initiatives take many different forms, performing different kinds of governance work in different contexts;
2. The formation of policy agendas should be integrated around some central framing concepts, which can then be translated spatially, so that stakeholders involved can grasp the practical implications;
3. The development of the spatial dimensions of strategic Proceedings of the Eastern Asia Society for Transportation Studies, Vol.6, 2007 plans is not just a matter of technical analysis, but the development of spatial logic and metaphors that can command attention and carry persuasive power in complex political contexts;


4. There is a need to create appropriate institutional arrangements among stakeholders; and
5. Initiatives benefits from the existence and acceptance of a strong role for the state and a strong political consciousness that allows for shifting governance cultures.

Usage and forms of Governance – The concept of Governance is being used in many ways. Hirst (2000, p. 14) has been analyses five contexts in which the term has been used.

1. Governance - economic development and political framework,
2. Governance - transnational institutions and Governments
3. Governance - Corporate governance,
4. Governance – Public service management
5. Governance - To public organizations and involvement of civil society and non-government actors in matters related to individuals and communities.

Accordingly, they define governance as “the relationship between civil society and the state, between rulers and ruled, the government and the governed” (McCarney, Halfani, and Rodriguez, 1995: 95). Important elements of this definition were adopted by other researchers writing about comparative local government in developing countries and were eventually incorporated into the United Nations Development Program (1997a: 2–3) current definition: Governance can be seen as the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country’s affairs at all levels. It comprises the mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests. In the United States, researchers dealing with metropolitan problems increasingly use the term “metropolitan governance” rather than “metropolitan government” because of the more inclusive connotations of the former (Stephens and Wikstrom, 2000: 47).
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Le Galès (1998)⁷, “the term ‘governance’ suggests . . . functions and actions of government, but without the idea of uniformity, rationality, or standardization. The term ‘urban governance’ implies a greater diversity in the organization of services, a greater flexibility, a variety of actors, even a transformation of the forms that local democracy might assume, and taking into account citizens and consumers, and the complexity of new forms of citizenship.” The most important goal of mega-urban region governance is ensuring a high quality of life for people living in the settlement.

Friedmann (1998, 21) which included the following has called ‘good city outcomes’.

- **A productive city** where those who work are adequately rewarded for their efforts and those who seeks work do not find difficulty in finding it.
- **A sustainable city** that ensures the right to a life-sustaining and life-enhancing natural environment for all citizens, including generations yet come.
- **A livable city** that guarantees the right to decent housing, public services, and personal safety in neighbourhoods of their own choice.
- **A safe city** that ensures each person’s right to the physical integrity and security of his or her own body.
- **An actively tolerant city** that protects and promotes citizens rights to group-specific differences in language, religion, national custom, sexual preference and similar marks of collective identity so long as these do not invade the rights of others and are consistent with more general human rights.
- **A caring city** that acknowledge the right of the weakest member of the polity to adequate social protection.

---

2.4. Metropolitan Governance models, reforms and initiatives

Tiebout (1956)\textsuperscript{38}, had revealed in most of the studies on governance of metropolitan areas have focused primarily on the cost efficiency of providing public services. Mainly concern about the development impacts of governance has focused on the economic relationships between cities and suburbs. The division of the metropolitan area into two distinct components (city and suburbs) obscures the very real differences between municipalities, and is a narrow analytical framework.

The structure of government in a metropolitan area can also influence the pattern of development, with fragmented regions producing more dispersed development (Lewis 1996), as well as more segregated communities. A more sophisticated handling of the consolidation variable would have been a substantial undertaking for a large comparative study, but not a study with only nine jurisdictions. Lewis's contribution was not limited to advancing the linkages between governance and development. His Political Fragmentation Index was a more sophisticated measure of governance in metropolitan areas than the count of government units, or a ratio of government units to population or area. These measures failed to control for the variation in power, function, and capacity, both across and within metropolitan areas and states (Lewis 1996, 48-49)\textsuperscript{39}.

The Political Fragmentation Index included only those governments that exercised land-use authority, because it was central to the kinds of development outcomes in which he was interested. In addition to general-purpose units, Lewis (1996) included special districts that influenced development patterns – transportation districts, housing and community development districts, and water and sewer districts. He excluded school districts, fire districts, and some other special districts. The measure was defined as:


PFI = TE * (1-SSP)^{40} \text{Where:}

PFI = Political Fragmentation Index

TE = total expenditures per capita by land use governments ($1,000)

SSP = sum of squared percentage of TE accounted for by each local government

Metropolitan solutions are untested in their application to development problems, but they are prevalent enough, and the issues and policy problems are important enough, that they warrant attention. On the other hand, arguments that decentralized regions are better suited to conditions of economic change are likewise untested. From a policy perspective, it is important to know whether metropolitan governance has an effect on economic performance, and if it does, whether centralized or decentralized systems offer greater benefits.

The Metropolitan Power Diffusion Index (MPDI) resolved many of the problems related to measuring the political effects of fragmentation (Miller 2000; Mitchell-Weaver, Miller and Deal 2000)^{41}. Based on 24 categories of government expenditures, the MPDI provides a proxy for the expression of power by units of government. However, it does so without obscuring the small players. This index was similar to the Political Fragmentation Index developed by Lewis (1996). These measures provided a better means of controlling for the variations in power and functions across metropolitan areas than measures that relied on the absolute or relative measure of governments. The MPDI calculated the sum of the square root of each municipality's percentage of metropolitan expenditures, while Lewis used the sum of the square percentage. The MPDI provides a rough estimate of

\begin{equation}
(1-SSP) \text{ is interpreted as the probability that the same unit of government did not spend two randomly selected dollars of expenditure. Multiplying (1-SSP)*TE effectively weights the measure by the total capacity of local government, providing a rough approximation of differences in power and functional responsibility (Lewis 1996, 51)}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
^{41} \text{Mitchell-Weaver, Clyde, David Miller, and Ronald Deal. (2000). Multilevel Governance and Metropolitan Regionalism in the USA. Urban Studies. 37. no. 5/6: 851-876.}
\end{equation}
local powers and responsibilities, but it does not explicitly consider the delegation of power between states, counties, and municipalities. As a result, the measure does not fully reflect state mandates or the distribution of state-local power that might increase local expenditures or state intergovernmental aid.

Stephen’s (1997)\textsuperscript{42} Index of State Centralization (SCI), calculated for 1957 and 1995, provides a measure of state power. The SCI incorporated three components: the services delivered by the state, the financial responsibility of the state for public services delivered by other levels of government, and state government personnel. These three components capture three important dimensions of the state government. Smaller states tend to have higher levels of centralization, but the SCI does not function as a proxy for the size of the state.

The Pakistan–based Mahbubul Haq Human Development\textsuperscript{43} Centre has recently come out with a \textit{Human Governance Index (HGI)} as ‘a composite index of indicators measuring economic, political and civic governance’. Although projecting its preliminary nature, the Centre has provided a quantitative measure to the complex, multifaceted concept of human governance should be in the South Asian region\textsuperscript{44}.

The United Nation Habitat \textit{had launched the Global Campaign on Urban Governance in 1999}, and developed the indicators to measure urban governance, or the ways citizens, public and private institutions manage the common affairs of their city. The \textit{Urban Governance Index} (UGI) has been created to answer to these needs (UNHabitat 2003)\textsuperscript{45}. The UN-Habitat has disaggregated this index into five principles of “good” governance, such as:

\begin{itemize}
\item Mahbubul Haq Dr. (1999). Human Development Centre in Pakistan
\item UN-Habitat (2003). Global campaign on urban governance. “Urban Governance Index: a tool to measure progress in achieving good urban governance”.
\end{itemize}
1. effectiveness (efficiency, subsidiarity, strategic vision),
2. equity (sustainability, gender equality, intergenerational equity),
3. accountability (transparency, rule of law, responsiveness),
4. participation (citizenship, consensus orientation, civic engagement), and
5. security (conflict resolution, human security, environmental safety).

In practice, the UGI embraces 16 indicators, which are based on factual data provided by municipalities and local governments, and grouped into the first four sub-indices (the security index was dropped for statistical reasons). This indicator can be useful to test for “correlation between the quality of urban governance and urban poverty reduction, city competitiveness and inclusiveness”. The UGI is planned to be refined through global initiatives, like surveys of 120 cities conducted mid-2005 to obtain a statistically valid global data base, and national efforts, to develop capacity for data collection. These indicators reveal the factors explaining the differences in governance processes and quality across regions, and therefore allow comparisons between cities in a country. They also promote participation, accountability and efficiency by helping “municipalities improve their functioning, engage more closely with the communities, and become more responsive and accountable”.

Pierre and Peters (2000) offer three models that depict the various relationships between government and the society: pluralism, corporatism, and corporate pluralism.

1. **Pluralism**, a familiar model in North America, assumes that government has relatively little direct involvement with interest groups. Government’s role is to establish the arenas through which groups work out their own political struggles, and to establish rules of the game and to frame how decisions are made. This model is consistent with traditional top-down notions of governance, in which government is relatively autonomous from interest groups and can therefore allow interest groups to struggle among themselves for ascendancy. Society is thus seen

---

in terms of a large, unorganized and relatively incoherent set of groups which have little systematic impact on government.

2. The second model, Corporateism assumes a much closer link between the state and the society. In this model, the government supports and encourages the functioning of some interest groups. These interest groups are accorded a legitimate role as representatives of their sector of the economy or society. The fundamental point is that only a limited number of actors can play the game, and those that do are bound closely to the state.

3. The third model, the corporate pluralist model falls somewhere between the other two. The basic feature of this model is that (like pluralism) a large number of actors are involved, but (like the corporate model) those actors are given a legitimate status for the purpose of influencing public policy. This pattern is observed in Norway and, to some extent in other Scandinavian countries where large numbers of interest groups are involved through advisory committees, petition processes and a variety of other participation mechanisms.

T.G.McGee and M.Robinson (1995)\(^\text{47}\), had developed the Mega-urban regions Governance Model: There are essentially four categories of mega-urban governance. These categories reflect attempts in other parts of the World to manage large metropolitan regions.

1. The first category, which can be called the Fragmented model, is characterized by a myriad of autonomous local government units, each with jurisdiction over a particular function and/or territory. There is sporadic and poor coordination among the various units. This model is the most typical of the American approach to metropolitan governance, though some examples exist in developing countries as well.

2. A second category, which can be termed the mixed model, encompasses regional governance approaches in which both central and local government play a role in

the administration of a region. This approach is typical of most mega-urban regions in developing countries, including the case of Bangkok.

3. A third form of administration is the **Centralized model**. This model, still found in transitional societies such as Vietnam, is dominated by a central government.

4. Finally, we should mention the **Comprehensive Metropolitan Governance model**, although no pure examples of this approach currently exist in developing countries. In this model there is either a single coordinating governance unit for the whole mega-urban region or a two-tier system in which local governments (or municipalities) perform a number of local functions, but cede to a higher metropolitan (sub national) authority the performance of region-wide functions.

### 2.4.1. Models of Governance Institutional Structures

A pragmatic approach is suggested by Webster, Cai, Maneepong (2006)\(^4\). Metropolitan governance around the Globe varies according to key characteristics. For example, metropolitan governance in the USA gives a major role to ‘civil society’ and ‘civic organizations’ as core agents in management of metropolitan space. In East Asia, the focus is put on fiscal considerations and arrangements (e.g. Tokyo). In Canada, the metropolitan issues revolve around ‘service delivery’ and incorporation of the disadvantaged groups into mainstream society.

In Europe, the main question is how to integrate urban physical structure and transportation systems to achieve energy, environmental and aesthetic objectives and to integrate metropolitan systems into European-wide economic and transportation/logistics systems. Economic development is key in many US metropolitan systems (e.g. Chicago and Phoenix) as well as in Britain (London, Glasgow).

In metropolitan regions, governance systems are even more important. Bird and Slack (2007) discuss four alternative models of metropolitan governance.49

(i). Unicities or one-tier model;
(ii). Two-tier model;
(iii). Voluntary co-operation, and
(iv). Special purpose districts

(i). Unicities or one-tier governments: a single local government is responsible for providing the full range of local services and has a geographic boundary that covers the entire urban area. In the one-tier model, which is common in the United States, a single level of local government is responsible for providing all local services. Most American cities organized in this way are highly fragmented. For example, the Chicago Metropolitan Area has 464 local governments (counties, municipalities, townships) and in Houston, Texas, the central city is surrounded by 790 governments and overlapping special districts. One-tier models are also found in other countries, such as Caracas (Venezuela) and Bogota (Colombia) and Shanghai (China), although in most cases such cities are ‘consolidated’ one-tier structures. In Shanghai, for instance, although there is essentially a one-tier government, within that tier there are three levels of management – municipal, district, and sub-district.

In India, Mumbai has been characterized as a “fragmented one tier structure” (Slack, 2007, p. 15)50. Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai itself has seven administrative zones, each zone consisting three to five wards and own municipal officials, and the surrounding eastern and western suburbs are also divided into wards. Within the Mumbai Urban Agglomeration, however, in addition to the municipal corporations of Mumbai, Kalyan and New Mumbai, there is the Mumbai Metropolitan Region Development Authority, 16 municipal towns, 7 non-municipal urban areas, and 995 villages. Moreover,
management of urban services in Mumbai is divided among the Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai, the state of Maharashtra, and the Government of India. For example, the urban rail network is run by Indian Railways.

(ii). Two-Tier Governments: In the two-tier model, the lower tier is responsible for providing services having smaller geographical spread while the upper tier encompassing a larger geographical area provides services with corresponding geographical spread as well as those involving significant economies of scale. This model has some characteristics that make it suitable for large metropolitan regions. Examples may be found, for instance, in Madrid (Spain), Santiago (Chile), and Manila (Philippines), and the two-tier model was adopted in London (U.K.) in 2002. Two-tier structures already exist in many Indian cities. For example, Hyderabad Municipal Corporation has 11 municipalities, Chennai Municipal Corporation has 36 municipalities, and Kolkata has 41 municipalities within its area (Bandyopadhyay and Rao, 2009).

(iii). Voluntary co-operation: The third approach to governing metropolitan regions is the voluntary cooperation model, which essentially consists of an area-wide body based on voluntary cooperation among different municipalities with no permanent institutional structure. Examples of such arrangements may be found in Bologna (Italy), Marseilles (France), Vancouver (Canada), and Sao Paulo (Brazil).

(iv). Special purpose districts: The fourth governance model for public service delivery in large metropolitan areas is the setting up of specialised agencies. Specialised agencies can provide similar municipal services to several municipalities while minimising unit costs and ensuring efficiency in service provision. In the United States, where such specialised agencies are particularly important, one third of all local governments are school districts.
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In India, specialised agencies for providing water supply, waste management and transportation across a number of municipalities already exist.

As Slack (2007) notes, for example, in recent years a number of major cities have changed their governance model. Toronto moved from a fragmented one-tier structure to a two-tier structure and then, most recently a consolidated single-tier structure. On the other hand, London moved from a two-tier structure to a one-tier structure and then, most recently, back to a two-tier structure. Cape Town (South Africa) moved within a very few years from having no metro government at all to first a two-tier and then a consolidated one-tier metropolitan structure.

Marino Pinto (2000)\(^\text{52}\) had revealed that four major types of administrative structure could be found in the context of Indian cities with respect to the division of responsibilities which are discussed briefly hereunder:

\(a\) The Weak Mayor-Council Structure- In this structure, the Mayor can recommend legislation and has policy making functions while administrative functions are vested in a Council through an elaborate committee system. Both the Mayor and Council as well as local officials are elected.

\(b\) The Strong Mayor Council Structure- This is similar to the earlier structure, but the Mayor and the Council are directly elected. Here, the Mayor assumes supreme control over administration and goes synonymous with presidential form of political governance. The Mayor is powerful as he combines political as well as administrative leadership and the Council becomes a scrutinizing body of his/her actions, policies and programmes.

\(c\) The Commissioner System - type of administrative structure that was borne out of the experience of city of Galveston, Texas, USA. A commission is made in charge of city affairs with the Commissioners acting as full time paid administrators and legislators. It works efficiently in a small city, but is not considered suitable to large cities, given the
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\(^{52}\) Pinto, M. R. (2000), Metropolitan City Governance in India. Sage Publications. New Delhi.
weaknesses of inability to cope with pressures as well as complexities in development and administration

(d) The Council – Manager System - under this system, the elected Council is responsible for policy making as well as administration, under a professional manager, who is responsible to the council. The Manager is appointed by the Council and serves during his tenure with the elected body being the deliberative, reviewing, annulling and monitoring body.

The three major metropolitan cities of India – Mumbai, Delhi and Chennai – have adopted a Commissioner led administrative system with the Council as political wing, which has also been followed by many cities in India; only Kolkata has adopted Mayor in Council administration system.

2.5. Metropolitan Spatial Planning Framework

In a review of various definitions of planning from an evolutionary perspective, Alexander (1993)\(^{53}\) observes that conceptualizations of planning like many of its counterparts in public policy domain suffer from problems of generalization and imprecision. He notes how planning as a concept as evolved from being conceived as a generic human behavior, to include aspects such as, offering rational choices, future orientation, control of future actions and implementation. By evaluating what is ‘not planning’ such as individualized, routine, present-oriented, trial and error, utopian activities, he defines planning as, “the deliberate social or organizational activity of developing an optimal strategy of future action to achieve a desired set of goals, for solving novel problems in complex contexts and attended by the power and intention to commit resources and to act as necessary to implement the chosen strategy”. Alexander’s definition as he himself acknowledges, is both abstract and universal as against other definitions that view planning from ‘what’ planners do in specific institutional contexts at a given place and time (ibid.:73).

Friedmann (1987)\textsuperscript{54} defines modern planning practice as a social and political process in which many actors, representing many different interests, participate in a refined division of labour. In this sense, planning is one element in the public domain understood as a territorially based system of social relations that are typically organized as political systems with their institutions of governance, legal and constitutional framework, political culture and other agents of governance such as political parties, interest groups and citizens.

Healey (2003)\textsuperscript{55} considers planning as, “a governance activity occurring in complex and dynamic institutional environments shaped by wider economic, social and environmental forces that structure, but do not determine specific interactions”. By ‘governance’ Healy means the processes by which societies and social groups manage their collective affairs.

Within the framework of urban governance, spatial planning is defined as a process by which land use and development plans for areas or regions are formulated and implemented. Broadly, it comprises of two types (Cousin 2002)\textsuperscript{56}:

- Statutory planning: The process of formulating predominantly legal instruments such as policies and zoning schemes for land use, land development and regulation of built environment.
- Strategic spatial planning: The process of investigating multiple factors affecting the patterns of growth, trends and dynamics of an area, particularly economic, infrastructure, social and environmental conditions and requirements and proposing strategic spatial interventions for attaining specific objectives.

Spatial planning involves ‘critical thinking about space and places as the basis for action or intervention’, according to the Royal Town Planning Institute’s New Vision for


Planning (RTPI, 2007)\(^7\). A recent RTPI commissioned research (UCL and Deloitte, 2007: 1)\(^8\) suggests that ‘spatial planning is the practice of space shaping and delivery at the local and regional levels that aims to:

- enable a vision for future regions and places that is based on evidence, local distinctiveness and community derived objectives;
- translate the vision into a set of policies, priorities, programmes and land allocations together with the public resources to deliver them;
- create a framework for private investment and regeneration that promotes economic, environmental and social well being for the area; and
- coordinate and deliver the public sector components of the vision with other agencies and processes.’

Shaw and Nadin (1996)\(^9\) further elaborated; spatial planning refers to the methods used largely by the public sector to influence the future distribution of activities in space. It is undertaken with the aim of producing a more rational organization of activities in space, including the linkages between them; and to balancing development with the need to protect the environment.

The objectives of spatial planning (balancing development, protecting the environment, etc) have been omitted from this definition as these will vary according to the locality. The idea of spatial planning acting always to create a more rational organisation of spatial structure, has been omitted in recognition that planning is a social and political process and not simply a technical one (Healey, 1997)\(^0\). In practice the term spatial planning is

---


actually being used in very different ways. There are three main contexts in which the term spatial planning is used:

- as a generic term to describe all physical/land use/territorial planning systems (spatial planning systems);
- as a specific term to describe a method of coordinating the spatial dimension of sectoral policies (spatial planning-sectoral coordination);
- the name of the system of physical/land use/territorial planning in a particular country (spatial planning-country system)

The Committee on Urban Management of Bangalore City (1997) had conceived planning is by far the most important tool for coming with the increasing demands made by the growth of the city on housing, infrastructure and amenities. In the absence of proper planning, the city experience infrastructural inadequacies and degeneration and the authorities are driven to finding ‘ad-hoc’ solutions and crisis management from time to time in respect of many of the city’s requirements, to meet which advance action had not been taken. Planning is important for rising public confidence and morale. Furthermore, planning helps to smoothen the relationship between the elected representatives and the official in charge of the city. Residents of the city routinely and quite rightly blame the ‘absence of planning’ or ‘poor planning’ for everything from congestion on the roads to poor sanitation and water supply.

The National Commission on Urbanization (NCU) identifies that the main spatial problem that the country is currently facing is excessive concentration of economic activities in a few metropolitan centers or metro-regions. This trend has given rise to irrational population distribution, generating spatial imbalances. Keeping the above in view, the NCU recommends that the spatial planning strategy during the time-frame of this policy shall be as under:
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• Selective channelization of labour intensive economic activities to second–order settlements (After the metropolitan cities) in the spatial hierarchy

• Selective concentration of socio-economic activities and related infrastructure in central villages and small and medium sized towns, depending upon their potential, functional specialization and hierarchy in the regional spatial system, with a view to equipping them to play a role in absorbing new migrants, help reduce the cost of urbanization and energy consumption, and maintain a desirable rural-urban continuum.

• Progressive realization of the long-term goal of balanced spatial and economic development through spatial development strategies and urbanization policies.

**Priorities Recommended by the NCU:** In an attempt suggest the ‘future urban settlement pattern’ the National Commission on Urbanization has recommended a few priority programmes and coined a number of acronyms to designate them, such as:

1. **GEMs:** Cities Generation Economic Momentum (329) in number comprising:
   - NPCs: National Priority Cities (77)
   - SPCs: State Priority Cities (252) and

2. **SPURs:** Spatial Priority Urbanization Regions (49)

Spatial Patterns of Urban Development – The National Commission on Urbanization (NCU) has expressed concern about excessive and unfettered growth of metropolitan cities and absence of ‘Selective discrimination and the need for a polynodal physical social structure’ it has not considered the feasibility of various spatial patterns of urban development such as:

An integrated development of small and medium towns (IDSMT)

- growth center strategy
- New towns concepts
- Development corridors and
- A ‘single counter-magnet’ to a major metropolis
Urban Rural Nexus - As per the National Commission on Urbanization (NCU), urbanization involves following two closely related aspects:

- People – work relationship in rural areas in terms of space and activity
- Capacities of urban settlement of non-agricultural employment, that is secondary and tertiary sector

2.6. Metropolitan Service Delivery Framework

There has been considerable debate in India about the quality of public services delivery. Services delivery in India remains poor as a whole, however, a national survey of major public services by Public Affairs Centre conducted that India did well in terms of providing basic access to such services, but far less well in terms of ensuring their quality, reliability and effectiveness (Public Affairs Centre, 2002). In absence of resources, fragmentation of schemes, and increasing stress on services, the quality of basic services is declining. Even the increasing coverage of infrastructure is not matched by improvement in the service levels. The failures in urban service delivery are caused by overlapping of policy, regulation and operational roles; fragmentation and duplication; limited autonomy to Urban Local Bodies (ULBs); weak links with citizens; lack of capacity; lack of incentives; etc.

The vision of the National e-Governance plan is to:

“Make all Government services accessible to the common man in his locality, through common service delivery outlets and ensure efficiency, transparency & reliability of such services at affordable costs to realize the basic needs of the common man”

The National Mission Mode Project (NMMP) for municipalities is one of the Mission Mode Projects that has significant citizen interaction, since municipalities provide a large number of basic services for millions of citizen living in India’s urban centers. NMMP envisages implementation of various application modules covering the following services/management functions within ULBs:

1. Registration and issue of birth and death certificate
2. Payment of property tax, Utility Bills and Management of Utilities that come under ULBs: Property Tax and Water Supply and other Utilities
3. Grievances and suggestions
4. Building plan approvals
5. Procurement and monitoring of projects: e-procurement and Project/ward works
6. Heath program: Licenses and Solid Waste Management
7. Accounting system

Singh A.K. (Dr.) (2006) had pointed out that, the instrument for improving service delivery include:

i. promoting competition,
ii. simplifying transactions,
iii. restructuring agency process,
iv. decentralization;
vi. building political support for programme delivery;
v. strengthening accountability mechanisms, etc.

It is the general assumptions that competition improves service delivery outcomes. Simplifying transactions through greater use of e-governance made easier for citizens to interact with the state governments. Similarly, restructuring agency processes involved change on several dimensions. Decentralization and strengthening of local governments have improved the functioning of public services in effective and efficient manner. Again, reducing premature transfers, fostering access to information, checking corruption through generating public pressure and public interest litigation may ensure accountability.

63 Dr. Awadhesh Kumar Singh (2006). Restructuring of Municipal Services in India. Regional Centre for Urban and Environmental Studies (RCUES). Lucknow.
In order to remove road blocks in delivery of urban services, three types of triggers offer the potential for inducing reform in urban governance and service delivery by Savage and Dasguptha (2006)\textsuperscript{64}

- The first trigger could be fiscal flows.
- Second, decentralization has potential to spark change and create incentives for ensuring accountability in delivery of services.
- A third set of triggers would come from the demand side, essentially by making service providers directly accountable.

Stein (1993)\textsuperscript{65} had noticed that, the contemporary research on service delivery has been preoccupied with the issue of privatization. The real potential for increased efficiency in the delivery of local government services may lie in matching specific services to the best mode of delivery for that service, given the characteristics of the municipality. Different goods and services are more effectively and efficiently provided by different modes of service arrangement. The question is not whether one sector is more widely used than another, but whether governments effectively have matched their service responsibilities with the appropriate method of service arrangement.

Improving the level of basic service delivery is partly a question of resources but it is also a question of governance and allocation (Stren 2007)\textsuperscript{66}. Most metropolitan areas are characterized by multiple municipalities each delivering services within their own jurisdiction. The majority of urban services (transportation, water, solid waste, and housing etc) spill over these municipal boundaries.

The literature indicates there is potential in each of these approaches. It is important to fit the mechanism for delivery to the service type. In his review of fifty years of evidence on


the relationship between the structure and performance of local governments, Bish (2001) suggests:

… given the diversity of communities and local services, no single organization can perform all the tasks demanded of local government. Metropolitan areas composed of a multiplicity of local governments and production arrangements are more responsive to residents’ needs and generally provide local government services at less cost than monolithic amalgamations.

Joassart-Marcelli, P and Juliet Musso (2005) investigate the decision of municipal governments to outsource the provision of public services during the 1980s and 1990s—a period of increased responsibility for municipalities. This study extends previous empirical work on outsourcing by distinguishing the type of outsourcing used (e.g., public, private, or other types of providers) and treating the outsourcing decision as a dynamic choice. Institutional characteristics and fiscal stress are found to play an important role in explaining service choices. Multinomial logistic regressions indicate that outsourcing was more common for poor cities than for wealthier ones, with the former often relying on government agencies and the latter opting for privatization. Throughout time, these choices are likely to reinforce inter-jurisdictional patterns of disparity in service quality and costs.

Nelson, M. A. (1997). Municipal governments are less likely to contract out for service delivery if citizen preferences for the service are heterogeneous. This conclusion is based on an analysis that extends to the public sector the empirical industrial organization literature on transaction costs and the “make or buy” decision faced by private firms. Service delivery practices for sixty-three municipal services are examined. The findings are consistent with the proposition that the cost of writing and monitoring contracts may
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be an important consideration in municipal service delivery approach and that bureaucratic supply may not be as inefficient as some previous studies indicate.

Some of the elements of pro-poor water have been identified under pro-poor water and sanitation Governance, Shelter for all: United Nations Human Settlements Programme, UN-Habitat (2008)⁷⁰:

- Governance
- Demand assessment
- Willingness-to-pay assessment
- Pro-poor cost recovery (affordability) mechanisms and pricing mechanisms
- Rights-based approach to service delivery
- Demand management
- Water education and conservation

Integrate infrastructure with environmental health strategy and behavior change, Partner with NGOs, Use appropriate technical and technological solutions, Do active monitoring of projects and Cost-effectiveness, Institutional Considerations, Operational Considerations

A set of recent studies on India have documented successful experiments in making service delivery effective without collective action playing a role, and without necessarily enhancing social accountability (Chand 2006)⁷¹. A variety of factors – political and institutional – have contributed to these successes, not all of which are or have been sustainable in the longer term.

Provision of municipal services is a continuing challenge for municipal governments in developing countries. It is imperative to strengthen municipal governments' capacity to
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deliver these services. In December 1997, Asian Development Bank (ADB)\textsuperscript{72} initiated a regional technical assistance - Enhancing Municipal Services Delivery Capability or Benchmarking Project - Phase 1, to examine the use of modern management techniques such as Benchmarking and Continuous Improvement.

Phase 1 established that Benchmarking and Continuous Improvement techniques are useful to:

- **improve quality and coverage of services:** The City of Colombo, Sri Lanka, updated its by-laws relating to littering and dumping and promoted awareness through media. Colombo Municipal Council identified food safety and city beautification as their key services to be improved.

- **promote customer orientation:** Cebu City of the Philippines established a new Customer Service Center and put-up public radio broadcasts for complaints. Cebu City agreed with its satellite cities in the Philippines to improve and benchmark services on acquisition of land for socialized housing and procurement procedures. Cebu City also has some 60 internal service improvements on-going. To support its efforts, the City has established the Service and Procedure Rationalization in Government (SPRING) Office to act as its resource center.

In the *White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery (Batho Pele)*\textsuperscript{73} Government Gazette 18340, 1 October 1997) the South African government committed itself to honouring eight principles in service delivery including the following:

- consultation: citizens should be consulted on the level and quality of services they receive
- service standards: citizens should be told what level and quality of public services they will receive so that they are aware what they can expect
- information: citizens should be given full information about the public services they are entitled to.


\textsuperscript{73} South Africa. (1997). *White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery.* (Batho Pele)
• openness and transparency: citizens should be told how national and provincial departments are run.

Some of the recommendations of Dr. Kasturirangan’s Committee Report

The Committee recognizes that a paradigm policy shift from the previous focus on city level urban local government to a metropolitan level institution was a necessary first step for enabling better strategic planning and co-ordination, to address Bangalore’s multiple challenges. The constitutional provisions of MPC need to be constituted. The committee observes that constitution of DPCs within the MPC might not be necessary. The BMRDA act as a technical secretariat of MPC and BDA need to be merged along with BBMP create separate planning wing. BWSSB’s and BMTC jurisdiction should be enlarged to cover the whole BMR. BMLTA should be accountable to MPC to review plans prepared by the urban and per-urban transport systems.

Some of the functions enlisted in the 12th Schedule of 74th CAA need to be included in Karnataka Municipal Corporation act 1976. Other relevant laws such as the Karnataka Land Reforms Act and the Karnataka Panchayat Raj Act should also be amended to restrict or eliminate the scope of development permissions granted by rural local bodies or revenue authorities within the BMR. Land acquisition for industrial purposes within the BMR should be within the regulatory domain of the MPC and necessary amendments should be incorporated in the KIADB Act to actualize this.


The Bangalore Region Governance Act (BRGA), 2009 It is considered necessary to provide for a model of governance wherein the urban citizen will be the central focus of governance. The model will also provide for a structure of governance that is responsive, transparent, accountable and citizen centric.

The BRGA, 2009 proposes to enact a comprehensive new Bangalore Legislation that supersedes/ encompasses all Bangalore/Municipal body legislations like BWSSB Act, BBMP Act etc\textsuperscript{75} which is explained in detail in the following paragraphs.

The Jurisdiction structure and the respective planning authorities and nodal agencies according to the new legislation by the BRGA, 2009, BMR will become the Local Planning area for Bengaluru and all the previous LPAs will be abolished. Jurisdictions for BWSSB, BMTC, BESCOM to be re-drawn to extend to the BMR Area. There will be one common shared Spatial Database which will be a basis for all planning in BMR Area and will reflect BMRDP and all Master Plans for which BMRDA will be responsible.

Focuses on Draft **Bangalore Metropolitan Governance (BMG) Bill, 2010**\textsuperscript{76}. All local authorities come under Bangalore Metropolitan Region (BMR) i.e. Bangalore Urban District, and Bangalore Rural District and Ramanagaram District. Draft bill commonly dealt with constitution of MPC, other committees and authorities. Constitution of Metropolitan Planning Board, Sectoral Committees, Bangalore Metropolitan Traffic and Transportation Authority, Bangalore Metropolitan Urban Art and Heritage Authority and Constitution of Municipal Corporation, municipalities and councils.

The BMG Bill mainly focused their it is necessary to provide for several consequential amendments to the following legislations, Karnataka Town and Country Planning Act, 1961, Bangalore Metropolitan Region Development Authority Act, 1985, Bangalore Development Authority Act, 1976, Karnataka Municipal Corporation Act, 1976, Karnataka Municipalities Act, 1964, Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964, Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board Act, 1964 and Karnataka Industrial Development Board Act, 1966 etc.

**Sivaramakrishnan K.C. (2009)**\textsuperscript{77}, had evaluated the current hierarchical model is neither sacred nor eternal. Today there are 35 cities or agglomerations whose total population, if governance restructuring isn't done, the current scheme of various agencies and split accountability will need complete restructuring to bring accountability.

\textsuperscript{75}Draft Bangalore Metropolitan Governance Bill-2010. Incorporating governance recommendations of the ABIDe Task Force as well as the Dr. Kasturirangan’s Committee

\textsuperscript{76}If governance restructuring isn't done, the current scheme of various agencies and split accountability will need complete restructuring to bring accountability.

According to the 2001 Census, exceeds 100 million, which is about 37 per cent of India’s total urban population of 285 million. By 2011, the number of such cities has increased to 53. For the present, let us just consider a few of them such as Mumbai, Kolkata, Delhi, Hyderabad, Bangalore and Chennai. None of these are a single municipality.

- The Mumbai Metropolitan Region covers seven municipal corporations, 13 municipal councils, 17 urban centers and several hundred urbanizing villages spread over four districts.
- Kolkata has over 60 municipal and non-municipal entities.
- Hyderabad, even after the recent amalgamation of 12 municipalities, is still a region of many jurisdictions.
- The Bangalore region covers the recently expanded city, 11 other municipalities and numerous panchayats.

2.7. Summary

The outline of this chapter is review of literature on good urban governance, metropolitan governance, and various metropolitan governance models supported by case examples. Followed by institutional structure of selected cities in Indian and abroad, reforms & initiatives and metropolitan spatial planning & service delivery. Based on the various literatures review, the key argument put forward is how spatial planning and service delivery effect on governing of metropolitan cities.