

**Impact of Infrastructure and Governance Transformations on
Small, Medium and Big Cities in India**

**Infrastructure and Governance
Transformation of IHSDP in Lunglei Town**

By

Dr. Kanagaraj Easwaran,
Associate Professor and Head,
Department of Social work

Ms. Priscilla Jahau
Research officer

School of Social Sciences,
Mizoram University, Aizawl

Project in Charge

Dr. Lalitha Kamath and Smita Waingankar
School of Habitat Studies, TISS

**Centre for Urban Policy and Governance,
School of Habitat Studies,
Tata Institute of Social Sciences,
Mumbai**

August 2015

ICSSR Sponsored Research

Content

Introduction

I Profile of Lunglei Town

II Slums and Houselessness in Lunglei Town

III Implementation of IHSDP in Lunglei Town

IV Implementation of IHSDP at Community Level

V Beneficiary Contribution, Construction of House, and Community Support

VI Infrastructure Development under IHSDP

VII Conclusion

Tables

Table 1 : Magnitude of Houselessness in Lunglei: Distribution of Households across the Slum and Non- slum Localities

Table 2 : Magnitude of Houselessness in Lunglei: Distribution of Population across the Slum and Non- slum Localities

Table 3: Distribution of Beneficiaries by Area of Dwelling under IHSDP

Table 4: Tenure Status of Residents and Distribution of HHs by living rooms in Lunglei

Table 5: Housing Condition across the Localities of Lunglei

Table 6 : Pattern of Distribution of Houseless Households and Beneficiaries across Localities

Table 7: Components of Funds Released under IHSDP

Table 8: Approximate Monthly Income

Table 9: Challenged among Beneficiaries

Table 10 : Ownership of House before Allotment

Table 11: Infrastructure Development under IHSDP

Annexure :

Key Informants used for the case studies

References

Infrastructure and Governance Transformation of IHSDP in Lunglei Town

Introduction

Housing is one of the three basic human needs, next only to food and clothing. Housing is also the place where people in general fulfill their basic domestic and personal needs of life. Housing standards do reflect the attitudes, and values of a nation towards human habitation. It assumes such a significant value in human society because it is place where all major moments of human life cycle viz., birth, growth and death take place by and large. It is a place where a human being is transformed into social being (Hmar and Kanagaraj 2007). It also provides economic and social security, and constitute an “asset” that can act as collateral for other borrowings (Fulwari 2012:1).

Housing is an essential element in the overall socio-economic development of the country and its citizens, and for the satisfaction of social and cultural aspirations of the people (Standing Committee on Urban Development (2008-2009). Further, provision of housing has a profound influence on the health, efficiency and social well-being of people (Nayar1997, Vagale, 1968: 416). The housing condition in a country has positive effect on the levels of public health, while having negative relation with the crime rate. It is also indirectly contributing to labor productivity in the economy through general morale of the workers (Kaur 2013: 11).

Housing shortage is major challenge to developing nations such as India. However, it is more an urban problem and product of poverty induced rural urban migration driven urbanization in the country. India is witnessing increasing levels of urbanization. Nearly one third of its population lives in cities and urban areas. It is double the level of urbanization at the time of independence in 1947 and it is projected to reach 50 per cent in 2030 (Fulwari 2012:1). Increasing levels of urbanization in the country has led to tremendous pressure on land, civic infrastructure, transport, open spaces, housing etc.

The magnitude of slum and squatter settlements is on the increase despite significant growth in housing stock in the urban areas. To meet the existing housing shortage, which primarily the problem of Economically Weaker Sections (EWS) and Lower Income Group

(LIG), more than 26 million housing units in urban areas were required by the end of financial year 2012 (Fulwari 2012:2). The Technical Group constituted by Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation in 2006 to assess the urban housing shortage in the country, had estimated that at the beginning of 11th Five Year Plan (2007-12), the urban housing shortage in India was 24.71 million. The Technical Group on Urban Housing Shortage for the 12th Plan (TG-12) has estimated the urban housing shortage as 18.78 million at the beginning of the 12th Plan Period i.e. 2012(GOI 2013).

The magnitude of housing problem in the urban areas of northeastern states of India is also alarming. These states together are facing a shortage of 0.68 million urban dwelling units, with Assam still topping the list despite recording a decrease since 2007. The urban housing shortage in the Northeast India has increased from 0.55 million units in 2007 to 0.68 million units in 2012. According to the report of the technical committee, set up by the government to estimate the urban housing shortage in the country, the highest urban housing shortage exists in Assam, followed by Nagaland and Manipur. Assam had an urban housing shortage of 0.28 million units, Nagaland 0.21 million units, Manipur 0.08 million units, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya and Tripura 0.03 million units each and Mizoram 0.02 million units. These households suffer from serious deprivation in terms of housing conditions.

As housing is recognised as a major challenge to urban policy and planning in India, there are a number of studies on urban housing problem in India. Some studies focus on the housing needs of urban poor in different urban areas (see Uplaonkar 1992, Mohan 1992, Bhatlacharya 1981). Some focus on the conditions of the urban homeless (see Jagmonhan 1981). Some others review housing choices of the urban poor (see for instance Bahri 1988). Some of the authors attempt to review the programmatic approaches of planning for urban housing (see for instance Basu 1989, Mehta 1981). There are a few studies evaluate the performance of centrally sponsored urban housing programmes in India such as basic services for urban poor (see Kamath 2012, Patel 2013) and Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (IHSDP) (Burte 2014 Burte, Bhide, Singh and Waingankar 2014).

In spite of growing literature on the housing policy and slum development programmes, there are hardly any studies on the housing problem or policy conducted in the context of north east India or one of its most urbanized state i.e. Mizoram. This present study has taken up such

task to examine the implementation of the Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme in the Mizoram. It forms part of a larger four-state study examining the impact of infrastructure and governance transformations of the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) and its Sub-Missions in eight Indian cities.

In line with the larger project, this case study takes the housing sector as the focus of study, examining in particular the role that the Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (IHSDP) has played in this sector. The IHSDP is a centrally sponsored programme for improving the housing conditions of poor in small and medium towns in India. The scheme is implemented in all cities and towns as per 2001 Census excluding the cities/towns covered under Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) (GOI 2009). IHSDP is a component of JNNURM, a national programme for producing affordable housing for the urban poor in smaller, non-mission cities (Burte 2014). The main objective of the IHSDP is to strive for holistic slum development with a healthy and enabling urban environment by providing adequate shelter and basic infrastructure facilities to the slum dwellers of the identified urban areas. The target group under the scheme is the slum dwellers from all sections of the community through a cluster approach (GOI 2009). This is the first time that an integrated public housing programme was to be implemented in Lunglei; previous housing programmes by the Local Administration Department focused almost exclusively on providing subsidies to beneficiaries to build or upgrade their houses and did not include focus on infrastructure amenities.

The paper presents the case study of Lunglei town and explores the quantitative and qualitative achievements of the programme from the perspectives of the beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries, leaders of civil society organisations and political leaders. The present case study attempts to describe the full life cycle of projects and reforms within the housing sector to understand the outcomes for different groups especially poor groups, the processes responsible for such outcomes, and the corresponding socio-politico-technical changes in governance of the urban local body (ULB) and implementing agency. It also explores the alignment between intention of the project, instruments used, implementation and outcomes and interrogates whether outcomes correspond to needs on the ground.

This case study is based on the secondary and primary data collected from Lunglei Town. The secondary data included the official documents and records of the district urban development

officer (DUDO) as Lunglei has no ULB. The fieldwork was undertaken during June – October 2014. The field work was conducted in 5 localities of the town. A total number of 29 interviews were conducted. Primary data was collected from the official's viz., District Urban Development Officer (DUDO), revenue department officials, village council presidents, leaders of civil society organisations, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries through key informant interviews.

The secondary information from the official statistics has been analysed with the help of percentages, ranks and correlation coefficients Pearson and Kendall's tau b were also used.

The present chapter is presented in seven sections. The first section presents the profile of the Lunglei Town. In the second section, a brief description on the slums and homelessness in Lunglei Town is presented. The process of Implementation of IHSDP in Lunglei Town is presented from an official perspective in the third section. In the fourth section, the process of implementation of IHSDP at Community Level is presented. The process of house construction and the contribution made by beneficiary households and role played by community are discussed in the fifth section. In the sixth section, the impact of IHSDP on the infrastructure development at community and city levels is described. Concluding observations are presented in the last section.

I

Profile of Lunglei Town

Lunglei is the second capital of the Mizoram state. It is the largest and the most important urban center in the Southern part of Mizoram. It serves as commercial and administrative center of the southern region of the state. The town is situated at 235 km from Aizawl, the state capital and at the heart of its district. The town lies at 92°45'E longitude & 22°53'N latitude. The altitude of the town varies from 650 to 1386m above MSL. It enjoys heavy rainfall and the climate is usually commodious compared to other towns.

Lunglei urban area comprises Zobawk in the South, Pukpui in the North & Hauruang in the west whereas the eastern land profile is not suitable for human habitation. These urban areas account for a substantial percentage of total urban population. They are suitably arranged along the ridges of hills where highway and other roads pass by, thereby having easy accessibility and potentialities forming linear type of settlement along the roads.

It is linked by NH-54 which passes through the length of the state. Bangladesh having a frontier length of 107 km bounds the western side of the district while Myanmar is in the eastern side measuring the international boundary of 25 km. The Indo-Bangla border trade is executed in its western side through Tlabung town.

Lunglei is the commercial and administrative headquarter of the southern part of Mizoram. The population of the town has increased rapidly since some decades, now accounting for more than 1,37,155 in the district at the growth rate of 23%. It is linked with all important towns, Aizawl city and many villages and acts as subsidiary commercial center in the state.

The topography of Lunglei region is undulating hilly surface except at some few areas. The town lies on an elliptical curve-like hill ranges. The inside areas from the top of the summit is occupied owing to its gentle slope whereas the outer one is uninhabitable due to its extremely descended features. The altitude of the town varies from 650 to 1386 m above mean sea level.

Since 1961, the neighbouring settlements have grown and widespread towards Lunglei town. Moreover, many remote and isolated villages were grouped together under compulsion shifted at some reasonable centers when an insurgency broke out in the state in 1966. Lunglei is one of such main centers. In 1972, Mizo district became Union Territory under the N.E Re-Organisation Act. This led to expansion of Lunglei Urban area since it is the subsidiary centers in the entire state of Mizoram and it attained full statehood in 1986 from Union Territory providing incentive to the villagers to shift their subsistence to urban areas. Lunglei town admits most numbers of villagers and gradually included the nearby villages who are seeking for better facilities required for development. At present, such inhabitants are spread over the area of Lunglei town: Kawmzawl in the North, Zobawk in the South, Hauruang in the West, identified as Lunglei Urban Agglomeration (LUA) in 2001 census.

LUA, which consists of different streets and villages, ensures different growth rate of people in each settlement, increment of every village is more than other towns of the state except Aizawl city. It is more in newly developed residential areas rather than the old villages/ town where it admits lesser immigrants due to the pre-congested contents. A certain number of new localities are established with new village Council administration. A hearth of the town despite the already high density of population also shows decline since the residential character

converted into trade and commerce zone (non- residential zone). There are also some localities with high density of population due to location advantage and high investment in that area. Hence, the pre 2001 census would have higher growth rate in the old areas whereas the new areas/ localities will experience higher growth rate than the same.

II

Slums and Houselessness in Lunglei Town

Slums in Lunglei

Before the implementation of IHSDP there were no localities in in Lunglei Town that were called as slums. However, there were a number of poor households having no house of their own and living in rented buildings. Realising this need for addressing the problem of houselessness and poor housing conditions of economically weaker sections, the DUDO held discussions with Officials of the Local Administration Department and Town & Country Planning Department and found the existence of slum- like localities that could be called as slums within the Urban Agglomeration. The slum-designated localities were Ramthar, Chanmari, Zotlang, Sazaikawn, Lungpuizawl and Hauruang. The DUDO identified these slum pockets for the sake of receiving benefits of Integrated Housing and Slum Development programme and other urban development programmes from the Central Government. They were very much aware of the fact that the nature of urban slums in other urban areas of India is qualitatively different from Lunglei and other urban areas in the state of Mizoram. This, however, meant that the slum-designated areas were not the only areas where residents had poor housing conditions and low access to infrastructure amenities, as shown by subsequent analysis.

For identification of these slum pockets, Census of India definition was adopted. According to it, “a slum is a cluster of compact settlement of 5 or more households, which generally grow very unsystematically and haphazardly in an unhealthy condition and atmosphere on government and private vacant land. Slums also exist in owner based household premises”. Additional criteria used for identification of the slum pockets included Poor quality of Housing, Absence of drainage facility, Non-availability of Sanitation facility, Non-availability of water

resources, Absence of Education facilities, Non-accessibility to roads/pathways, and Area being prone to landslide disaster.

In Lunglei these designated slum pockets consisting of poor or Below Poverty Line (BPL) families were scattered in the different localities of the town mainly in the outskirts. Many of the BPL families had land but could not construct their own houses and so they were living in rented houses. The families living in their own houses also had dilapidated houses. Many of the families also did not have proper toilet and bathroom. These pockets of poor families that were designated as slum pockets do not have proper access to infrastructure facilities. Some of the slum areas are shown in the following pictures.

The Problem of Houseless in Lunglei

The problem of housing in Lungeli town has three interrelated dimensions. They are related to houselessness, ownership tenure, inadequate space and poor structure.

The first dimension of the problem of housing in the town is that of houselessness. Though the poor and houseless are not concentrated in some localities of the Lunglei Town, the problem of poverty and houseless are very substantial and significant. The analyses of the data from survey conducted by UD&PA Department, Lunglei in 2008 shows 2867 households, with a population of 18,259 persons, as houseless. They constitute 27.93 per cent of the total households and 38 percent of population in the town (see tables 1 and 2).

**Table 1: Magnitude of Houselessness in Lunglei:
Distribution of Households across the Slum and Non- slum Localities**

No.	Ward/Village Council/ Locality	Type of Locality	No of Households	No. of occupied Residential Houses	Number of Houseless Households	Percent of Houseless Households
1	Zobawk	Non-Slum	629	595	34	5
2	Lungpuizawl	Slum	134	93	41	31
3	Hrangchalkawn	Non-Slum	141	88	53	38
4	Theiriat	Non-Slum	369	361	8	2
5	Sethlun	Non-Slum	141	122	19	13
7	Luangmual	Non-Slum	433	319	114	26
8	Lunglawn	Non-Slum	625	470	155	25
9	Salem	Non-Slum	291	197	94	32
10	Ramthar	Slum	737	461	276	37
11	FarmVeng	Non-Slum	351	224	127	36
12	Chanmari	Slum	1023	455	568	56
13	Electric Veng	Non-Slum	858	454	404	47
14	Venglai	Non-Slum	544	409	135	25
15	Rahsi Veng	Non-Slum	801	561	240	30
16	Venghlun	Non-Slum	380	260	120	32
17	Hauruang	Slum	243	234	9	4
18	Sazaikawn	Slum	89	43	46	52
19	College Veng	Non-Slum	217	169	48	22
20	Bazar Veng	Non-Slum	821	645	176	21
21	Zohnuai	Non-Slum	263	237	26	10
22	Serkawn	Non-Slum	411	322	89	22
23	Zotlang	Slum	450	381	69	15
24	Pukpui	Non-Slum	315	299	16	5
I	Slum Area		1960	1848	1009	38
II	Non-slum Area		8,306	5,551	1,858	24
III	Total Town		10,266	7,399	2867	28

Source: Computed from Survey conducted by UD&PA Department, Lunglei in 2008

**Table 2: Magnitude of Houselessness in Lunglei:
Distribution of Population across the Slum and Non- slum Localities**

No	Ward/Village Council Locality	Type of Locality	Total Population	Houseless Population	
				Number	Percent
1	Zobawk	Non-Slum	3092	432	14.0
2	Lungpuizawl	Slum	567	168	29.6
3	Hrangchalkawn	Non-Slum	647	335	51.8
4	Theiriat	Non-Slum	1892	144	7.6
5	Sethlun	Non-Slum	751	108	14.4
7	Luangmual	Non-Slum	1903	1580	83.0
8	Lunglawn	Non-Slum	2971	1115	37.5
9	Salem	Non-Slum	1300	571	43.9
10	Ramthar	Slum	3469	1472	42.4
11	FarmVeng	Non-Slum	1739	790	45.4
12	Chanmari	Slum	5014	2015	40.2
13	Electric Veng	Non-Slum	3725	2079	55.8
14	Venglai	Non-Slum	2277	1479	65.0
15	Rahsi Veng	Non-Slum	3680	1512	41.1
16	Venghlun	Non-Slum	1897	659	34.7
17	Hauruang	Slum	1158	123	10.6
18	Sazaikawn	Slum	380	196	51.6
19	College Veng	Non-Slum	1017	296	29.1
20	Bazar Veng	Non-Slum	3975	1748	44.0
21	Zohnuai	Non-Slum	1283	193	15.0
22	Serkawn	Non-Slum	2087	669	32.1
23	Zotlang	Slum	1791	410	22.9
24	Pukpui	Non-Slum	1457	165	11.3
I	Slum Area		9633	1165	12.1
II	Non-slum Area		38,439	17,094	44.5
III	Total Town		48072	18,259	38.0

Source: Computed from Survey conducted by UD&PA Department, Lunglei in 2008

The analysis also reveals that the extent of the houseless is greater in the slum designated areas as compared to that of the non- slum areas. In the slum area 38 percent of the households were houseless while in the non-slum area 25 percent of the households were houseless. Regarding the number of houseless persons 38 percent of those in non-slum areas were houseless while 35 percent of them in the slum designated localities were houseless (see tables 1 and 2). However, when the slum and non-slum areas are taken together, in the overall number of households and population of the Lunglei Town the proportion of the poor households was higher in the non-slum areas as compared that of slum areas. Over ninety five percent of the houseless households belong to the non-slum areas while only less than five percent of the houseless households belong to the slum areas; see given below table 3.

Table 3: Distribution of Beneficiaries by Area of Dwelling under IHSDP

No	Area	Houseless Households		Beneficiary Households	
		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
1	Non-slum	2755	96	366	72
2	Slum	112	4	141	28
	Total	2867	100	507	100

Source: Computed from Bio-metric Survey by UD & PA and Other Documents

The analysis of distribution of houseless revealed that majority of the households in the slum designated areas of Chanmari (56%), Saizaikawn (52%) were houseless while in Ramthar (37%) and Lungpuizawl (31%) nearly one third of the households were houseless. In Zotlang 15 percent of the households were reportedly houseless while in Hauuang only 4 percent of the households were houseless. Further we could notice the fact that the localities like Electric veng(47%), Hrangchalkawn (38%), Farmveng (36%), Salem(32%),Venghlun (32%), Rahsi veng (30%), Luangmual (26%) have more than one fourth of their households without house but they were not designated as slum areas (see tables 1 and 2). The selection of localities therefore seems to have been done in a hurried manner for practical purpose of submission of proposals and receiving funds.

Tenure status of the households in Lunglei is also an issue of concern. Nearly 50 percent of the residential households in the town are residing in rented or rent free houses. Most of the

households live in the houses with two or three rooms (see given below table 4).

Table 4: Tenure Status of Residents and Distribution of HHs by living rooms in Lunglei

No	Tenure Status	Distribution of Persons by HHs rooms					Number HHs	Percent
		One room	Two rooms	Three rooms	Four rooms	Five rooms		
1	Owned	260 (4.7)	2117 (38.2)	1812 (32.7)	795 (14.4)	552 (10.0)	5536 (100)	53.9
2	Rental	450 (11.1)	1774 (43.7)	1279 (31.5)	392 (9.7)	161 (4.0)	4056 (100)	39.5
3	Rent free	101 (15.0)	274 (40.7)	202 (30.0)	57 (8.5)	40 (5.9)	674 (100)	6.6
	Total	811 (7.9)	4165 (40.6)	3293 (32.1)	1244 (12.1)	753 (7.3)	10266 (100)	100

Source: Computed from records of UD and PA

In the Lunglei town, a third dimension to the housing problem is poor quality of housing. In the town only 44 percent households are living in permanent house buildings while about 56 percent households are living in either semi permanent (35%) or kuccha buildings (21%). This problem is as serious in the non-slum areas as in the slum areas. In the non- slum areas (46%) and slum areas(42%) of the households are only living in permanent housing structures while majority of the households are either living in semi permanent or kuccha houses; see below given table 5.

Table 5: Housing Condition across the Localities of Lunglei

Sl.No	Village Council	No. of Households	Existing Housing Condition		
			Permanent	Semi-Permanent/Improvement Required	Kuccha/New Construction Required
1	Zotlang	383 (100)	26 (7)	342 (89)	15 (4)
2	Sazaikawn	80	4	15	61

		(100)	(5)	(19)	(76)
3	Chanmari	996 (100)	520 (52)	433 (43)	43 (4)
4	Ramthar	850 (100)	350 (41)	250 (29)	250 (29)
5	Hauruang	510 (100)	255 (50)	0 (0)	255 (50)
6	Lungpuizawl	141 (100)	78 (55)	23 (16)	40 (28)
I	Slum Area	2960 (100)	1233 (42)	1063 (36)	664 (22)
II	Non-slum Area	4950 (100)	2255 (46)	1676 (34)	1019 (21)
	Total	7910 (100)	3488 (44)	2739 (35)	1683 (21)

Source: Computed from records of UD and PA

III

Implementation of IHSDP in Lunglei Town

Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (IHSDP) is a major project for economically weaker section (EWS). The Central Government sanctioned Rs. 621.41 lakhs in 2008 (Vide F.No.59 (7)/PF-1/2007-30 Dt. 29.4.2008) for implementation of IHSDP in Lunglei. The IHSDP programme was supposed to be implemented by the Lunglei Municipal council. As it has not been enacted yet the programme was implemented by the DUDO, an official of the Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation Department (UD&PA). The revised IHSDP guideline provided scope for implementing the scheme without constituting a municipal council. At the community level, however, the elected Village Councils (VCs) were involved in the implementation process.

The original plan of the UD&PA was to appoint a Contractor for constructing the houses by way of giving out a tender notice at the National Level. However, the State Level Co-ordination Committee decided to adopt the in Situ development model instead of cluster approach. Accordingly the work of overseeing project implementation was undertaken by the department while permitting each beneficiary to carry out the construction of his/her own house. The in situ model was adopted considering the cultural context of Mizo society. The committee members felt that concentrating the poor in one segmented area with the cluster approach was not socially desirable. They observed that the condition of the poor in the State is totally different from other

parts of India and nobody in Mizoram would like to be designated as a slum dweller. Practically, there are no slums in the state and the poor are not concentrated in a few areas like the metro cities of Mumbai, Kolkata or Chennai. Instead, they are scattered in the lower portion of different localities of the town. The members of the committee were afraid if the poor are concentrated in one area, income generation opportunities would not be available conflicts would rise and that particular locality would surely become a source of social evils such as selling and consumption of liquor and drugs, running a brothel, robbery, theft etc. They also felt that those people would be stigmatised by others. They also feared that those in authority and power would neglect these 'slum' groups because of their low social status.

The Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUDCO) prepared the detailed project report (DPR) for IHSDP in Lunglei under the supervision of the DUDO. There was time lapse between the formulation of DPR and the funds were actually released. In that time several families who had been selected as beneficiaries had moved out of the LUA while some had deceased. Additionally, the DUDO as well as VCs were aware that poor groups were scattered across localities of Lunglei and so the earlier beneficiary list consisting of beneficiaries only in 5 slum-designated areas would need to be revised. As such, the Department revised the beneficiary list, which had earlier been approved by the Government of Mizoram on 27th Oct. 2010 (Vide No. B, 11030/40/20080-UD&PA Dt. 27.10.2010). New beneficiaries of IHSDP consisted of deserving families from all localities of Lunglei town since the houseless poor households are scattered all over the town. In fact most of the houseless households were present in the non-slum areas, see table 6.

Table 6: Pattern of Distribution of Houseless Households and Beneficiaries across Localities

No	Name of Locality	Type of Locality	Houseless Households			Beneficiary Households		
			Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank
1	Ramthar	Slum	1472	8.1	7	52	10.3	1
2	Zobawk	Non-Slum	432	2.4	13	37	7.3	2
3	Electric Veng	Non-Slum	2079	11.4	1	33	6.5	3
4	Chanmari	Slum	2015	11.0	2	32	6.3	4

5	Rahsi Veng	Non-Slum	1512	8.3	5	31	6.1	5	
6	Bazar Veng	Non-Slum	1748	9.6	3	29	5.7	6	
7	Zotlang	Slum	410	2.2	14	27	5.3	7	
8	Farm Veng	Non-Slum	790	4.3	9	26	5.1	8	
9	Venghlun	Non-Slum	659	3.6	11	26	5.1	9	
11	Lunglawn	Non-Slum	1115	6.1	8	25	4.9	10	
10	Theiriat	Non-Slum	144	0.8	21	25	4.9	11	
12	College Veng	Non-Slum	296	1.6	16	23	4.5	12	
13	Pukpui	Non-Slum	165	0.9	20	23	4.5	13	
14	Serkawn	Non-Slum	669	3.7	10	20	3.9	14	
15	Venglai	Non-Slum	1479	8.1	6	19	3.7	15	
16	Hauruang	Slum	123	0.7	22	19	3.7	16	
17	Salem Veng	Non-Slum	571	3.1	12	13	2.6	17	
18	Zohnuai	Non-Slum	193	1.1	18	12	2.4	18	
19	Sethlun	Non-Slum	108	0.6	23	10	2.0	19	
20	Hrangchalkawn	Non-Slum	335	1.8	15	9	1.8	20	
21	Lungpuizawl	Slum	168	0.9	19	7	1.4	21	
22	Luangmual	Non-Slum	1580	8.7	4	5	1.0	22	
23	Sazaikawn	Slum	196	1.1	17	4	0.8	23	
	Total		18,259	100		507	100		
	Pearson Correlation Between Number of Houseless and Beneficiary Households								0.47*
	Kendall's tau_b between Ranks of Localities								0.38* *

Source: Computed from records of UD and PA *P< 0.05 **P<0.01

As soon as the Government approved the new Beneficiary List, a total of 60 dwelling units (DUs) were constructed in the 1st phase. In the 2nd phase, 100 DUs were constructed, 90 DUs in the 3rd phase and 58 DUs in the 4th phase. In the 5th phase, 164 DUs has been constructed and around 26 DUs are currently under construction.

Location of Projects

The beneficiaries were selected from across the slum designated and non-slum localities. They were spread across all the 23 localities of Lunglei Town. In fact most of the beneficiary households were from the non-slum localities (72 percent) while only a few beneficiary households (28 percent) was selected from slum designated localities in Lunglei Town viz., Ramthar, Chanmari, Zotlang, Sazaikawn, Lungpuizawl and Hauruang (see table 6).

Importantly, there was low level of correspondence found between the patterns of distribution of the houseless households and the distribution of beneficiaries across the 23 localities of the Lunglei town. This shows that there were other considerations in the selection of beneficiaries across the localities than the distribution of the houseless households or population. Electric Veng, Chanmari, Bazar Veng, Luangmual, Rahsi Veng, Venglai, and Ramthar constituted the top seven localities in terms of the number of houseless households while in the beneficiary list Ramthar, Zobawk, Electric Veng, Chanmari, Rahsi Veng, Bazar Veng, and Zotlang occupied the top seven positions in terms of the number of beneficiaries. The top seven localities in terms of the number of houseless households constituted 65 percent of the houseless households in the Lunglei Town while 47.5 percent of the beneficiaries were from these seven localities. On the other hand, Sazaikawn, Zohnuai, Lungpuizawl, Pukpui, Theiriat, Hauruang, and Sethlun localities occupied the lowest seven positions in terms of the number of houseless households with the share of 6 percent of the total houseless households in the Lunglei Town. In the beneficiary list localities like Salem Veng, Zohnuai, Sethlun, Hrangchalkawn, Lungpuizawl, Luangmual, Sazaikawn occupied the lowest positions in terms of the number of beneficiary households constituting about 12 percent of the beneficiaries. To see the level of fit between the actual number of houseless in localities and the number of beneficiaries Karl Pearson's coefficient of correlation was computed (see table 6). Though it was positive and significant at 5 percent level, magnitude of it was low (0.47). Further, to see the correspondence between the patterns of distribution of houseless and beneficiary households ordinal correlation measure of Kendall's tau_b was computed. It was significant at 1 percent level but substantially low (0.38).

IV

Implementation of IHSDP at Community Level

For selection of beneficiaries a selection board was formed constituting members from the Village Council (VC), Community Based Organisations viz., Young Mizo Association (YMA), Mizo Women Association (MHIP), UD&PA under the supervision of the District MLA. It consisted of 2 members each from the VC, YMA and MHIP. It functioned under the supervision of the UD & PA.

The criteria used for selection of beneficiaries included

1. The household should be enrolled in the Local Area Department (LAD) BPL List
2. It should be a resident of Lunglei at least for the past 5 years
3. It should own a land within the town area and hold LSC
4. It should be a resident of the identified slum pocket
5. It should be willing to pay beneficiary contribution

There are three interrelated problems found in the process of beneficiary selection in the perception of the community leaders. They are concerning the nature of involvement of the members of civil society organisations, strong involvement of the branch of the ruling party and allegations of lack of fairness in the selection.

The first problem encountered in the process of selection of beneficiaries was nominal or no involvement of community based organisations viz., Young Mizo Association (YMA), Mizo Women Association (MHIP) etc. One informant representing a CBO alleged that they were not included in the Selection Board and did not have much knowledge about IHSDP. Another told that as their involvement didn't count for anything, they practically excluded themselves from the Selection Board and even when a joint meeting of the CBOs was called for the selection of beneficiaries, they did not participate nor attend it. Yet another leader reported that they have not been involved much in the EWS selection process. Even though they were included in the selection board, their voices were often ignored. He also reported that CBOs wanted the beneficiaries to be only those deserving ones, not necessarily the people who are associated with the ruling party. Another leader said that in the beginning the MHIP and other CBOs were included in the Selection Board and together they have selected 30 beneficiaries. But the Department has reduced it to 7 and then the ruling party unit took over and without consulting they selected the beneficiaries from among its party members. She felt that they were included in the selection board for name sake only so that the ruling party would not have a bad reputation.

In spite of the fact that Mizo villages and urban localities have a vibrant civil society represented by associations of youth (YMA), women (MHIP) and elderly (MUP); its representatives have not been properly involved in governance or development. Civil society groups were in fact sidelined by the branches of the ruling party in the selection process. Though they were not officially part of the selection board, it seems that ruling party branches had a greater say in the beneficiary selection. There were reported instances where even the village

council president was side lined along with the CBOs when he belonged to the opposition party and the branch of the ruling party in the locality selected the beneficiaries.

The nominal involvement of Civil Society organisations and leading role played by the local branch of the ruling party is cited as a reason for rejection of most deserving poor households by the leaders of these CBOs. One of the leaders of the community based organisations said that even though they were included in the selection of beneficiaries, they did not make any contribution as decision was practically undertaken by the ruling party unit and the members of the village council. The selection process was highly politicized. Another said the selection of beneficiaries was undertaken by the VC and the ruling Unit (Indian National Congress) alone, giving preference and showing favoritism to the members of their party. One of the leaders said that there were many deserving families who were not selected. The deserving families that were selected were around 9/10 families only out of the 21 families that were getting the funds from their locality. He alleged that those who were members and were associated with the ruling party regardless of their economic status were given the housing fund. Another CBO leader in another community felt that all the beneficiaries were from BPL households but some lived well enough and even without getting the funds, would surely be able to construct a house on their own. Only one CBO leader felt that all the beneficiaries were really the deserving ones.

Besides leaders of civil society, some non-beneficiaries reported that politicisation of the beneficiary selection had resulted in unfair selection of beneficiaries. One of the members of houseless poor household said that the VC and the ruling party unit had the power to select anyone whom they favoured and there was nothing that they could do. Another non-beneficiary said that they were selected in the beneficiary list in the beginning but were excluded from the list by the leaders of the ruling party unit. Yet another non-beneficiary reported that there were few who were well connected to officials and they got the funds.

Beneficiaries who actually benefitted from the scheme also reported the problem of undeserving getting the benefits under IHSDP. One informant said that there were certain economically stable people getting the funds. Among such were two of the VC members; though there were no government employees in their family, they are still financially stable and already owned a concrete building while there were still many deserving BPL families who did not get the fund. Another beneficiary felt that there were also some other Government employees getting

the housing fund. These ‘rich people’ utilised the fund for constructing a farm house in their agricultural land. There were some who constructed houses in other localities and also rented out to other families since they were already living in the luxury of their own home.

According to the official view, only those deserving families were selected, and no pressure from the ruling party was entertained in the selection process. He also told that the Selection Board recommended 90% of the beneficiaries while 10% of them were those recommended by the MLAs/officials.

The village council presidents (VCPs) excepting the one who belonged to the opposition party who implemented the housing scheme at locality level also felt that the CBOs were fully involved in the beneficiary selection process and only deserving families were selected. One VCP said all the beneficiaries are the most deserving ones meaning and no political favouritism is involved in the selection process. Another VC informant has said those among BPL households who really deserve and having a land but will never be able to construct a house on their own were selected. Village council presidents also felt that community based organisations had been adequately involved in the selection process. One of the key informants said that the VC called a joint meeting with CBOs (MHIP, YMA, and MUP) and together they made the selection of beneficiaries. They had selected 30 beneficiaries among the LAD BPL families and submitted it to UD&PA Department. However, the Department has informed them to reselect 7 beneficiaries since the number of beneficiaries to be selected should be on the basis of their population and that their locality could have only 7 beneficiaries.

Title of Ownership

Title of ownership was usually given in the name of the male member contrary to the guidelines of the IHSDP. According to the guidelines “the title of the land should preferably be in the name of the wife and alternatively jointly in the names of husband and wife. In exceptional cases, title in the name of male beneficiary may be permitted”. The results of analysis of the survey data supplied by UD & PA department showed that more than two thirds of the beneficiaries were males (70%) while less than one third of the beneficiaries were female (30%). No joint titles were reported at all.¹ According to the officials this is also because of the cultural

¹ Interview with DUDO dated 9th June 2014.

practices in the Mizo society. One official opined that “as our society is a patriarchal society, it is virtually impossible for us to give title of ownership to women. Title was conferred [in the woman’s name] only in a few exceptional cases where the land for EWS housing was donated by the wife’s relatives”.

Land Acquisition

Most of the beneficiaries had land of their own. In a few cases there were a few needy families who did not own any land but were donated land by a few private individuals. This is in keeping with the strong community bonds within Mizo society and a tradition of helping each other. In these cases, the DUDO took special initiative to liaise with officials from the Land Revenue and Settlement Department to ensure title of the land (called a Land Settlement Certificate- LSC) was accorded to them after the construction was completed. There were also certain issues when the land of the beneficiary had multiple claimants because they had neglected the land since they were without finances to construct a house, leaving the land without looking after it. In such issues, the DUDO intervened and claimed back LSC in the beneficiaries’ name.

However, the major challenge for houseless poor in Lunglei is actually landlessness as the benefits of IHSDP were available only to those who owned a plot of land and the fund released did not cover the amount needed for purchase of land. This hit mostly poor migrants from villages in search of livelihood as they did not have a house plot of their own to construct their houses. One of the village council informants reported that the VC doesn’t own any land in order to distribute it to these needy families. All the land within their locality, whether occupied or vacant, is now private land. When asked about how such individuals acquired the land, he said that during the time when the VC had a lot of land to lease i.e., way back before 1990s their ancestors living in the locality were intelligent enough to visualise the future value of land, capitalised the opportunity and had acquired as much land as possible from the VC and passed on to their descendants. There are no middlemen or developers/real estate companies involved in the land market; negotiations are usually done between the land holder and the buyer of the land.

While the IHSDP focused on those who already owned land, a few families were also included as beneficiaries among those willing to purchase a land plot on their own so they could benefit under the scheme. In these cases, several strategies were used to acquire land and the village council took proactive measures to support them. First is that they purchased a plot of land on their own. One of the beneficiaries reported that he purchased a land with Rs. 20,000. According to him among the beneficiaries, 3 of them did not own land and bought it when receiving the first instalment. Secondly, some joined together and purchased a land and divided equally for house construction. One of the beneficiary informants told that before receiving IHSDP housing fund, he along with the 3 other BPL families contributed Rs. 60,000 respectively and collectively bought a land in 2013 and constructed their own houses (DUs) from 1st December, 2013. Thirdly, their relatives gifted them land. Fourthly, the village council president allowed the landless beneficiaries to construct houses in other localities if they owned or had a plot there.

Fund Release and Utilisation

The funds were released to the beneficiaries on an instalment basis. In the 1st instalment, a total of Rs. 60,000 was released for each beneficiary. Rs. 47,500 was released in the 2nd and 3rd instalments respectively whereas Rs. 30,000 is reserved for the cost of materials. In the last i.e., 4th instalment Rs. 10,000 was reserved for land settlement certificate (LSC) purposes since the department feared that those private owners would claim back the lands that they have donated if title was not settled in the name of the beneficiary.

The fund was given out directly to the beneficiaries through Rural Bank. Though the Rural Bank has 3 branches in Lunglei, the deposit and transaction process is done only through the main branch which is located in Venglai. This was done to prevent misuse and misappropriation of the fund. Some the beneficiaries felt that the duration of constructing their house was prolonged as the fund was released on instalment basis and construction was completed by 2013.

Table 7: Components of Funds Released under IHSDP

No		Amount	Percent
I	Cost		
	Cost of 1 Dwelling Unit	1,11,000	84.9
	Cost of Septic Tank	19,750	15.1
II	Contribution		
	Government	1,27,750	97.7
	Beneficiary	3,000	2.3
	Total amount	1,30,750	100

Source: Records of UD and PA

V

Beneficiary Contribution, Construction of House, and Community Support

The UD & PA department had fixed Rs. 3,000 as beneficiary contribution, and beneficiaries could contribute in terms of manual labour in the house construction. However, the DUDO shared that most of the beneficiaries had contributed much more than Rs 3000 from their personal savings and contribution from relatives for constructing their houses. In fact, most of the informants and leaders of the village council and community based organisations felt that the fund available under IHSDP was not adequate for house construction considering the topography of Lunglei Town and cost of materials which were to be transported from outside the state.

Fund inadequacy was successfully managed by the beneficiaries in different ways. Some have spent their savings for house construction. One beneficiary informant told that they contributed around Rs. 50,000 from their own savings and constructed their house. The second strategy to manage the inadequacy of funds was sale of domestic animals. One of the beneficiary informants was telling that as the IHSDP fund was too less and could not cover all the expenses for construction of their house, they sold their domestic animals and contributed around Rs. 20,000 so as to complete the construction. The third way of managing the financial crunch was to divert the fund sanctioned to them under New Land Use Policy (NLUP) of Mizoram government for livelihood promotion for house construction. One of our key informants reported that the fund was insufficient and he utilised some of the funds they received from the NLUP for the construction purpose. Another said that they received NLUP sanction which is Rs. 20,000 at the time of building the house and they utilised it for construction purpose. The fourth way was to seek social support from the relatives, members of church and community organisations. One

beneficiary informant reported that in the construction process, they received much help from their relatives. Another reported that his two relatives from other villages came to help him and with their assistance, worked hard and completed the construction. Another beneficiary revealed that for the construction, they received much help from the local people. Yet another said that the local people especially members of their church denomination (Presbyterian) helped them all through the construction process. One of the leaders of community based organisations has reported that a voluntary labour was called all through the construction process and was completed with the help of the community people.

Socio Economic Background of the Beneficiaries

Whether the programme has benefitted the really deserving ones is a major contention between the officials and leaders of civil society organisations. The officials and village council presidents who implemented the IHSDP emphatically state that the beneficiaries are the most deserving ones. When we look at the data provided by UD and PA department on the socio economic characteristics it seems that most of the beneficiaries belong to the below poverty line (BPL) category. However, the major problem with the information is that this data was collected by the village council presidents of the localities. As there are allegations by the poor as well as leaders of civil society organisations that there is lot of politics involved in the inclusion of households in the BPL there is difficulty in completely accepting that. They feel that the members of ruling party and relatives of the VCP are included in the list more often instead of the really deserving poor.

The average monthly income computed from the survey data supplied by the UD and PA department shows that possibly most of the beneficiaries are poor. Further, there was not much difference between the monthly income of the beneficiary households of the slum and non-slum areas. On the whole the average monthly income of the beneficiary households was worked out to Rs 3094. The average monthly income of the beneficiary households was Rs 3085 for those in slum localities while it was Rs 3118 for those from slum designated localities.

Table 8: Approximate Monthly Income

Sl.No	Statistic	Area		Total
		Non-slum	Slum	
1	Mean	3085	3118	3094
2	Std. Deviation	847	741	818

Source: Computed from Bio-metric Survey by UD & PA

Our key informants were all from the households belonging to BPL category. They by and large belonged to the working class. One of the informant informed that her husband works as a driver in private company and supports their family. And another told that her husband was engaged in carpentry and was currently in Aizawl for work. Three of their sons were daily wage labourers and one was studying in a college. Another informant said that he was a carpenter but work demand was less. He was also engaged in daily wage labour whenever work was available to support his family. Yet another respondent told that they met their livelihood by selling local cigarettes (*zo-zial*). They themselves prepare it and sell it in their home itself. They usually earned Rs. 200 per day. The IHSDP has benefitted poor elderly couple who were houseless. They used to engage in agricultural farm but since they are growing old and become physically weak, they can no longer continue to undertake such a heavy load. However, one of popular vegetables called *khanghu* in Mizo is still there in their farm and when the season for it comes, it still produces a yield regulating certain amount of income. Moreover, they are practicing kitchen gardening.

The IHSDP has benefitted the households with physically challenged members also. Nearly two percent of the beneficiary households were from this category. Seven households in the non-slum area and 2 from the slum designated localities were of this category.

Table 9: Challenged among Beneficiaries

No	Challenged	Area		Total
		Non-slum	Slum	

1	No	359 (98.1)	139 (98.6)	498 (98.2)
2	Yes	7 (1.9)	2 (1.4)	9 (1.8)
	Total	366 (100)	141 (100)	507 (100)

Source: Computed from Bio-metric Survey by UD & PA

The programme has by and large benefitted the households who did not own any house and were living in rented buildings in both non-slum and slum areas of the Lunglei town. Nearly three fourth of the beneficiaries on the whole were living in rented buildings before the implementation of the IHSDP while more than one fourth of them were living in their own buildings. The proportion of the beneficiary households living in the rented building was greater in non-slum areas as compared to that of the slum designated areas. More than three fourth of the beneficiaries in the non-slum areas(77.9%) were living in rented buildings while only two thirds of the beneficiaries in the slum designated areas(63.6%) were living in the rented buildings(see table 4).

Table 10 : Ownership of House before Allotment

No	Ownership of House	Area		Total
		Non-slum	Slum	
1	Rented	285 (77.9)	89 (63.6)	374 (73.9)
2	Own House	81 (22.1)	51 (36.4)	132 (26.1)
	Total	366 (100)	140 (100)	506 (100)

Source: Computed from Bio-metric Survey by UD & PA

There are few exceptional cases when the beneficiaries were not in a position to construct their DU due to lack of responsibility. Some were substance abusers and if the funds were vested unto their hands, the locality leaders feared that they would not utilize it for construction process,

they would spend it on liquor/drugs consumption and gambling. For example, one of the beneficiaries was alcoholic and he did not have a land and build a pucca type of house in private land. His wife left him and took all 4 of their children because of his irresponsible behaviour. The land owner then donated the land to him and the YMA and VC kept the fund and shouldered the responsibility of constructing the house. When the construction was completed, his wife along with their children moved back and the amount of money left over was accorded back to them. There was one incidence where one of the EWS housing was caught on fire and everything was burnt down. The localities contributed/donated money and reconstruct the house even better than the previous one.

The Problem of Non-utilisation

The problem of non-utilisation of the fund by a few beneficiaries was reported by the officials and non-beneficiaries. One non-beneficiary informant reported that in her locality two beneficiaries were unable to construct the DU and she wished that they had been selected instead. This non-utilisation of the benefits many a times is attributed to the male members involvement in gambling and drug use.

The village council presidents and members of the selection board had tried to take precautions to exclude such people from selection.² In some instances the village council president and civil society leaders successfully managed the problem. The official informant told that there were few exceptional cases when the beneficiaries were in no position to construct their houses due to lack of responsibility. Some were substance abusers and if the funds were vested unto their hands, the locality leaders feared that they would not utilize it for construction, they would rather spend it for liquor/drugs consumption and gambling. In one locality one of the beneficiaries was alcoholic and he did not have land. His wife had left him and taken all 4 of their children because of his irresponsible behaviour. A land owner then donated the land to him and the YMA and VC kept the fund and shouldered the responsibility of constructing the house

² One non-beneficiary informant told that there are still some poor families who often got certain schemes from the government like Indira Awas Yojana (IAY) but never utilised the fund in a proper way, even when they got metal sheets and other materials they always sold them away, never utilising it for constructing a house. When IHSDP was introduced, the leaders of the unit party and VC left them out in the selection since they knew that they would not utilise the fund as it is supposed to be

for him. When the construction was completed, his wife along with their children moved back and the amount of money left over was accorded back to them.

Impact of IHSDP on Housing Conditions

The housing conditions of the beneficiaries have significantly improved because of the implementation the IHSDP programme. All the stakeholders recognise the positive change that has taken place in the housing situation of the economically weaker section of the Lunglei town. Before the implementation of the programme most of the poor households were living in kuchcha houses. The results of analysis of survey data supplied by the UD & PA department clearly show that most of the beneficiaries were living in rented buildings. The beneficiary informants also reported that their earlier housing condition was poor. Nearly three fourth of the beneficiary households (74%) were living in rented houses earlier. More than three fourth of the beneficiaries in non-slum areas (78%) while more than two thirds of those in slum designated areas were living in rented buildings.

All of the houses constructed by the beneficiaries were of semi-pucca structure because the material cost is very high in Mizoram. They could not build pucca buildings. However the housing condition has improved due to the IHSDP implementation. One beneficiary reported that before they had lived in a dilapidated house. They have completed the construction in May 2011 and moved in right thereafter. The length and breadth of their DU is 24x15 with two rooms, separate kitchen and toilet.

The beneficiaries were very happy to receive the benefit under the IHSDP. One beneficiary informant felt that she was extremely glad for getting the fund. She also says that without it, they would have never been able to construct a house on their own. Another said he was extremely glad to receive the housing fund. If it wasn't for the IHSDP, they still would be living on a rented house because they will never be in a position to construct a house of their own. Another beneficiary said that he is extremely happy that he is getting the housing fund.

Access to Drinking Water and Solid Waste Management: Unresolved Issues

The IHSDP has provided housing and sanitation facilities to its beneficiaries however it could not tackle other pressing problems of urban poor households: the lack of connectivity to regular drinking water supply network and solid waste disposal system.

Of these the lack of connectivity to protected water supply network is most serious one and poorest among the beneficiaries were not able to pay the deposit to get the water connection from PHC department. Inability to get water connection and also inadequate water storage facility is acute problem with the beneficiaries. They generally face the water shortage problem during the summer. They manage water shortage by relying on natural spring water, getting water from better off neighbours and also some time purchasing water.

The problem of lack of water connection was very much recognised by the officials. An official informant reported that water connection is also not provided in EWS housing till date creating much problem for the beneficiaries. Most of their water requirements are met through springs, which are not safe for consumption, and they do not have a proper place for storing rain water. Sometimes they asked their neighbours having pipe water connection and fetch some for drinking purposes. One beneficiary informant said that they do not have private water connection but they shared their church's water connection and received water once a week, which is not sufficient. They fetch water from the springs water point (*Tuikhur* in Mizo) nearby their house. They do not practice rain water harvesting because all the funds they received was utilised for construction purpose alone and they do not have the finances for constructing a tank for storing rain water. One more beneficiary said that they did not have pipe water connection but had a small barrel, the capacity of which was around 200 litres. During monsoon, they rarely had water problems but in the dry season i.e., in between the month of December to April, it was quite difficult to meet their water needs. During those months, they used to fetch water from the spring water points early in the morning. Another told that they did not have proper place to store rain water and wished that the government would make a water tank for rain water harvesting in their locality. There are two spring water points on land owned by private individuals nearby their house and their needs were usually met through them. During the dry season, they used to purchase water for Rs. 5 per bucket/Rs. 500 per 400 litres. Since they lived in lower portion, there is no public water point and the community leaders and the PHED have been searching for a natural water source but haven't found any. Another beneficiary informant told that they do not have pipe water connection. However, just next to their house is located the Forest Department quarters and they share their water connection. They never had any the problems of water shortage even during the dry season.

Some of the beneficiaries do have their own water connection. One informant reported that they have pipe water connection. They utilised their own money - more than Rs. 5,000 for water connection alone- since the housing fund they received could not cover the connection expenses. They also bought the water meter box from the dealer but the fitting part was done by the PHED free of cost. Regarding the expenditure on the water for household use another informant informed that the amount of water bill varies from Rs. 100-300. In the previous month, their water bill came up to Rs. 400. Since they did not receive water regularly (two/three times a month only), they made a complaint to the department and it was reduced to Rs. 300.

Another major problem is management of solid waste. Though the UD & PA department operates a vehicle to collect solid waste weekly, this was not available to the houses of the beneficiaries located in the lower part of the localities. One beneficiary said that since they could not avail the waste collector provided by the UD&PA, their waste was disposed to the drainage basin nearby their house during the rainy season and during dry the season, they used to burn it. Another beneficiary said that in the upper portion of their community the vehicle for collecting the waste by UD&PA visited every week but the lower inhabitants never got access to it. Therefore, they disposed waste in the nearby drainage basin/watershed. During monsoon, the rain water would wash it away.

VI

Infrastructure Development under IHSDP

The people of the Lunglei Town especially the poor suffer from inadequate physical and social infrastructure. IHSDP has been a major contributor for improving infrastructure in the five slum designated localities. Under IHSDP, UD & PA has constructed 2 Community Halls in Salem Veng and Lungpuizawl locality respectively. Currently, one community hall in Venglai is under construction with IHSDP funds and the community people as well as the CBO have donated a huge amount of money to better construct the hall.

Table 11: Infrastructure Development under IHSDP

No	Infrastructure	Localities	Number of Works
1	Cantilever Footpath	Chanmari	2
2	Community Centre	Lungpuizawl, Salem Veng, Venglai	3
3	Link Drain	Chanmari, Zotlang, Zotlang	3
4	S/M Pavement	Ramthar,Zotlang, Luangmual,	5
5	S/M Steps	Luangmual	1
6	Side Drain	Ramthar, Hauruang	4
7	Water Point	Hrangchalkawn, Pukpui, Lunglawn, Ramthar, Sazaikawn	8

Source: Records of UD and PA

The table 8 presents details of the infrastructure development projects undertaken by UD & PA. From the table it seems that construction of the community centre was the major social infrastructure development project undertaken under IHSDP. Three community halls were built in two of the slum designated areas viz., Chanmari and Zotlang. As per the DPR Rs 30, 96,000 was supposed to be spent on each of these community halls.

Other than that construction of water points were undertaken five slum designated localities viz., Hrangchalkawn, Pukpui, Lunglawn, Ramthar, and Sazaikawn. From the DPR we learnt that natural water point buildings were constructed to harvest the spring water and protect the same from contamination. On these projects Rs 285,000 was spent. S/M Pavement, S/M Steps, Cantilever Footpath, Link Drain, and Side Drain were some of the physical infrastructure development projects successfully completed under the IHSDP in Lunglei.

At community level the positive contribution of the IHSDP in infrastructure development of the community was very much acknowledged. One VCP has observed that the UD&PA also gave fund for construction of steps and footpaths. The UD&PA has provided a vehicle to collect waste that comes to their locality once a week. But most of them deposited their waste in the nearby drains in the outskirts of their locality. Another VCP said that under IHSDP they also received funds for maintaining/constructing side drains. Three side drains were made in various

parts of the locality. Yet another VC has reported that a drainage basin is also constructed under the IHSDP.

The village council presidents have actually played significant role in utilisation of the funds for construction of some important social infrastructure such as community Hall. One village council president says that earlier they did not have Community Centre and he come to know that under IHSDP, there is a fund for constructing a community centre. He heard that it was among one of the components of IHSDP and submitted a proposal to the Department. When the sanction was released, the officials tried to give only Rs. 14 lakh, deciding to utilise the rest of the fund for constructing other community halls in other areas within Lunglei town. But he wasn't satisfied, claiming that since he was the one submitting the proposal in the first place, he should get enough funds for constructing their own community centre. Then he was given 34 lakhs and was able to construct the hall, adopting RCC structure.

In the infrastructure development of the urban localities the people have also made financial contribution when there was a need and no other funds were readily available with the VC. One of our VC informants said that street lighting was also done by the contribution donated by the local people and the VC collectively. No funding from the government was available. The interviews with the village council representatives also show that the earlier rural development programmes implemented in the localities have contributed to infrastructure development in the localities. In infrastructure development of the localities especially the slum designated localities the NRGS and LAD have contributed significantly. One VCP said that most of developmental works like construction of retaining wall, culvert, side drain and plantation of trees are funded by NREGA. They also received fund under Twelfth Finance Commission for construction of steps and pavements.

VII

Conclusion

Housing and Infrastructure constitute the major challenge to Lunglei, a main urban centre of the southern Mizoram. The economically weaker section of the town consists of people from newly incorporated villages surrounding the town in larger Lunglei Urban Area and migrants from within Mizoram and Myanmar that have been pushed out due to poor livelihood base in

their native location. The poor households generally live in rented buildings and the quality of these was perceived as poor. The poor houseless households are widespread across the city in almost all the localities. However, their settlements are found mostly in the lower part of the different localities of the town. Hence, identifying some localities and designating them as slums was the major problem encountered. As it is mandatory under IHSDP to have slum pocket for the state government to receive the funds from the centre only 6 localities were identified as slums. The original plan had included proposal of housing and infrastructure development in these localities. However, the programme was implemented in all the localities across the town due to pressure from VCPs and local officials who knew that houseless families were scattered across the town.

The programme was supposed to be implemented by the Lunglei Municipal Council as it is a mandatory reform under IHSDP. However, this reform has not been undertaken. The department of Urban Development and Poverty alleviation has implemented the scheme with active support of the elected village councils and also the ruling party in the every urban locality. The beneficiaries were supposed to be selected by the selection board comprising of the members of village council and community based organisations. However, in actual practice the voices of the leaders of CBOs were not given due recognition. Hence, the participation of the civil society organisations in the selection was nominal. The key role in the selection of the beneficiaries was actually played by the ruling party branch in the locality. Hence, there are allegations of wrong selection from the non-beneficiary poor as well as leaders of community based organisations. There are some who allege that better off sections of the community were also selected.

The major problem in the design of the programme is the inadequacy of amount sanctioned for house construction under this programme. And another limitation of the scheme is that it did not have any provision for purchase of land. So the landless households were not included in the beneficiary list. However, those who could manage to purchase land of their own or who could mobilise support from their relatives were also selected.

Excepting a few all of the beneficiaries have successfully constructed houses on their own land following the in situ development model. The UD & PA department has supported the beneficiaries by purchasing the materials in bulk and supplying them. The village council and

community based organisations have extended necessary support for house construction. Kinsmen and members of own denomination have also supported the beneficiaries in the construction process. Many beneficiaries of the IHSDP programme, the first ever urban housing and slum development scheme, perceive it as blessing as it improved the quality of their housing.

The programme has had a positive impact on the housing and infrastructure development of Lunglei Town. However, it could address only a tiny portion of the problem of housing and infrastructure development. Many poor houseless households are left out because of the inadequate allocation made under IHSDP for Lunglei Town. The housing conditions of the beneficiaries have actually improved from kuccha to semi pucca. The amount sanctioned under the scheme is inadequate considering the topographical conditions of Mizoram. Further, there is lot more to be done to improve the supply of drinking water, roads and communication networks as well as solid waste management.

Governance reforms especially the enactment of the Municipal council bill has yet to take place. The people of Lunglei Town are eagerly waiting for that. In fact the civil society organisations are fighting for the same. Hence, it is necessary that urban local bodies to be introduced in the urban areas of Mizoram at the earliest for the responsive democratic governance of urban areas.

Annexure

Key Informants used for the case studies

- 1 Local resident(1 no.) at Chanmari
- 2 Local people (2 no.) Chanmari
- 3 Beneficiary (1 no.) Chanmari
- 4 Mr. Dorawta, Village Council President, Chanmari
- 5 Mr. Lalbiakzuala, Chanmari YMA President
- 6 Mrs. Zosangi, treasurer chanmari branch MHIP
- 7 Mr. Hrangliana, Village Council President, Sazaikawn
- 8 Mr. R. Lalmawia a beneficiary , Sazaikawn
- 9 Mr. Lalthangliana Sailo, Village Council President, Lungpuizawl
- 10 Mrs. Vanlalzawni, MHIP secretary, Lungpuizawl
- 11 Beneficiary Mrs. Lalzaidami, Lungpuizawl
- 12 Mrs. Lalianmawii, VC Member, Hauruang
- 13 Mrs. Lalengmawii, Local resident , Hauruang
- 14 Beneficiaries 5 interviews Ramthar
- 15 Mr. Lalrinmawia, President Village council , Ramthar
- 16 Mr. Lalzidinga, District Urban Development Officer(DUDO), UD&PA, Lunglei

Reference

- Bahri, H.P. (1988) Housing Choices of the Urban Poor, *Social Change*, 18(4), 22-26.
- Basu, Ashok Ranjan (1989) Housing Urban Poor: Preview of Alternative Approaches. In Girish K Misra, M.K. Narain (Eds.), *Development Programmes for Urban Poor*, New Delhi: Indian Institute of Public Administration.
- Bhattacharya, Ardhendu(1981) Housing for the Urban Poor: A Case Study of Bombay. In Gopal Bhargava (Ed.), *Urban Problems and Policy Perspectives*, New Delhi: Abhinav Publication, 139-155.
- Burte, Himanshu Amita Bhide, Simpreet Singh and Smita Waingankar(2014) Affordable Housing by the State. Mumbai: Urban India Reforms Facility (UIRF), School of Habitat Studies, Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS).
- Fulwari Archana (2012) “Issues of Housing Finance in Urban India: A symptomatic Study”. Unpublished PhD thesis submitted to Department of Business Economics, Faculty of Commerce, Vadodara: Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.
- Gogoi, Manchumi and Kalita, Kamalesh (2002) Housing Problems and Policies of Assam: Introspection. In B. Datta Ray (Ed.), *Agenda for North East India*, New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
- Hmar, Zothanpuui and Kanagaraj, E. (2007) “Rural Housing Schemes for Tribal Poor: Evaluation of IAY and PMGY in Mizoram”. In B.S. Vasudeva Rao and G. Rajani Kanth (Eds.) *Rural Resources and Development Initiatives: Structural Issues & Development Interventions*. Ambala Cantt: The Associated Publishers. Chapter 3: 34-79.
- Jagmohan(1981) The Urban Homeless, In Bhargava Gopal (Ed.), *Urban Problems and Policy Perspectives*, New Delhi: Abhinav Publication, 131-138.
- Kamath, Lalitha (2012) “New Policy Paradigms and Actual Practices in Slum Housing The Case of Housing Projects in Bengaluru”. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 47(47 & 48): 77-86.
- Kaur, Manjit (2013) “Urban Housing in India and China - A Comparative Analysis”. Unpublished thesis. Department of Economics Punjabi University, Patiala.

- Mehta, Jashwant B. (1981) "Urban Housing: A Pragmatic Approach of Planning". In Bhargava Gopal (Ed.), *Urban Problems and Policy Perspectives*, New Delhi: Abhinav Publication, 118-130.
- Mohan, Rakesh (1992) "Housing and Urban Development: Policy Issues for 1990's", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 27(36), 1990-1996.
- Nayar, K.R. (1997) "Housing Amenities and Health Improvement: Some Findings", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 32(22), 1275-1279.
- Patel, Sheela (2013) "Upgrade, rehouse or resettle? An assessment of the Indian government's Basic Services for the Urban Poor (BSUP) programme". *Environment and Urbanization*, 25:177-188.
- Vagale (1968) "Housing and Town and Country Planning". In Government of India, *Encyclopedia of Social Work in India*, Vol. I. New Delhi: The Planning Commission, Government of India.