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Although urbanization has the potential to make cities and countries develop, many urban residents and cities struggle with fragmented growth accompanied by high levels of inequality. Despite several decades of policy intervention, there is still a shortage in affordable housing and ‘slums’ continue to exist in the global South; this research examines the question why this situation continues to exist.

Prior studies on informal settlements either had a micro focus on slum households or undertook a macro structural analysis of urban poverty, but usually did not combine the two perspectives. This thesis addresses this gap and explores the relations between the ‘slum’ and the city across and within multiple scales (geographic and institutional) in a comparative perspective; drawing on the case of Chennai in India and Durban in South Africa. Taking a relational perspective, the study integrates the micro perspective of households’ livelihoods strategies vis-à-vis the strategies for informal settlements outlined in policy, planning and practices of the state. More specifically, the research looks into the livelihoods building processes of households living in informal settlements in relation to their settlement and city contexts. The household’s process of building livelihoods in an informal settlement is associated with settlement histories and a city’s development trajectories. At the settlement scale, the thesis utilizes a spatial approach to informality associated with the ways the state is flexible in defining informal areas and how that evolves over time. Approaches to informal settlements encompassing urban governance, political coalitions, institutional practices and policy discourses form the macro perspective of this thesis within which the settlements and household scales evolve.

The main question raised in this thesis is - How are informal settlements transformed through relations across/within multiple scales (geographic and institutional) and how does this transformation link to household opportunities for building livelihoods? The eight chapters of this thesis put together take an intermediate position between a monograph and article based approach. While the four empirical chapters can be read together as standalone articles, introduction, theory, methodology and conclusion bind these independent pieces together. The introduction of the thesis sets the tone by discussing the background, research questions and the structure of the study. Due to the multi-scalar nature of this thesis research, the theoretical framework draws upon debates on urban livelihoods, informal settlements, urban planning, governance, and comparative urbanism. Combining the different perspectives, the thesis contributes to the understanding of household’s processes of building livelihoods (Hendriks, 2011; Krishna, Sriram & Prakash, 2014; Moser, 1998, 2009; Rakodi, & Lloyd-Jones, 2002; Verrest and Post, 2007) in the informal settlements of Chennai and Durban taking into considerations their relations with the institutional context in the two cities. The research looks into how policies and institutions deter or support livelihoods processes at household and settlement levels (Dutta, 2012; Krishna, Sriram & Prakash, 2014; Nijman, 2009; Roy, 2009;
2014; 2015; Subbaraman et al., 2012; Sutherland, Braathen, Dupont & Jordhus-Lier, 2016.). Approaches to informal settlements encompassing governance, political coalitions, policy discourses and planning form the macro aspect of the study within which the settlements evolve and households build their lives (Baud & de Wit, 2009; Dupont, 2010; Ghertner, 2010; Haferburg & Huchzermeyer, 2015; Hajer, 2009; Huchzermeyer, 2010; Watson, 2009;).

Based on a mixed method design of research, this study draws on fieldwork for a period of fourteen months conducted between the years 2012 and 2015. Chapter 3 presents the methodology of the thesis and elaborates the research design, case selection, data collection and analysis. Each of the four empirical chapters (Chapters 4-7) explore relations of informal settlements and the cities from a different perspective. Specifically, chapter 4 engages in a top down analysis and questions the evolution of ‘slum’ policy approaches in Chennai since the seventies. Chapter 5 explores relations of the households to their settlement history, institutions and city context of which they are a part, and how they affect livelihoods building in two informal settlements of Chennai. Chapter 6 integrates the analysis of the preceding empirical chapters to examine the rationalities behind city approaches to informal settlements vis-à-vis urban livelihood building processes by drawing on relations between different institutional and geographic scales in Durban. Chapter 7 takes a comparative perspective to understand the differences in the relations between the cities and their informal settlements influence livelihoods building processes in the context of Chennai, India and Durban, South Africa. The key findings per chapter are summarised below.

Drawing on ‘slum’ enumeration reports, Chapter 4 explores the approaches to ‘slum’ settlements in Chennai as a combination of policy discourse, political coalitions and practices of the Tamil Nadu Slum Clearance Board. The analysis shows that ‘slum’ practices in Chennai continue to be characterized by an underlying continuity, with relocation as the dominant mode of operation since the nineties. However, approaches to ‘slums’ have evolved from paternalistic socialism with in-situ development in the seventies, to approaches characterized by affordability and cost recovery in the eighties, to the aesthetics of global cities in the nineties, and to the technology driven and ‘slum’-free ‘smart city’ discourse currently in vogue. While the chapter highlights the evolution of ‘slum’ categories in the enumeration reports commissioned by TNSCB, the general and most negative definition of ‘slums’ was preserved over time.

Chapter 5 reveals the diversity of ‘slums’ in Chennai as outcomes linked to their internal development and their relations to the city’s macro-economic policies and institutional landscape. The focus of this discussion is on how such relations shape opportunities and constraints of households’ livelihoods over time in two ‘slum’ settlements of Chennai – Anna Nagar and Kamaraj Nagar. This chapter argues that ‘slum’ development models and policies should promote relational understandings of ‘slum’ settlements to influence policies towards more effective support for reducing poverty among residents.
Chapter 6 explores the rationality between governance and planning for informal settlements and the logic of survival of the urban poor. The empirical discussion shows that though the River Side Settlement in Durban grew over the last couple of decades, the precariousness of assets has contributed to higher risks for households. The debates on approaches to informal settlements reveal that the planning rationality draws heavily on the model-based technocratic solutions that are proposed as development options for the informal settlements by the Municipality. The findings of this chapter illustrate that the conflict in rationalities is not only between the state and the urban poor, but also includes a divide between planning discourses and practices towards informal settlements.

By exploring the relationships between households, settlement and city scales for building livelihoods over time, Chapter 7 contributes to the existing literature on informal settlements using a comparative lens. Although historical events have differently shaped the urban development trajectories of Indian and South African cities, this chapter reveals increased use of planning as a shared logic for improvement of informal settlements in both contexts. However, discourse of planning remains a normative exercise overruled by political relations influencing informal settlements in the two cities. While the informal settlements of Anna Nagar and River Side Settlement seem to share many of the commonly held perceptions, by taking a closer look, a more variegated situation appears which is closely associated to the relations that the households have developed over time with settlement and urban contexts of which they are a part.

The conclusion of the thesis brings together the different relational aspects explored in the four empirical chapters discussed above. Against the territorial understanding of informal settlements in policy, practice and academic discourse, the thesis shows that these areas often act as ‘nodes’ within the wider socio-spatial networks of which they are a part. By exploring how the households have transformed over time vis-à-vis the settlements and cities where they are embedded, the thesis reveals two distinct relations that operate between city and the settlement, and the settlement and the households. In analysing these relations, the thesis illustrates the need for looking beyond the planning based technocratic solutions for informal settlements. It highlights how building livelihoods at household level is linked to the settlement and city regions where they are embedded. Finally, this study indicates further research is needed, focusing on three dimensions – 1) household dynamics and gender based analysis, 2) settlements across cities of all sizes and importance, and 3) for engaging in discussions on informal living conditions beyond the limits of global South.
Samenvatting (NL)

Hoewel verstedelijking een positief effect kan hebben op de economische ontwikkeling in steden en landen, ervaren een groot aantal stedelijke bewoners en lokale overheden moeilijkheden met betrekking tot gefragmenteerde groei en grote mate van ongelijkheid. Ondanks meerdere decennia van beleidsinterventies zijn er tekorten aan betaalbare woningen en een hardnekkige groei van sloppenwijken (slums) in het globale Zuiden, die onderzocht worden in mijn proefschrift. Eerdere studies naar informele wijken en stedelijke armoede hadden een micro-focus op huishoudens of waren gericht op een macro-structurele analyse van stedelijke beleid tegen armoede, maar zelden in combinatie. Dit proefschrift behandelt deze lacune en onderzoekt de relaties tussen sloppenwijk en stad op meerdere schaalniveaus (geografisch en institutioneel) in een vergelijkende casus van Chennai in India en Durban in Zuid-Afrika. Door gebruik te maken van een relationeel perspectief, integreert de studie het microperspectief van huishoudens met hun overlevingsstrategieën in interactie met het beleid, planning en praktijk van de overheid. Het onderzoek kijkt naar de wijze waarop huishoudens hun overlevingsstrategieën ontwikkelen in informele wijken (‘informal settlements’) in relatie tot de plek waar ze wonen en de context van de stad. De processen voor het opbouwen van overlevingsstrategieën van huishoudens in informele wijken worden in verband gebracht met de geschiedenis van deze wijken en de ontwikkelingstrajecten van het stedelijk bestuur. Op het schaalniveau van de wijken sluit het proefschrift aan bij de ruimtelijke benadering van informaliteit die samenhangt met de wijze waarop de staat flexibiliteit betracht bij het definieren van informele gebieden en hoe dat in de loop van de tijd evolueert. Benaderingen van informele wijken door lokaal bestuur, politieke coalities, institutionele praktijken en beleidsdiscoursen vormen de macro aspecten van dit onderzoek in relatie tot de schaalniveaus van wijken en huishoudens.

De hoofdvraag van dit proefschrift is - Hoe worden informele wijken getransformeerd door relaties op meerdere schaalniveaus (geografisch en institutioneel) en hoe is deze transformatie gerelateerd aan de mogelijkheden voor huishoudens om overlevingsstrategieën op te bouwen? De acht hoofdstukken van dit proefschrift vormen een combinatie tussen een monografie en een benadering gebaseerd op artikelen. Hoewel de vier empirische hoofdstukken kunnen worden gelezen als op zichzelf staande artikelen, voegen inleiding, theorie, methodologie en conclusie deze onafhankelijke stukken samen.

De introductie van het proefschrift zet de toon voor het proefschrift door de achtergrond, onderzoeksvragen en de structuur van het onderzoek te bespreken. Vanwege het gebruik van meerdere schaalniveaus in het onderzoek, baseert zich het theoretisch kader op debatten over stedelijke overlevingsstrategieën, informele wijken, stedelijke planning, lokaal bestuur en vergelijkende stedenbouw. Door de verschillende perspectieven te combineren, draagt het proefschrift bij tot het begrip van de processen waarmee huishoudens hun overlevingsstrategieën opbouwen (Hendriks, 2011; Krishna, Sriram & Prakash,
in de informele wijken van Chennai en Durban, waarbij rekening gehouden wordt met de relaties van de wijken met de besturen van de twee steden.


Deze studie maakt gebruik van veldwerk uitgevoerd in een periode van veertien maanden tussen 2012 en 2015, op basis van een onderzoeksontwerp met meerdere methodes. In hoofdstuk 3 wordt de methodologie van het proefschrift beschreven en wordt verder ingegaan op het onderzoeksontwerp, casus selectie, dataverzameling en analyse. De vier empirische hoofdstukken (hoofdstukken 4-7) onderzoeken de relaties van informele wijken en het stedelijke bestuur vanuit een perspectief, wat hierna verder wordt uitgewerkt. Hoofdstuk 4 betreft een bestuurlijke analyse over de evolutie van stedelijke beleidsbenaderingen van sloppenwijken in Chennai sinds de jaren zeventig. Hoofdstuk 5 gaat over de relaties van huishoudens met de geschiedenis van de wijken, instituties en context van de stad waar zij deel van uitmaken bij het opbouwen van overlevingsstrategieën in twee informele wijken in Chennai. Hoofdstuk 6 integreert de analyse van de voorgaande empirische hoofdstukken en onderzoekt wat de overwegingen zijn achter de stedelijke bestuursbenaderingen van informele wijken in interactie met de huishoudprocessen om overlevingsstrategieën op te bouwen, door de relaties tussen verschillende institutionele en geografische schalen te analyseren. Hoofdstuk 7 gebruikt een vergelijkend perspectief om te analyseren hoe de relaties tussen de steden en hun informele wijken de processen om overlevingsstrategieën op te bouwen beïnvloeden in de context van Chennai, India en Durban, Zuid-Afrika. De belangrijkste bevindingen per hoofdstuk zijn hieronder samengevat.

Op basis van rapporten over de omvang en samenstelling van sloppenwijken (‘slum’ enumeration reports) onderzoekt Hoofdstuk 4 de beleidsbenaderingen van sloppenwijken in Chennai als een combinatie van beleidsdiscoursen, politieke coalities en praktijken van de Tamil Nadu Slum Clearance Board. De analyse laat zien dat sloppenwijken in Chennai nog steeds worden gekenmerkt door een onderliggende continuïteit, met relocatie als de dominante manier van werken sinds de jaren negentig. Echter, de benadering van sloppenwijken is veranderd van paternalistisch socialisme met in-situ ontwikkeling in de jaren zeventig, naar benaderingen die worden gekenmerkt door betaalbaarheid en kostenherstel in de
Hoofdstuk 5 laat de diversiteit van sloppenwijken in Chennai zien als uitkomsten van hun interne ontwikkeling, hun relaties met het macro-economische beleid en het institutionele landschap van de stad. De focus van deze discussie ligt op hoe de relaties kansen en beperkingen vormen voor de overlevingsstrategieën van huishoudens door de tijd heen in twee sloppenwijken van Chennai - Anna Nagar en Kamaraj Nagar. In dit hoofdstuk wordt betoogd dat ontwikkelingsmodellen en -beleid de relationele kennis van sloppenwijken moeten bevorderen om het beleid te beïnvloeden met het oog op een effectievere ondersteuning voor het terugdringen van de armoede onder bewoners.

Hoofdstuk 6 onderzoekt de rationaliteit tussen de governance en planning van informele wijken en de logica van het overleven van de stedelijke lage inkomensklasse. De empirische discussie laat zien dat hoewel de River Side Settlement in de eThekwini-gemeente de afgelopen decennia groeide, de wisselvalligheid van bezit heeft bijgedragen tot hogere risico’s voor huishoudens. De discussies over benaderingen van informele wijken wijzen uit dat de planningsrationaliteit sterk voortbouwt op de modelgebaseerde technocratische oplossingen die worden voorgesteld als ontwikkelingsopties voor de informele wijken in het huisvestingsplan van de gemeente eThekwini. De bevindingen van dit hoofdstuk illustreren dat het conflict in rationaliteiten niet alleen tussen de staat en de stedelijke armen bestaat, maar ook een kloof inhoudt tussen planningsdiscoursen en praktijken met betrekking tot informele wijken.

Door de relaties tussen huishoudens, wijken en schaalniveau’s van de stad te verkennen voor het bouwen van overlevingsstrategieën door de tijd heen, draagt hoofdstuk 7 bij aan de bestaande literatuur over informele nederzettingen met behulp van een vergelijkende blik. Hoewel historische trendbreuken de stedenbouwkundige trajecten in steden in India en Zuid-Afrika op verschillende manieren hebben vormgegeven, onthult het hoofdstuk toegenomen gebruik van planning als de gedeelde logica voor verbetering van informele wijken in beide contexten. Het discours van planning blijft echter een normatieve oefening die wordt ondermijnd door politieke relaties die van invloed zijn op informele wijken in de twee steden. De informele wijken van Anna Nagar en River Side Settlement lijken veel van de algemeen gangbare percepties te delen. Echter, wanneer nader wordt gekeken blijkt een meer gevarieerde situatie te verschijnen die nauw samenhangt met de relaties die de huishoudens in de loop van de tijd hebben ontwikkeld met de context van wijken en steden waar deze wijken toe behoren.

De conclusie van het proefschrift brengt de verschillende relationele aspecten samen die zijn onderzocht in de vier empirische hoofdstukken die hierboven zijn
besproken. Anders dan de territoriale opvatting van informele wijken in beleid, praktijk en academisch discours, toont het proefschrift aan dat deze gebieden vaak fungeren als 'knooppunten' binnen de grote sociaal-ruimtelijke netwerken waar zij deel van uitmaken. Door te onderzoeken hoe de huishoudens in de loop van de tijd zijn getransformeerd ten opzichte van de nederzettingen en steden waar ze zijn ingebed, demonstreert het proefschrift twee verschillende relaties die werken tussen stad en de wijk en de wijk en de huishoudens. Door deze relaties te analyseren, illustreert het proefschrift de noodzaak om verder te kijken dan de op planning gebaseerde technocratische oplossingen voor informele wijken. Het laat zien hoe het opbouwen van overlevingsstrategieën op het schaalniveau van huishoudens gekoppeld is aan de wijken en stadsregio’s waarin ze zijn ingebed. Ten slotte wijst deze studie er op dat vervolgonderzoek zich op drie vraagstukken zou moeten richten - 1) dynamiek van huishoudens en op gender gebaseerde analyse, 2) wijken in steden van alle groottes en belang, en 3) op het deelnemen aan discussies over informele leefomstandigheden buiten de grenzen van het globale Zuiden.
Appendix I: Household Survey

1. **Details of the respondent (S1)**
   1.1. Name:
   1.2. Religion:
   1.3. Gender:
   1.4. Location of the house in the settlement:
   1.5. Employment status (S1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   What type of job do you do?

   Where do you work? (Specific location in Durban)

2. **Household**

2.1. Household details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. no</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Relation To Head of Family</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>What do you do to earn money?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. What is your monthly income for the household
(in Rupees / Rands): ..............................................................
2.3. Broad fixed expenditures per month (as Rupees/ Rands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure type</th>
<th>Amount (Rupees / Rand)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraffin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Social life

3.1. Migration:

3.1.1. Original place of residence:

3.1.2. Reason for migration:

3.1.3. In which year did you move here: ......................

3.1.4. Has your economic condition improved or not since you moved here?
Yes/No. Explain.
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3.1.5. Where is that home:

3.1.6. Who lives there:

3.2. Health:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What kind of doctor do you go to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which hospital / clinic do you go to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you visit the doctor in a month?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the most frequent complaint or illness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Social Networks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To which social activity groups do you belong? e.g. stokvel, church group, self-help groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the aims of these groups in the settlement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your family / friends help you with money?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your family and friends help you with other than money? What help do they provide?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Physical Assets**

4.1. **Housing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>When you came here</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership – Rented/own/other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you own, how did you get the land/structure/shack?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof material – thatch/plastic/corrugated iron/RCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall material – mud/brick/wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people in the house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1. In what category would you put your house and why:

- Not adequate.................................................................
- adequate...........................................................................
- more than adequate........................................................

**Commodities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodities (only tick)</th>
<th>Did you have it when you came here?</th>
<th>Do you have it now?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sofa set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas stove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraffin stove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric stove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Infrastructure:

#### 4.2. Water:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>When you came to the settlement</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you get water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River / ablution blocks / private tap / other source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent on water collection per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of water: Good/ average/ poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many buckets of water do you collect every day?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2.2. Transport: What modes of transport are you using in this area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3. Sanitation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>When you came to the settlement</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of toilet: individual, ablution blocks, other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4. Waste management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>When you came to the settlement</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you get rid of your waste? River, municipality collection, other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Political involvement

4.3.1. Governance/institutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>When you came to the settlement</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who manages or controls this settlement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you participate in the committee?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you speak to or visit the municipality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, for what reasons do you speak to or visit the municipality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you vote here in the elections?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, where are you registered for voting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also, if you don’t vote, what is the reason behind it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2. Do you think the councillor represent your interests? Yes / No / Other

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

4.3.3. Do you sometimes contact a Councillor? Yes / No: ......................
a) If yes, specify how often per year:
........................................................................................................................................
b) Indicate for what purpose you meet:

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. **Subjective evaluation:**
5.1. What is a ‘good life’ mean for you:

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

5.2. Do you feel that you have a good life? Explain:

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

5.3. After coming to live in the settlement, what has changed in your life in terms of health, education and employment opportunities?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

5.4. What three things do you like most about living in this settlement?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
5.5. What three things would you like to change about this settlement?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

5.6. Will you move from here if your income increases? And where would you go?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

5.7. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me about your life here?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Appendix II: Settlement Interview Guide

Date of interview:
Name of the Key informant:
Role at the settlement level:

Identification:
Name of the settlement:
Location in metropolitan area:
GPS:
Area and size of the settlement:

History:
When does the settlement date back to:
What challenges did you face then:
How did the settlement grow:
Level of services when the settlement was established
Present status of services in the settlement
Demographic Characteristics:
Population:

Social indicators:
Main religious groups:
Major caste affiliations / population group:
Areas of geographic origin:
Main languages spoken:
Occupation specialization (if any):
Urban Infrastructure:
Transportation:
Proximity of public transport:
Cost of public transport:

Drainage System:
Type: open/closed,

Water supply:
Type: public/private
Cost, if any:

Other infrastructure:
Connectivity to the sewage system: Yes/no
What are the different types of toilet facilities available in the settlement? Are there households who use private toilets as well?
Is there Solid waste collection from the settlement:
Is there official electricity supply in the settlement:
What are the nearby health-care facilities for the residents living in the settlement?
What are the educational facilities for children?
What are the commercial facilities in the settlement?
What are the recreational facilities in the settlement?
Appendix III: Institutional Interview Guide

Date of interview:
Name of the respondent:
Official position:
Organization:
Contact Information:

Organization:
What is the role of your organization:
Since when are you working here:
How many people work with you:
What are the current projects that you are involved in:

Informal settlements
How would you categorize the sub-standard settlements in the city?
How many informal settlements exist in Chennai/eThekwini Municipality, as per
the official and unofficial records?
Why do you think the residents live in these settlements in spite of all the
hardships?
What are the plans for the future of these settlements by your organization?

Temporal dimension:
What was population in the informal settlements in 2001?
How many settlements were listed in 2001 and in 2011? What is the reason for this
shift? Was it the change in definition or impact of policy or any other?
How have the policy towards informal settlements shifted over time? What are the
reasons behind these shifts?
What are the main challenges faced by the government with respect to informal
settlements?

Spatial dimension:
Which areas have the highest concentration of ‘slums’ in the city?
Do the elected officials such as councillors, MPs and MLAs work closely with your
organisation? If yes, how.
How are the informal settlements enumerated?
Do you use GIS or any other spatial program for the planning and implementation
of projects?
Do you have any spatial maps of informal settlements in the city? Census 2011?
### Appendix IV: List of Governance Actors Interviewed in Chennai and eThekwini Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Details of interviewee</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>Tamil Nadu Slum Clearance Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Level Coordinator for RAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Community Development officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Senior planner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Chennai Municipal Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Superintendent Engineer</td>
<td>DMK Political party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politician and secretary</td>
<td>AIADMK Political Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward councilor</td>
<td>Chennai Municipal Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Urban Planner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Deputy Editor</td>
<td>The Hindu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Analyst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper Reporter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Poverty Activist</td>
<td>Information and Resource Centre for the Deprived Urban Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director - Projects</td>
<td>Chennai City Connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Researcher</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Technology, Madras Institute of Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher and PhD Candidate</td>
<td>Madras Institute of Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Jindal School of Government and Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Researcher</td>
<td>International Institute of Social Studies (ISS), Erasmus University Rotterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Researcher</td>
<td>Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies, Erasmus University Rotterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Researcher</td>
<td>University of Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Details of interviewee</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eThekwini Municipality</td>
<td>Manager – Research and Policy, Human Settlements Department</td>
<td>eThekwini Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Planner - Human Settlements Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architect - Urban design Branch,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex- head of Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Head: Technical Support, Water and Sanitation Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Planner for Housing - Human Settlements Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward Councilor</td>
<td>Democratic Alliance Political Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward Councilor</td>
<td>African National Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community officer</td>
<td>Community Organization Resource Centre (CORC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community officer</td>
<td>Federation of the Urban Poor (FEDUP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Executive officer</td>
<td>Project Preparation Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Activist and Chairman</td>
<td>Abahlali baseMjondolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architect/Urbanist</td>
<td>Aiello Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Kirk White Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic and public intellectual</td>
<td>University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Researcher</td>
<td>University of KwaZulu Natal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental planner and researcher</td>
<td>University of KwaZulu Natal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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