*Children, Youth and Environments 15(2), 2005*

# An Alternative Model for Responding to Children in Poverty: The Work of the Alliance in Mumbai and Other Cities

**Sheridan Bartlett**
*Children's Environment's Research Group*
*The Graduate Center, City University of New York*

Citation: Bartlett, Sheridan. (2005). "An Alternative Model for Responding to Children in Poverty: The Work of the Alliance in Mumbai and Other Cities." *Children, Youth and Environments* 15(2): 342-355. Retrieved [date] from **http://www.colorado.edu/journals/cye/**.

---

**Comment on This Article**

## Abstract

*This paper describes the work of the NGO SPARC and its grass roots partners in Mumbai (together known as the Alliance), with particular reference to the implications of their work for children and child-focused organizations. Although the Alliance does not specifically target children, its efforts to find the most practical solutions to the problems of urban poverty often involve close attention to children's needs. A particular example is described: the community toilet blocks developed in Mumbai and other Indian cities that include special toilets for young children. By ensuring that the particular needs of the youngest community members are met, this component ensures that the toilet blocks work better for everyone. The paper suggests that responding to children within the context of more general community-led development efforts may result in more effective, grounded and enduring solutions than those achieved through separate projects for children.*

**Keywords:** **urban poverty**, **children**, **community development**, **sanitation**

This paper was initially commissioned by Save the Children Sweden.

## Introduction

Children and young people under 15 make up about 30 percent of the world's population. In some poor urban communities in the South, almost half the residents are children. But the decisions that affect the quality of life in these communities are seldom made with close attention to this large group of people.

This case study is part of a larger effort to compile some practical lessons on supporting the development of cities and towns that are responsive to the concerns of children and young people.[1] One objective of this effort has been to find out what works to encourage government agencies, especially at the local level, to act on their responsibilities towards children as citizens, and to take into account the broad and often very significant impact that their activities have for children's rights—especially for their everyday living conditions.

The case study looks at the NGO SPARC (Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centres) and its partners in Mumbai, the National Slum Dwellers Federation and the women's collective, Mahila Milan. Together the three organizations are known as the Alliance, and their work has been quite extensively documented for its effectiveness in addressing urban poverty.[2] It may seem strange, given the objectives here, to present the work of a group of organizations which do *not* primarily focus on children, and which do *not* use rights as an explicit frame of reference. Wouldn't it make more sense to learn from the work of effective children's agencies with rights-based agendas?

There were three good reasons for undertaking a case study about the Alliance:

- The very fact that the Alliance is not specifically child-focused in most of its activities is an asset in this case. Few government agencies make children their primary concern, even when their activities affect children. There is more to be learned here about integrating attention to children into broader responsibilities than might be learned from an organization that primarily targets children.
- Not all governments are interested in children's rights; more often than not there is a need for active pressure and for more complex forms of engagement than just awareness-raising or encouragement. The Alliance offers some interesting models for negotiating concessions in favor of the poor from government, and has many practical successes in this area.
- Surveying other responses to the problems of urban children, we have found little that explores the processes that ensure long-term systemic change. The Alliance is critically reflective on these issues, and over time has arrived at principles and practices that deserve careful consideration for any effort to move beyond isolated projects as a way of responding to the concerns of the poor.

Let us consider these three points in more detail.

## Why Consider the Alliance's Work as a Template for Attention to Children?

### 1) "Including" versus "Targeting" Children

For most local authorities, responding to the concerns of children means setting up health care, education and other social services. These services are critical to children's welfare, but they are not the only support that children need from local government. Everyday living conditions are also a concern. Secure, functional housing; proper provision for water, sanitation, drainage, garbage collection and electricity; and safe, pleasant public space are all fundamental to children's health, well-being and long-term development (Chawla 2001; Satterthwaite et al. 1996; Wohlwill and Heft 1987). These concerns are rarely addressed with children as the focus of attention since the general assumption is that living conditions will affect children the same way that they affect everyone else.

This is not always true, however. The living conditions of the urban poor are challenging for all residents, but children can be affected in distinct ways. For instance, they are more susceptible to infection when very young, they crave space for active play, and they run higher risks from numerous hazards (Murray and Lopez 1997; Berger and Mohan 1996.) A failure to respond to the requirements of children's minds and bodies during their years of rapid growth and change can have irrevocable consequences. Where there are larger, more compelling priorities—such as balancing the requirements of the poor with the development of a city at large, or getting *any* level of provision for illegal squatters—it can seem frivolous to worry about the particular needs of children and adolescents, girls and boys. But in most poor communities, these young people are almost half the population. It is only practical to consider how change (or its absence) will affect them.

Even in cities that call themselves "child-friendly," this kind of inclusion is rare. Few local authorities seriously consider the implications for children when they allocate resources for basic services, plan changes to their transportation systems, or consider how to respond to squatters. Organizations that focus on children may not be the most useful groups to turn to for guidance, since by definition they do not face the same range of competing interests. They may be effective in developing good, innovative programs for children, but they are generally not as experienced in ensuring that children's interests are routinely taken into account across a broader range of activities (Bartlett 1999). The Alliance, on the other hand, is focused on all of the urban poor, not just children. They have repeatedly demonstrated a capacity to understand, respect and respond to different concerns and interests among those they represent and support—children among others.[3]

### 2) Working Constructively with Government

To a large extent, the goods, services and supports necessary for ensuring adequate living conditions for urban children in poverty are either provided, controlled or regulated by government. Except on a small scale, it is usually not possible to ensure that these conditions can be met without government support.

Local authorities in cities that have proclaimed themselves "child friendly" are in theory committed to ensuring this kind of support. They may be open to considering how they can bring about a basic shift in values to regard children, and especially children in poverty, as deserving of consideration across the full range of government actions (although in fact there do not appear to be many cities that have this kind of change in mind when they decide to call themselves "child friendly.") But there are many more cities in the world that have no real interest in responding to the concerns of the poor, and no interest in whether they are "child friendly" or not. In these situations, it has to be up to civil society to bring the issue to the table, and to push for attention. The Alliance has been very effective in this regard, taking a pragmatic, strategic, persistent approach to working with government at all levels. They work as negotiators, partners, mediators, manipulators—whatever it takes to make things happen. This can involve some problematic collaborations, as will be discussed below, but there is much to be learned from them about practical strategies for bringing about change.

**3) Lasting Change**

In searching out examples of attention to urban children, whether on the part of governments or NGOs, one finds a greater emphasis on isolated projects than on longer term processes. There are many descriptions of innovative undertakings, but few case studies that follow an effort over time, considering its problems as well as its strengths, discussing the relationships and dynamics that have been part of the process, and looking critically at how and where it fits in the larger picture. This may be an artifact of documentation—it is certainly easier to obtain quick snapshots. There may be many untold stories of projects where people have learned from their own mistakes and successes in ways that have contributed to broader lasting change. However, an unfortunately large number of these children's projects, when followed up a few years later,[4] appear to have dropped out of sight. No matter how interesting or innovative these efforts have been, they often seem to do little to change the long term realities for children, or to contribute to our understanding of how this is best done.

A hallmark of the Alliance has been its capacity to build on experience and to value problems as much as successes for their capacity to contribute to learning and to change. Their objective is not to create isolated showcase projects as ends in themselves that will be dropped if they fail to work out as planned, but rather to view any project as a component integrally linked to the larger context of a community or city, and to a larger process of change.

These are some reasons, then, for turning to the Alliance for practical lessons. These lessons are not unfamiliar to many in the development world, but it is useful to consider what they mean in terms of delivering for children. It is also important to recognize that no matter how simple or familiar some of these strategies may be, it is still rare to see them taken seriously in practice.

After providing some background on the Alliance and the basic principles that inform its activities, this paper will discuss one of their programs as a way of exploring in more detail what their work means for children, and how the concerns of children inform their work.

## Some Background on the Alliance

The Alliance consists of three partners: SPARC, the National Slum Dwellers Federation (NSDF), and Mahila Milan.

- SPARC (Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centres), a registered NGO, was founded in 1984 by social workers in Mumbai. It focused initially on working with women pavement dwellers, but now provides broad support to its partners and to a wider network.
- NSDF, or the Federation, was set up in 1974 as a grassroots, community-based organization of the urban poor, working on preventing demolitions, securing tenure and obtaining basic services—first in Mumbai, and now in over 50 cities throughout India. In Mumbai alone, the Federation has over 250,000 members.
- Mahila Milan, established in 1986 with support from SPARC, is a network of collectives composed of women pavement and slum dwellers who form organized savings schemes to undertake various efforts, and who work closely with the Federation. Although Mahila Milan started in Mumbai, like the Federation, it now has members throughout India.

The three organizations came together to form the Alliance in 1987, and they work in partnership to address issues of urban poverty—particularly in securing tenure, proper housing and access to such basic services as water, sanitation, electricity and transport.

### The Involvement of Poor Communities

An important aspect of this partnership is the basic understanding that SPARC plays only a supporting role, and that slum and pavement dwellers themselves, through their organizations, are the key players in the struggle against poverty. This comes out of a recognition that the poor have a lifetime of experience in developing ingenious responses to the challenges of daily survival; they are seen as better equipped to understand their own problems and to identify practical, economical solutions than professionals who, in spite of their training, may have a limited grasp of very local problems and requirements. It is also a recognition of the importance for the poor of gaining experience and confidence in developing their own solutions and negotiating to carry them out. SPARC provides a link to the world of formal institutions; it spearheads connections and buffers the Federation and Mahila Milan from the accounting and administrative demands of outside agencies and funders. It provides back-up and support for urban poor groups that want to learn from experience as they develop new ways of solving their own problems.

"Community participation" is a development cliché at this point—but the way it is understood can vary enormously. As far back as 1969, Arnstein pointed to this variation (Arnstein 1969). "Participation" is often nothing more than permitting the poor to play some limited role in an initiative, such as viewing plans in progress, or supplying the labor or maintenance for a project that they have had little chance to shape. The Alliance demonstrates instead that communities of the poor, given the opportunity and the time, can play a primary role in designing and implementing solutions to the problems that affect them and the larger city. Only by working

through these solutions, the Alliance believes, will the poor really take ownership of the results. It is generally accepted that missteps and detours are central to learning, and that only through this cumulative learning can the poor take control of their lives.

**Federation and Horizontal Exchange**

Central to the Alliance's approach is a belief in the power of federation and horizontal exchange between groups. This can contribute to a flexible, non-hierarchical and mutually supportive form of organization. Local households and individuals organize themselves into groups or collectives (generally involved together in small-scale daily savings) that can then support, teach and learn from other groups with similar objectives. This occurs at the city level, but also between cities, and even between countries—the Alliance is part of an international network of federations of the poor in 16 nations. Visits by groups of slum dwellers to other groups, whether in the same city or across the world, are key to the activity of the federations. They share learning, exchange strategies, and add to the body of practical knowledge that is constantly being expanded and refined, whether on savings activities, sewer digging or housing design. To some critics, these visits may seem a wasteful use of resources, but they are in fact a powerful tool in broadening perspectives, invigorating local practices and adding legitimacy in the eyes of the authorities, who tend to take local groups more seriously when they see them being visited by delegations from a distance.

**Relationship with the Authorities**

The Alliance's achievements depend on their relationships and negotiations with local authorities and government agencies at all levels. How best to deal with these groups is a critical question. Sheela Patel, Director of SPARC, puts it like this:

> *When organizations commit themselves to working with urban poor communities, they are often faced with difficult choices. Should they confront and challenge the powers that determine and rule their lives or should they work around the problem and negotiate?* (Patel and Sharma 1998).

The Alliance is practical in this regard, finding incremental and patient work towards agreements and solutions more productive than head-on confrontation (although at times, groups may choose to confront as a part of a longer-term strategy to secure their interests.) They work with whatever group is in power rather than affiliating themselves with political parties, as is more common for the leadership of many grassroots organizations in India. This has opened the Alliance to criticism, since it often means working collaboratively with parties with which they may have strong ideological differences. The argument of the group is that, in representing the poorest, they do not have the luxury of waiting for the right government to be elected (d'Cruz and Satterthwaite 2005). While maintaining political neutrality, they try to develop good working relationships with individuals and agencies within state and local bureaucracies. The strategy is always in favor of long-term relationships, just as it is with cumulative learning over time. The knowledge about how to negotiate with agencies and authorities and how to navigate through the complex web of regulatory codes and political agendas is seen as far more valuable than the product of any one initiative (Shah and Shah 1995).

**Precedent Setting**

The Alliance has practical techniques for making progress in this world of often conflicting rules and regulations which can so easily derail a project. One of these strategies is what they refer to as "precedent setting." When existing policies or practices fail to work for them, they demonstrate more sensible alternatives. This generally involves actually creating or constructing the precedent in question, and then inviting government officials and others to visit it and see it working, and to consider it as a viable option. This can be a lengthy process. Sundar Burra, who works with SPARC, describes, for example, the case of ceiling heights in apartment buildings constructed by the Alliance. It took three years of lobbying and negotiation to get the city to accept the ceilings they had raised to 14 feet, allowing the construction of a mezzanine level for increased living area and greater privacy within the family. Now this has become an accepted precedent that offers more options to other families and groups. As Burra points out, it is practice that changes policy, not the other way around (Burra 2002). Precedent setting is seen as a constructive form of rule-breaking—a strategy for legitimating the kinds of innovative but usually illegal solutions that are so routine for the urban poor.

**The Alliance and Children**

What does all of this have to do with children? In practical terms, without specifically targeting children in most of its work, the Alliance gives precedence to precisely the issues that most deeply affect children, but that are generally not within the remit or capacity of child-focused agencies or programs. In dealing with eviction, tenure, housing, water and sanitation, the Alliance has improved the lives of hundreds of thousands of children.

But there is also an awareness of how specific conditions and events affect children, and attempts are made to respond accordingly. Some new Alliance apartment blocks, for instance, have wider hallways than are legally permitted in Mumbai buildings, partly to accommodate play in an environment that does not allow for easy outdoor access—another example of precedent setting or creative rule breaking in a densely populated city where housing solutions demand vertical living. The Alliance is pushing now for another zoning concession: shared open space where children can play and adults can socialize on each floor of new buildings—an attempt to regain some of the social solidarity that high-rise living can erode. These kinds of responses are not reserved for children; it is recognized that in any group there is a range of different concerns. In the same way, ground floor apartments are saved for those who have the greatest difficulty with stairs, and in planning for buildings with Muslim groups, the need for a separate social space for women and girls is acknowledged. There is a general attempt, within often pressing constraints, to accommodate particular needs as far as possible. The simplest way to illustrate this is by describing a program of work in which attention to young children's needs has become integral to a larger solution.

## The Alliance's Community Toilet Programs[5]

Sanitation for slum dwellers in India is extremely poor. Most have no provision in their homes, and the only sanitation, where it exists at all, consists of rundown public toilet blocks constructed by the municipality, with one toilet seat commonly serving over 600

people. This is true even in cities where resources are available for sanitation. These toilet blocks are usually poorly designed and shoddily built, and residents are rarely consulted on any aspect. Maintenance, which is supposed to be the responsibility of the municipality, is almost nonexistent, and toilets can be non-functional within months of their construction. An early Alliance survey in Mumbai found that in 151 settlements with one million residents, there was one toilet seat for every 1,500 users and 80 percent were not in working condition—latrines clogged and septic systems overflowing. Sometimes NGOs and private concerns build better quality toilets, but they generally charge more per use than the poor can afford.

For the pavement dweller women of Mahila Milan in central Mumbai, who had no place to defecate, sanitation was a high priority. They decided that community toilets were the most practical solution, but, after visiting local communities served by public toilet blocks in the late 1980s, they were well aware of the drawbacks—long lines, low-quality construction, wretchedly poor maintenance, and the fact that the area around toilets was used for defecation and dumping household waste. The municipality ignored the suggestions they made for improvements. So, drawing on funds from the UK charity Homeless International, they began to construct community toilets in Mumbai and four other Indian cities to gain experience and to demonstrate that they could design, build and maintain well-functioning community-managed toilets at a reasonable cost.

Between 1988 and 1996, Mahila Milan groups, supported by engineers and architects from SPARC, demonstrated a growing capacity to manage construction, arrange for maintenance, and deal effectively with local bureaucracies and regulations. These early experiences led to the Alliance being taken more seriously by municipalities and donors. Typical of the Alliance process, experience also led to a number of improvements and innovations. No two toilet blocks were the same—each reflected local circumstances and the needs of the communities that created and used them.

One innovation was the provision of special children's toilets. The women of Mahila Milan recognized that toilet blocks for adults did not work well for children. Small children were pushed out of the way when there was a line, and most were reluctant to use the latrines, put off by the dark and the smell, and frightened of falling into overly large pit openings. Mothers encouraged them to defecate outside. This is not unusual; research from several countries finds that young children rarely use latrines (Bartlett 2003). A UNICEF study in urban India, for instance, found that only 1 percent of children under six use latrines. The feces of an additional 5 percent are thrown into latrines, the remainder ending up in drains, streets or yards (UNICEF 2000). The resulting contamination is unhealthy and unpleasant for everyone in a community, but has especially critical implications for young children. 84 percent of all sanitation-related illness affects children under five, and diarrheal disease is second only to acute respiratory disease as a killer of young children (WHO 1999).

The women of Mahila Milan responded by building special children's toilet blocks next to the adult toilet blocks. These were bright open-air places with half-walls; the toilets had smaller squat plates and handles to hold on to, and opened into a trench easily

flushed with a small amount of water. Brightly colored tiles, and even plastic abacuses in some cases, made the toilets fun as well. Children were happy to use them, and there were adequate facilities for washing up nearby. This simple innovation, which has evolved over time, is now a standard feature of Alliance toilet blocks. Moreover, some of the cities where they have been built now include children's toilets in their specifications for municipally-funded toilets—a classic example of an Alliance precedent becoming routine practice.

Other toilet block innovations have also been good for children. Many blocks include a community room often used as a day care center. The outdoor area, no longer littered with feces, is a safer children's play space. Rather than being on the community periphery as with more conventional municipal-built blocks, Alliance toilet blocks are more centrally placed. This makes toilets easier to get to for most people—a critical feature for young children—and helps ensure that sites stay clean. The location and better upkeep, along with the addition of community meeting space, helps to change people's attitude towards toilets. Instead of being shameful eyesores, facilities can be viewed with pride and used with dignity. This is highly significant for children and adolescents, who are developing a sense of the world and their place in it. In poor urban communities in a number of countries, children speak of feeling shame in their filthy and neglected surroundings, which they see as a reflection of their own lack of worth (Chawla 2001). Knowing that their own bodily functions contribute to the squalor around them is a powerful component of this humiliation.

These toilet blocks have been a vital component of a much larger effort to improve living conditions and fight the insecurity which is standard for the urban poor. As Sundar Burra of SPARC points out, the demand for sanitation is strategic—local government can see how it relates to the health and well-being of the entire city, and it is less threatening than, say, a demand for secure tenure (although the state must allocate land for the toilet, thereby raising tenure issues implicitly). By taking the lead in planning, building and maintaining their own toilets, urban poor communities demonstrate their capacity on a number of fronts and change the basis of their relationship with government, laying the groundwork for addressing tougher issues. Instead of being seen as "the problem," these groups demonstrate that they are fundamental to the solution. This has meant growing interest and involvement on the part of local authorities and an initiative that has spread to many places. In the city of Pune, 85 percent of slum communities now have access to decent toilets, and within another year, five Indian cities will have complete sanitation. This is not to say that all the toilets, or any of the other Alliance initiatives are trouble-free. Even when there are carefully thought-out ways of dealing with potential problems, there can be tensions in any community between individual and collective interests.

## Conclusions

What lessons does this initiative offer? How are these children's toilets any different from any other attempt to improve conditions for children in poverty?

- **The essentially integrated quality of effective interventions.** The children's toilet effort has been successful largely *because* it is part of a larger effort to improve sanitation for all community members, and *because* it has

been necessary to the success of that effort. Only by recognizing and acting on children's realities has it been possible to create sanitation solutions that work well for everyone. The toilet blocks are also part of a larger coordinated effort on the part of slum dwellers to improve living conditions. It is unlikely that a special project to build children's toilets, separate from this larger context, would have been as successful—either in terms of the work needed to sustain it over time, or in terms of the capacity reach larger numbers of people. There are practical implications here both for the work of child-focused organizations and for efforts by municipalities to address children's rights. When attempts to improve conditions for children are integrated into more general community efforts to tackle the problems of urban poverty, there is more chance they will take root and thrive.

- **Solutions from the community**. These toilets came out of the communities they serve and are a reminder that this has to be the basis for truly grounded responses to children's requirements. This solution was identified, designed, developed, improved and disseminated by poor women, mostly illiterate and untrained—not experts or outside agencies. The Alliance's approach has very specific implications for how "participation" happens in order to be this effective. It allows people the space to identify their own needs and to learn from their own mistakes. Mistakes, too often, are not easily tolerated by funders. SPARC says that

  > *Built into many community participation programs, is an 'only one chance' clause which does not allow the learning and training capital produced by mistakes to be reinvested in new processes. Instead, it stops participation at the first sign of error. Poor communities are unable to experiment because they have no margin within their limited resources to absorb mistakes. This is one of the crises of poverty, and this is why these toilet projects make room for and even encourage mistakes* (Burra 2002).

  The Alliance approach has had proven effects for young children through their mothers' involvement. But what does it imply for the participation of children themselves, especially given that their involvement is an increasingly accepted and even requisite component of environmental initiatives for children and young people? Is it reasonable for them to take this kind of time to learn from a process they have undertaken? Children do not remain children for long, and a slow process of learning and experimentation could be less ideal in their case. Some people argue that children need to see results in order not to become disillusioned. The process, for instance, of going through bureaucratic channels to create recreation space in a hazardous waste-strewn lot might end up involving different "generations" of children.

  These kinds of delays are frustrating, but it is questionable whether they are more frustrating than participatory projects undertaken more for their educational benefits for "young citizens" than with any real commitment to follow-up. Even those projects that *are* intended to contribute to real change to

the local environment often seem to run into bureaucratic obstacles or fall into black holes of official disregard (**see the paper by Clements in this issue**).

If children are part of a larger culture of participation, they may more easily recognize the broader changes around them as part of a slow incremental process. If their involvement is not so compartmentalized from that of adults, perhaps they are more likely, not less, to feel that they are being taken seriously, and to recognize that their priorities, over time, are more likely to be realized. We have too few examples of children's participation as an accepted and routine part of a community process, rather than as a specially funded and organized program-for-children.

That being said, it would be a welcome addition to the work of the Alliance if more attention and support were given to the active involvement of young people within their communities. The particular issues and conditions that affect older children are surely best identified and responded to with their help, and attention to these concerns is likely to improve the situation for all.

- **Taking a pragmatic approach—letting policy follow practice.** Engagement with local authorities around issues involving children is frequently framed and approached in terms of children's rights. While the work of the Alliance is clearly imbued with a recognition of the rights of the poor, they do not use human rights as a strategic tool. The Alliance takes a pragmatic, rather than an idealistic, approach to dealing with government. Their style is to start small. By demonstrating that change is possible and practical, they persuade the authorities at least to consent to change, if not actively to support it. Support tends to follow as success becomes apparent, or, as pointed out above, "policy follows practice." Governments, even "child friendly" governments, are averse to risk. They want to know that something works before they commit themselves to it. If the children's toilet program had been initiated through discussions with the Pune municipality on children's right to adequate sanitation, it might have ended right there. But by demonstrating that children's toilets are an economical and effective contribution to the solution of a larger problem, the Alliance was able, over time, to have Pune officials adopt the children's toilets as part of their own specifications, and to invest in them willingly as a sensible solution. In time, anything less might come to be unthinkable.

  What does this mean for a rights-based approach? As with policy and practice, it is possible in some cases that an awareness of rights follows the experience of rights, not the other way around. When Mumbai families living along the railroad tracks organized themselves through the Federation to relocate, their main concern was to find an alternative to certain forced eviction. A few years later they said that they could never go back to their former conditions, now that they had experienced something different. Without this change, they said, "we would have lived in the dirt and died in the dirt."

  The same thing may be true for officials: actually seeing how children's toilets can change the local environment and the daily experience of young children,

the notion of a child's right to a standard of living that promotes healthy development may become meaningful for them in practical terms. Cities that have decided to take on the banner of child-friendliness may be ready to use children's rights as a framework for action, but there are many more cities that probably need to learn about rights by experiencing them. Encouraging these cities to respond to children's rights may mean adopting the creative, pragmatic, inch-by-inch strategies of the Alliance, rather than starting with more traditional forms of advocacy and awareness-raising.

## Endnotes

1. This effort, funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, was undertaken by Save the Children Sweden in 2003-2004.
2. For recent descriptions of the Alliance's work, see, for instance, Appadurai 2004; Mitlin and Satterthwaite 2004; and Samuels 2005. For descriptions of other federations of the urban poor and the NGOs that support them, see *Environment and Urbanization* 13(2), 2001.
3. The Alliance has in fact "targeted" children on occasion. Their *Sadak Chaap* program, for instance, focuses on the needs of a group of street children, and back in 1990, SPARC undertook research identifying the concerns of a number of vulnerable groups of children in Bombay (Patel 1990).
4. This observation is based on experiences of attempting to follow up examples in the Child Friendly City database and in the UN Habitat Best Practices database.
5. Information on this program is taken from Burra, Patel and Kerr (2003) as well as from discussion with Alliance members.

***Sheridan Bartlett*** *is a research associate at the Children's Environments Research Group in New York, and works as a consultant to Save the Children's International Alliance, conducting research involving young children in Nepal, and supporting the development of environment-related programming in several other Asian countries. She is also associated with the International Institute for Environment and Urbanization (IIED) in London, where she is managing editor of the journal* Environment and Urbanization*. Recent publications include a UNICEF Innocenti Digest on urban children with David Satterthwaite, a review of children's rights and the physical environment for Save the Children- Sweden, and articles in various journals on topics related to children's environmental health.*

## References

**Appadurai, A.** (2004). "The Capacity to Aspire: Culture and the Terms of Recognition." In Rao, V. and M. Walton, *Culture and Public Action*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 37-58.

**Arnstein, S.R.** (1969). "Eight Rungs on the Ladder of Citizen Participation." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35(4): 216-224.

**Bartlett, S.** (1999). "Children's Experience of the Physical Environment in Poor Urban Settlements and the Implications for Policy, Planning and Practice." *Environment and Urbanization* 11(2): 63-75.

**Bartlett, S.** (2003). "Water, Sanitation and Urban Children: The Need to Go Beyond "Improved" Provision." *Environment and Urbanization* 15(2): 57-70.

**Berger, L.R. and D. Mohan** (1996). *Injury Control: A Global View*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

**Burra, Sundar** (2002). "Changing the Rules: Guidelines for the Revision of Regulations for Urban Upgrading." Mumbai: SPARC.

**Burra, S., S. Patel and T. Kerr** (2003.) "Community-Designed, Built and Managed Toilet Blocks in Indian Cities." *Environment and Urbanization* 15(2): 11-32.

**Chawla, L., ed.** (2001). *Growing Up in an Urbanizing World.* Earthscan/UNESCO, London.

**D'Cruz, C. and D. Satterthwaite** (2005). "Building Homes, Changing Official Approaches: The Work of the Urban Poor Organizations and Their Federations and Their Contributions to Meeting the Millennium Development Goals in Urban Areas." *Poverty Re-Education in Urban Areas Series, Working Paper 16.* London: IIED.

**Mitlin, D. and Satterthwaite, D.** (2004). *Empowering Squatter Citizens: Local Government, Civil Society and Urban Poverty Reduction.* London: Earthscan.

**Murray, C.J. and A.D. Lopez** (1997). "Global Mortality, Disability, and the Contribution of Risk Factors: Global Burden of Disease Study." *Lancet* 349(9063): 1436-42.

**Patel, S.** (1990). "Street Children, Hotel Boys and Children of Pavement Dwellers and Construction Workers in Bombay: How They Meet Their Daily Needs. *Environment and Urbanization* 2(2): 9-26.

**Patel, S. and K. Sharma** (1998). "One David and Three Goliaths: Avoiding Anti-Poor Solutions to Mumbai's Transport Problems." *Environment and Urbanization* 10(2): 149-160.

**Samuels, J., ed.** (2005). *Removing Unfreedoms: Citizens as Agents of Change in Urban Development.* Rugby, Warwickshire, UK: ITDG Publishing.

**Satterthwaite, D., R. Hart, et al.** (1996). *The Environment for Children.* London: Earthscan.

**Shah, P. and M.K. Shah** (1995). "Participatory Methods: Precipitating or Avoiding Conflict? *PLA Notes No 24*. London: IIED, 48-51.

**UNICEF** (2000). *Multiple Indicator Survey*. Delhi: UNICEF.

**WHO** (1999). *World Health Report, 1999 Data Base.* Geneva: World Health Organization.

**Wohlwill, J. and H. Heft** (1987). "The Physical Environment and the Development of the Child." In Stokols, D. and I. Altman, eds. *Handbook of Environmental Psychology*. New York: Wiley, 175-204.