



What can we learn from Place-Work-  
Workplace entitlements about good  
urban living?

**Smita Srinivas**



# What can we learn from Place-Work-Workplace entitlements about good urban living?

---

**Smita Srinivas**

**Case No 1-0017**

This Case Brief contains:

**Introduction**

The IIHS Case Method

**Case Note**

Summary and the pedagogical imagination of the case

**Teaching Note**

Ways of teaching this case

**Detailed Table of Contents**

The full breadth of material available in the full case,  
including exhibits and archival materials

**Access Information**

Details on how to access the full case

**First published in Bengaluru, 2017.**

**Suggested Citation for this case is:**

Srinivas, S. (2017) What can we learn from Place-Work-Workplace entitlements about good urban living? IIHS Case No 1-0017. Bangalore. Indian Institute for Human Settlements.

# Reframing Urban Inclusion

The opening set of cases produced by IIHS represents a focus central to our institutional mission, its teaching and its practice: urban inclusion. Through an on-going collaborative, multi-year research project titled 'Reframing Urban Inclusion', the 30 cases available on the website, [www.cases.iihs.co.in](http://www.cases.iihs.co.in) include original teaching and learning cases commissioned and produced at IIHS through support from the Ford Foundation.

The cases were curated to address a particular set of challenges. The first is pedagogical. IIHS' stated aim is to be part of a global moment to re-think urban theory and practice from India, South Asia and the Global South. These cases are a key curricular and pedagogical intervention within that effort. Distributed through open access modes to encourage widespread, public and diverse forms of use, the cases seek to give scholars and educators in the Global South a new canon to teach with, that begins from and is responsive to place.

The second is more outward facing. India is at a critical moment in its urbanisation. The urban agenda has begun to emerge strongly on the national political register, and questions of how to shape policy agendas from housing to employment, planning to service delivery, are more pressing than ever before. It is our hope that these cases will therefore equally be used by and inform an evidence-based, empirically rich, conceptually grounded and reflexive practice and interface with policy.

Since 2013, the project has brought together leading academics and practitioners from different disciplines to identify and contextualise social and economic realities of Indian cities through the case method. We hope that they will provide new evidence of the possible opportunities and mechanisms for urban integration as well as build a conceptual and empirical foundation for politically, socially, and economically inclusive cities.

The project has three thematic foci:

1. Conceptualising Pro-Poor Planning

Urban planning processes determine access to basic resources such as land, shelter and housing, livelihoods, mobility, and security. Inclusive urban planning is aimed at serving all the citizens of the city, reducing vulnerability and addressing exclusion from access to these basic resources.

Cases in this theme (1) untangle the current state of urban planning and its effects on vulnerability and exclusion, (2) explore how meaningful participation can be more effective in pro-poor planning, and (3) highlight opportunities for, and instances of successful integration across agencies and organisations involved in urban planning.

## 2. Re-visiting Settlement Upgrading

This theme seeks to expand and re-articulate debates on slums in India. The 'slum' is a form of an urban settlement that is situated at the intersection of land markets, new urban political economies, the efficacy of the state as a provider of housing to the poor, differentiated state-citizen relations, splintered urban infrastructure, questions of law, legality and planning, as well as conceptions of urban citizenship.

Cases in this theme (1) explore the processes of settlement and resettlement, paying attention to the market and political forces that shape the outcomes, (2) broaden the scope of settlement transformation from spatial upgradation to impacts on other sites of transformation such as livelihoods and employment, and (3) explore alternative imaginations of 'property rights' and tenure regimes.

## 3. Re-drawing the Picture: Metrics of Urban Inclusion

The dynamics of urban poverty and vulnerability are poorly understood. We know that the security of tenure, spatial coherence of urban infrastructure and service delivery, transit distances between livelihoods and living spaces, socio- cultural identities and social networks play important roles in inclusive cities. However, we have limited statistical data and information on the locational and distribution patterns of urban India.

Cases in this theme (1) examine the use of data in urban decision making and identify potential sites for intervention, (2) provide a more contextual and holistic analysis of urban dynamics, moving beyond sector-wise administrative data collection methods, and (3) emphasise improvements in information and learning from experience for local decision making.

# IIHS Case Method

The IIHS case is a work-in-progress that represents experiments in different forms of creating interdisciplinary and inter-sectoral cases, as well as a diversity of pedagogical environments to learn and teach with these cases. The opening set of cases is, thus, also in a sense, an experiment in form and teaching modes. Given this, we do not claim a singular 'IIHS Case Method' or any one form or definition of a case. Indeed, one of the explicit aims of case development at IIHS is to challenge conventional ideas of what case-based learning is.

How then does a user know how to use cases? Pedagogical transactions will differ from case to case and indeed multiple options will be open within each case. Therefore, in order to aid users, all IIHS cases come with a set of consistent elements that help users navigate through the diversity of form and content. These are:

- **Preface:** Every case begins with an introduction by the case writer that describes their own approach to the case. How did the case writer frame the case? Why did they choose to structure it as they have? What were their intentions in writing the case?
- **Teaching Note:** The second shared case element is the Teaching Note. Here, the case writer lays out their imagination of how they would teach with the case in its current form. They suggest learning outcomes, pedagogical modes, learning environments and assessment frames. True to the diversity of the cases, each of these is particular to the case.
- **The Main Case:** This is the main body of the case—its core empirics, arguments, discourse and data. Across the cases, these come in different forms: PowerPoint presentations, audio-visual material, web interfaces, written text, and data visualisations.
- **Pedagogical Possibilities:** The next element lays out the case writer's suggestions on other ways in which the case could be taught, including in other disciplines or learning environments. These are not as detailed as the Teaching Note but offer a set of possibilities to the user to imagine other uses of the case than those laid out.
- **Case Archive:** The final element of the case is a library of documents—reports to interview transcripts, unedited footage to visual photo libraries—that act as an archive for the case. This repository allows users to also access a host of background and additional information necessary to navigate the larger contexts in which the case is situated.

Each IIHS case—regardless of the diversity of its form—comes structured with these elements. It is our hope that this recognisable framework will enable users to navigate easily across cases with very diverse elements and forms.



# Case Note

## What is the 'Case'?

While debates of poverty have a vital place in the debate of urban inclusion, discussions of firms are sometimes absent. Urban inclusion requires a more determined approach to analyse how employment or 'labour' is represented, and what role the location of production plays.

This case focusses on a more complete discussion of a taxonomy of industrial welfare (Place-Work-Workplace) in Srinivas (2009; 2010) in Indian, and historical context.

## The analytical perspective

At its heart, this is a case of economic development and growth of national industrial development plans and how cities are affected. The case elaborates on the particular taxonomy of 'P-W-WP' or 'place, work, or work-place entitlements' that reflect different degrees and types of urban inclusion of workers.

What are its benefits? The case uses the taxonomy to debate how people might be analysed with respect to urban contexts and the various paths of inclusion represented by this taxonomy within a context of national industrial growth and welfare concerns. This allows us to address economy and social life together more directly.

The argument through the study of this taxonomy is so that there can be no notion of inclusive planning without a clear understanding of how economic development and work relations are jointly governed by the state in an urban, industrialising environment. By a differentiated understanding of categories of industrial sectors and workers, we can parse how the nation-state and cities deem workers and other residents eligible for particular forms of inclusion.

Moreover, it is more useful to separate the overarching spatial lens of cities into three distinct institutional environments (place, work, and workplaces) in which the employment-social policy relationship can be more clearly seen. As will become clearer, these three institutional environments and India's complex relationship to them, permit a different reading of the opportunities of combining economic and spatial planning in order to have healthier, more secure, urban residents.



## The policy and planning advantages of the approach

In addition to the analytical advantages of the taxonomy for debate, there are some programmatic and process insights to be offered.

If we are to provide more political economy context to spatial analysis, the analysis of industrial sectors and worker categories leads us into this task. To this end, this paper is a way to understand the notion of industrial welfare and the ways in which India might manage inclusion of workers and others in its cities and wider regions. The presumption here is that no discussion of urban inclusion or ‘pro-poor’ can make sense without a direct discussion of industrial firms and the economy, and the limits to approaches exclusively situated in firms. Yet, without conceptual underpinnings made more explicit, the optimism that industrial transformation will necessarily be good for our cities and nation, may be misplaced. Rather than discuss ‘inclusion’ in multiple ways—which have been well done elsewhere—this paper focusses on how industrial transformation and its welfare benefits are institutionally and organisationally regulated. Through this, we can see how some types of inclusion and exclusion become more visible.

## Components and Materials

The components of this case study exclusively comprises written material.

Exhibit 1 Introduces the reader by first discussing some important structural features of the economy and their institutional characteristics. This requires understanding why entitlements based in or even delivered through firms might go some distance in improving welfare and contributing to income, spatial, and health inclusions for example, but this will not be enough.

Exhibit 2 talks about the several reasons for trying to understand a more integrated approach to cities with examples derived from construction works and street vendors. It also talks about how the Supreme Court’s ruling addressing the right to work for all people is pitted against a constitutional ruling against municipal government functions, because it is the latter that is required to find the places in which people can legitimately exercise their right to work.

Exhibit 3 is a table from the section ‘The Taxonomy of Place, Work and Workplace’.

For example, when we see that workplaces are treated in unique ways by sectors, we can say more about what ‘pro-poor’ planning can be. Spatial and institutional features of individual sectors show us the dynamic nature of the economy. The construction sector, for example, offers itinerant worksites, while a garment factory is a fixed location. On the other hand, a piece-rate worker for a garment factory, will inevitably work in her home, so her workplace is different from a factory worker. Whether such workers can organise, have political entitlements such as healthcare or housing, transportation allowances, or decent housing, is also determined by the taxonomy used for analysis. There are also numerous ways to view political organising strategies based on whether workers are grouped by workplaces or not.

Likewise, urban master plans that treat spatial analysis in an undifferentiated way will create zoning categories that are more static and invariably insensitive to the location of work, or the dynamic institutional context for workers coming in, or moving across towns and cities. Using the taxonomy, urban locations can be presented analytically with more texture, acknowledging in many cases that no clear categorisation is possible. This too can lead us to better planning processes and cities that are more dynamic and attentive to work processes and industrial investments.

## Structure of the case

The paper first discusses some important structural features of the economy and their institutional characteristics. This requires understanding why entitlements based in or even delivered through firms might go some distance in improving welfare and contributing to income, spatial, and health inclusions for example, but this will not be enough.

The paper then discusses a framework based on Work, Place, and Workplace (Srinivas 2009, 2010) and explains its importance. This moves away from the simpler, more utopian notion perhaps of 'urban inclusion' which ironically removes some of the spatial characteristics of cities by confusing several different strands of entitlements, their dynamism and their regulation.

Finally, it provides examples from Bengaluru as a specific example of how economic growth and development characteristics, specifically sector changes, can be used with this W, P, WP framework to understand the gaps in urban inclusion.

Not all aspects of urban inclusion or of industrial and labour debates can be addressed here. For elaboration of the issues on industrial welfare, social protections and industrial growth, the reader should look at the select publications below from the author and writings by others on labour markets, social policy history, or the informal economy, on which the arguments are based, all of which further describe the challenge of bringing economic and social policy issues together.

# Exhibits

## Exhibit 1: from 'Introduction'

If employer benefits are rarely available to most workers, and government programs are hard to access, then only programmes generated either through work identities ('I work, therefore I am entitled') or through where people are located (I access benefits through my ward location, my housing status, my ration card or other location status) are left. The Aadhar card debates in India have run into perilous terrain because while they were imagined as a way to integrate all Indians irrespective of income, location, or work-status, they have been constitutionally challenged as a mechanism to ensure social program benefits (I need an Aadhar card to get my gas connection, my BPL food benefits, or group health insurance).

While the entitlement route may seem spatially simple, when an Aadhar card is discussed, the political mediation required to receive any benefits at all, are clearly laid out in the political economy and social policy literatures. (A motivated reader can summarise some of these challenges through a literature survey). The literatures point out that political patronage of various types continue to bedevil Indian social programs from Public Distribution Systems (PDS) to the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) and Slum Redevelopment benefits and relocation to better housing.

Then we come to cities. Set against this wider economic transformation issue of which employment and location are institutionally 'sticky' (Srinivas 2009), and against the challenges of easy access to existing or planned government programs, urban residents who are low-income have no one set of 'inclusion' options, nor are these social programs all necessarily 'pro-poor'. This provides, therefore, the necessary impetus to ask what types of taxonomies and historic considerations might inform the way economic and social programs for cities can be formulated.

This case originates from the idea of whether or not urban residents experience good living, which has a lot to do with whether their health, housing, education, and transport are well taken care of. However, these are historically set against national and regional contexts of welfare entitlement in industrial transformation, specifically the approach to social protection plans and 'productive social policies'. This paper shows, building on prior analyses, how three distinct roots of industrial welfare (place, work, and work-place systems of entitlements) can prove useful explanations for re-translating national institutional design to the urban and regional levels in the way they situate inclusive entitlements and urban inclusion. Using a range of data sources—including Indian national and state plan documents, healthcare entitlements in cities, and the organisational histories for struggle in labour and health—it explores the challenges and opportunities to urban inclusion within the context of India's industrial transformation and its particular forms of industrial welfare.

## Exhibit 2: from the section 'The Analytical Impasse'

There are several analytical reasons and practical ones for trying to understand a more integrated approach to cities. For example, on the practical side, construction workers, street vendors, and 'putting out', contracted or piece rate workers have traditionally been difficult to categorise because their workplaces are challenging to identify. This limits not only healthcare benefits in many countries, but it fundamentally affects their national and urban identity as full worker participants in the economy. Therefore, the spatial location of work and its institutional affiliations connect both work identities and workplaces. Relatedly, the more national or constitutional considerations pushed towards a unitary identity of 'worker' as a mechanism for progressive rights but in the absence of a contingent spatial or institutional modifier, these rights-whether they be obtaining an identity card or being permitted to use a street sidewalk, or access benefits for healthcare, become especially difficult to obtain.

In the Indian context, the Supreme Court's ruling addressing the right to work for all people, has pitted a constitutional ruling against municipal government functions, because it is the latter that is required to find the places in which people can legitimately exercise their right to work. The understandable response of several cities has been either to contest the ruling, or to delay the implementation because it can be a mammoth task to reconfigure the process by which an urban space is allocated and regulated.

Analytically, one could argue that this type of spatial integration is in fact a more theoretically rigorous approach to political economy as opposed to a fragmented economic process in which production and redistribution are separated spatially and institutionally (Srinivas 2012). The labour movement for one has struggled in many ways and across countries to consolidate its organising games. This is because more workers have moved away from factory based work into other spatially dispersed forms of work, or have never entered factory based work in the numbers that allowed for 'traditional' labour organising. The decline in membership in the labour union has been explained in several ways, not least because factory labour in many countries has been declining and 'informal' contracted or other types of work have been rising. Sites and types of organising have shifted (Roy Chowdhury 2003).

### Exhibits 3: from the section 'The Taxonomy of Place, Work and Workplace'

|           |  |  |
|-----------|--|--|
| Place     | Location of residence                                | The location of residence is separated from workplace in many instances, but might be the same. E.g., construction workers living on-site may temporarily live and work in the same place, while a home-based garment worker may permanently work where she lives, or an IT worker may telecommute several days a week. In contrast, a garment factory worker travels from home to work.   |
| Work      | Labour status (often defined by national labour law) | Those who 'work' are invariably defined and recognised quite strictly and narrowly by national labour law. However, children, much older people, or others such as pregnant women or new mothers may all lie outside-to different degrees-the 'workforce' recognised by labour laws, yet all may be working in reality. Work status however, provides a unique set of political and financial entitlements—often in the form of provident funds, healthcare, or other benefit. Those seen as 'not working' or not recognised by labour law definitions—such as contracted workers, piece-rate workers, own-account or other workers in the 'informal economy'—are usually ineligible to participate in these schemes.  |
| Workplace | Location of work                                     | Workplace is distinct from Place, although it may overlap in some instances. Workplaces are also regulated spaces when the status of work is formally recognised by the state/government. For instance, factory workers have always retained special status in industrial transformations and economic priorities, and often special benefits such as healthcare and subsidised cafeterias. Thus factories are special workplaces with specific sets of norms and rules, such as about the role of employers, unionisation, or about safety standards. In contrast, if a workplace is not explicitly recognised (e.g., streets or footpaths for street vendors), then workers may be actively vulnerable both to the state, and to the elements/working risks. |

Source: Srinivas 2010, 2014 TUSS proposal

# Teaching Note

As a whole, cities under the Indian Constitution have mixed responsibilities on work (or employment) regulation and social program entitlements. One of the core tasks for learners is to research and elaborate on this theme, and to understand how much flexibility and authority state and municipal governments can garner in ensuring that work and workers are at the core of economic plans and social entitlements. The move of many organisations to use the term 'livelihoods' or 'work' instead of 'labour' or 'employment' also reflects a sentiment that existing economic and social policy frameworks poorly capture the reality of working lives i.e., multiple jobs, itinerant, or heavily sub-contracted work, or work without formal standing of any sort within labour laws; multiple employers but no security; and work at many sites, including the home. As is evident, there are specific gender-differentiated repercussions in each context.

India is going through particular contentions of entitlement and identity; therefore, knowing where the labour/work context is institutionally situated and regulated is especially important in the urban and regional planning domain and also in the improvements of economic methods and planning instruments. However, at a time when mainstream economics has come under considerable fire for being unable to attend to inequality, it is important to remember the immense gains in heterodox approaches to economics in describing dynamic economies. These advances in heterodox economic theory and methods offer a great deal to the study of work and cities because they shed new perspectives (now for over 30–40 years) on topics such as technological change, on innovation, on behavioural analysis, on organisational theories, on evolutionary economics, institutional analyses ('old and new institutionalisms') and many others. Furthermore, the narrow domains of spatial and physical planning that has come to be thought of as 'town planning' or 'urban planning' in India divorced from economic dynamics has to be entirely re-imagined as far as work is concerned. People come to cities to work and their work-lives dominate how they engage with what the city has to offer and how they are treated when they are not working.

When the case is taught—as I have in the past—there are important sub-national, cross-territorial, and international comparisons to be made. The instructor can decide what approach best generates debates and mixed-method skills of analysis and policy redesign.

The bigger issues to debate using the taxonomy of 'Place-Work-Workplace' are whether India has made progress when our cities are regulated so haphazardly. Which states and which cities are addressing these complexities in more or less interesting ways? How are these development plans contested and constituted?

## Alternate ways to approach and teach this case

This case is also calling out to be taught on specific entitlements such as health, housing, or education in how they relate to the taxonomy. We take several correlates for granted in the Indian policy arena, but these do not hold either across industrial sector and workers, nor across nations, and certainly not across time. Healthcare entitlements provided by employment often run strictly along workplace lines. However, as I have discussed in Srinivas (2010), there are examples of cities and nations across history that have made other choices to offer healthcare access based on citizenship, on residence, or on labour identity (but not on workplace). Similarly, housing policy is a mixed bag to be re-analysed anew. As most Indians know, the considered advantages of careers in the government civil or administrative services, the army, or certain public sector enterprises, was the employer-generated 'workplace' benefit of health, education, and housing combined in various ways.

This case can therefore be taught along these various dimensions and separate sessions organised. Any able instructor should be able to parcel this into different models of classroom or outside learning, and into specific analytical dimensions. This taxonomy can also be taught as a methods module where spatial analysis techniques and employment analysis techniques are compared and contrasted.

I have taught elements of this in 2–3 session discussion seminars as part of semester-long courses, in a few hours in studio/workshop courses, in more detailed methods research seminars, and in preparation of policy materials. Instructors can choose more traditional in-class 3-day UPP courses or other formats.

If taught separately, or alongside specific case histories of cities and particular social benefits, this can be extended into a week-long session.

## Proposed learning outcomes: 'Pro-poor' planning and urban inclusion

Not all aspects of economic transformation, nor of cities are about 'pro-poor' planning. Other income groups matter too. However, the taxonomy and the debate can help enliven the connection between poverty and growth and between cities and their specific locations of work. Learners will have to think of 'pro-poor planning strategies' that can combine existing constitutional or other guarantees of inclusion with the more dynamic aspects of urban and regional economic growth.

This case aims to get learners to be more aware of cities in terms of the dynamic nature of industrial transformation and work characteristics. This would mean becoming more schooled in seeing cities and analytical categories of economic development in terms of a worker's landscape, or ex-worker's landscape, or a to-be worker's landscape. To be sure, there are questions about industrial transformation such as: Is this only manufacturing? What about construction? Does industry include agriculture or not, in these days of agribusiness logistics and freight requirements of agriculture? The reason to look at industrial transformation is that most of the ideas we have of 'employment' come from the history of



industrial development in other nations, and from India's complex approach to 'formal' employment. This is reflected in the challenge facing organisations and coalitions representing so-called informal workers (India's 'unorganised' workers). The taxonomies of past use have also shaped not only what we read into industrial and employment histories of social welfare, but equally the ways in which we assume nations or cities can be inclusive terrains.

Learners can move from this case report to richer analyses listed in the references that provide problematic data and contrasts of how settlement histories are analysed, or whether nations can easily be contrasted on industrial paths because their strategies of industrial welfare reconciliation are quite different.

Learners can understand the nitty-gritty of public administration and planning guidelines in urban and regional terms when national contexts often define the industrial and economic policy and planning instruments available.

Some issues that the learner can debate by the end of this course, or structure their assignments and projects on (depending on the format in which it is taught):

- a. They will develop familiarity with industrial labour characteristics, spatial and economic data, types of 'informal'/'unorganised' workers; economic growth data by sector; urban spatial growth data by sector where available.
- b. With some practice, they should be able to identify sections of city maps and discuss why some sectors are located there (e.g., In Bangalore, garments and IT), and which highways or freight/rail corridors might be useful to map such sector growth.
- c. They can debate the classification of cities by the taxonomy as well as by relative levels of inclusion. Although this is not a course on inclusion or inequality measures, they can develop their own composite indicators.
- d. They should be able to debate whether Pune and Bengaluru are similar or different based on IT sector profile or construction sector profile and then judging the interventions (insurance, health clinics, mobile crèches, etc., available in the two cities), using urban health data (accident rates, dengue cases, etc.) and how people have access to healthcare. They can assess which of the two cities is more inclusively planned—Pune or Bengaluru.
- e. Depending on how the course is taught, they can begin developing arguments with evidence of policy reform and political economy. For example, how can you construct policy design that it is in the interests of state, employers and workers of different types, to invest in public health programs and preventative community health interventions (cleaning the drains, vaccination programs, health education, and waste collection)?

# Accessing the Full Case

The full content of this case is open-access and downloadable at [www.cases.iihs.co.in](http://www.cases.iihs.co.in).

The full content of this case includes the following documents:

## **Folder A: Introduction to the Case**

Terms of Use and Agreement

Reframing Urban Inclusion

IIHS Case Method

Preface Note

Teaching Note

## **Folder B: Main Case**

Place, Work, Workplace

## **Folder C: Case Archives**

Place, Work, Workplace: Case Author References

# Terms of Use and Agreement

## General

The downloading and reproduction of this document is subject strictly to the following conditions:

## Copyright and Use

All the content created by the author(s) here is copyrighted and copyright rests with the author. For permission to reproduce copyrighted materials, it is necessary to contact IIHS or the author of the copyright. Under this license, any person is free to share, copy, distribute and transmit the work under the following conditions:

**Attribution:** Such person must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse the author or the author's use of the work).

**Non-commercial:** Such person may not use this work for commercial purposes.

**No Derivative Works:** Such person may not alter, transform, or build upon this work. With the understanding that:

**Waiver:** Any of the above conditions can be waived if such person gets permission from IIHS or the copyright holder or where more than one copyright holder is involved, from all the copyright holders concerned or from IIHS.

**Public Domain:** Where the work or any of its elements is in the public domain under applicable law, that status is in no way affected by the license.

**Other Rights:** In no way are any of the following rights affected by the license:

- Fair dealing or fair use rights, or other applicable copyright exceptions and limitations;
- The author's moral rights;
- Rights other persons may have either in the work itself or in how it is used, such as publicity or privacy rights.

## Additional Conditions of Use

- (i) I may redisplay only the title, author and/or abstract for an individual document, together with a link to that document's public abstract page on this site;
- (ii) To utilise this document (download, use, reproduce—subject to the abovementioned conditions), or certain portions thereof, I may be required to complete a registration and submission process and establish an account ('Account'). I represent and warrant that all information provided by me is current, accurate, and complete, and that I will maintain the accuracy and completeness of this information on a prompt, timely basis.
- (iii) Further, I agree not to:
  - a) modify, stream, sublicense, or resell the content;
  - b) enable or allow others to use the content using my personal information;
  - c) access or attempt to access the content by any means other than the interface we provided or authorised;
  - d) circumvent any access or use restrictions put into place to prevent certain uses of the document;
  - e) share content or engage in behaviour that violates anyone's Intellectual Property Rights ('Intellectual Property Rights' means copyright, moral rights, trademark, trade dress, patent, trade secret, unfair competition, right of privacy, right of publicity, and any other proprietary rights);
  - f) attempt to disable, impair, or destroy the content or any related software, or hardware;
  - g) violate any applicable laws of India.

## About the Author

Smita Srinivas is an economic development and industry specialist. Her research focuses on technological capabilities, industry development plans, and employment and skills systems. This includes investigating traditional and modern techniques and the co-evolution of jobs and skills with national and supra-national technical standards. Her theoretical and applied works involve projects that examine industry's social, urban and regional embedding.

## About IIHS

The Indian Institute for Human Settlements (IIHS) is a national education institution committed to the equitable, sustainable and efficient transformation of Indian settlements. IIHS aims to establish an independent funded and managed National University for Research and Innovation focused on the multi-sectoral and multi-dimensional challenges and opportunities of urbanization. The University is intended to be a globally ranked institution. The IIHS is a proposed network of mother and daughter institutions across South Asia, leveraging on the local and regional knowledge and innovation and linking them to global best practices. Its mother campus, based in Bengaluru, will include academic, research and social infrastructure, student and faculty housing. This campus is expected to set international standards for efficient, economic and sustainable design, operations and maintenance.

**IIHS Bangalore City Campus:**

197/36, 2nd Main Road, Sadashivanagar, Bengaluru 560 080. India  
T: +91 80 6760 6666 | F: +91 80 2361 6814

**IIHS Chennai:**

Floor 7A, Chaitanya Exotica, 24/51 Venkatnarayana Road, T Nagar Chennai 600 017. India.  
T +91 44 6630 5500 / 6555 6590

**IIHS Delhi:**

803, Surya Kiran, 19, Kasturba Gandhi Marg, New Delhi 110 001. India  
T: +91 11 4360 2798 | F: +91 11 2332 0477

**IIHS Mumbai:**

Flat No.2, Purnima Building, Patel Compound, 20-C, Napean Sea Road, Mumbai 400 006. India  
T: +91 22 6525 3874