Abstract

This paper tries to examine the on ground impact of the shift in urban governance from *managerialism* to *entrepreneurialism* (Harvey, 1989) in the case of housing policy for the urban poor with a focus on issues related to eviction and resettlement. There is no doubt that the livelihoods of the urban poor are deeply affected by how cities are governed and managed (Devas, 2002). Nevertheless in this present era, the notion of ‘government’ as the single decision making authority has been replaced by multi - scale, polycentric ‘governance’ models taking into account the fact that a large number of stakeholders in different institutional settings contribute to policy and management of a resource. Harvey (1989) describes this in terms of the shift in urban governance towards an entrepreneurial stance in contrast with the managerial practices of earlier decade. Moreover, there seems to be a general consensus emerging throughout the advanced capitalist world that *positive benefits* are to be had by cities taking an entrepreneurial stance to economic development (Harvey, 1989). Has the shift in urban governance from *managerialism* to *entrepreneurialism* in the specific case of provision of land and housing really made positive benefits in the lives of the urban poor? The main focus of this paper will be to contextualize this shift in urban governance in the case of Kathmandu, the capital city of Nepal specifically in the case of the provision of land and housing for the urban poor. The empirical evidence will be based on the first ever NGO led housing resettlement project for the urban poor in Kathmandu, the capital city of Nepal.

Introduction

There is no doubt that the livelihoods of the urban poor are deeply affected by how cities are governed and managed (Devas, 2002). Until the 1980s, the predominant assumption was that governments had the authority and capacity to govern: to formulate and implement policy and to realize development goals – however on the basis of theory, practical experience of limited state capacity in the North especially in the South and the emergence of new social forces and ways of doing things; dissatisfaction with government gave way to a concern with governance (Rakodi, 2001). The notion of ‘government’ as the single decision making authority has been replaced by multi - scale, polycentric ‘governance’ models taking into account the fact that a large number of stakeholders in different institutional settings contribute to policy and management of a resource.

The UNDP’s Policy document on Governance for Sustainable Human Development (UNDP, Jan, 1997) defines governance as,

*Governance includes the state, but transcends it by taking in the private sector and civil society. All three are critical for sustaining human development. The state creates a conducive political and legal environment. The private sector generates jobs and income. And the civil society facilitates political and social interaction – mobilizing groups to participate in economic, social and political activities.*

According to the UN Habitat (2001),

*Today’s governance takes place in a more polycentric system of actors in which the state is less dominant than before. The multiplicity of actors*
complicates policy – making since no single actor is legitimate enough to
direct societal change. Consensus is no longer given by virtue of legitimacy
granted to the state’s action but must be socially constructed. This requires
alliances, coalitions and compromises. (UN – Habitat, 2001b, pp 61 – 62)

Nevertheless, there is no common definition of governance in governance theory, but
it may be referred to broadly as the setting, application and enforcement of rules of the
political game (Kjaer, 2004a: 12).

However, according to Harvey (1989), urban “governance” means much more than
urban “government”. He describes the above as a shift in urban governance towards an
entrepreneurial stance in contrast with the managerial practices of earlier decades
which primarily focused on the local provision of services, facilities and benefits to
urban population (Harvey, 1989). According to Harvey, transformation of urban
governance has substantial macro – economic roots and implications. Therefore, he
specifies that this shift must be examined in terms of the variety in scale, who is being
entrepreneurial and about what. This in fact again takes us back to the role of the urban
actors and institutions in shaping the urban built environment. According to Porrio,
urban governance deals with the power relationship among different stakeholders
in cities (Porrio, 1997). Similarly, according to Healey (2007) governance involves
the articulation of rules of behaviour with respect to the collective affairs of a political
community; and of principles for allocating resources among community members
(Healey, 2007).

In today’s multi - scale, polycentric ‘governance’ models urban actors and institutions
include:
private sector businesses, both corporate and informal; civil society including
community – based organizations, NGOs, political parties, religious groups,
trade unions and trade associations; and a whole range of governmental
agencies of national, regional and local government (Devas, 2004).

Inspite of the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders; in some cases the way in
which they operate may actually widens the physical gap separating the centres of
decision - taking and those affected by the decisions (Cassen, 2000). However, some
believe that in recent years in particular, there seems to be a general consensus
emerging throughout the advanced capitalist world that positive benefits
are to be had by cities taking an entrepreneurial stance to economic development (Harvey, 1989).
Has the shift in urban governance from managerialism to entrepreneurialism in the
specific case of provision of land and housing really made positive benefits in the
lives of the urban poor? The main focus of this paper will be to contextualize this shift
in urban governance in the case of Kathmandu, the capital city of Nepal specifically
in the case of the provision of land and housing for the urban poor. The empirical
evidence will be based on the first ever NGO led housing resettlement project for the
urban poor in Kathmandu, the capital city of Nepal.

Theoretical background
Shift from ‘government’ to ‘governance’
The changes in both urban and national bureaucracy over the last decades have
been described as a shift from ‘government’ to ‘governance’ (Rhodes, 1997; Stoker,
1999) or as a move from the ‘old governance’ to the ‘new governance’ (Peters,
2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Refers to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>‘Government’ or ‘old governance’</td>
<td>Organizations are hierarchical; public officials are recruited on merits and there is clear separation between the private and public spheres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(based on Max Weber’s theories)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
<td>Transfer of private sector management principles to the public sector; explicit standards and measures of performance; managing by result and values for money; privatization; agencification; competition; decentralization and citizen empowerment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Reagan and Thatcher era)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>‘new governance’</td>
<td>The rise of networks and the blurring of public – private boundaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Timeline reflecting the shift from government to governance
There is a reason for the emergence of these practices at this time – according to Castells (1996) we have entered the Information Age. The rise of the vocabulary of governance makes clear that we experience a shift in language from institutions to networks (Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003). Networks constitute the new social morphology of our societies and the diffusion of network logic substantially modifies the operation and outcomes in processes of production, experience, power and culture (Castells, 1996). Technological change is breathtakingly rapid, information flows around the globe in days or even hours; power is increasingly fragmented as globalization creates more and varied sources of power (Innes and Booher, 2003). However, Rhodes argues that the emergence of networks is not the end of state authority per se but the redefinition of it, characterized by a much more open mind allowing for much more diversity and experimentation (Rhodes, 2000; Heritier, 1993; Kickert, Klijn and Koppenjan, 1997). This clearly suggests that the governance of cities has been profoundly affected by three separate but related shifts in international scene: globalization, decentralization and democratization (Devas, 2004).

...instead of reducing inequalities, globalization of trade exacerbates them and does so both between and within nations (Cassen, 2000)

Decentralization is the process of transferring responsibility from central agencies and institutions to lower levels of management and administration (Hague, et al, 2006)

The most significant change to affect city governance has been the emergence or restoration in many countries of democracy at the national and local level (Devas, 2004)

Governance and Planning
Politics, policy and planning are very much linked to the term governance. According to Patsy Healey (2006), these terms refer to the activities of governance or to describe particular styles of governance activity. Furthermore, Healey (2006) argues that politics is not just what politicians do, it is everywhere. Recent accounts of planners at work provide vivid examples of how planning expertise is deployed in the micropolitics of local planning practices (Forester, 1989, 1992a; Krumholz and Forrester, 1992; Thomas and Healey, 1992; Hoch 1992). In some languages there is no distinction between policy and politics; however, commonly ‘policy’ refers to an explicit statement of a governance objective. Healey (2006) argues that planning is thus more than the translation of knowledge into action as proposed by John Friedmann (1987); it is a style of governance within a policy driven approach which emphasizes knowledgeable reasoning and argumentation.

Similarly according to DiGaetano and Klemanski (1999), political institutions in each city are linked together by informal arrangements which may be referred to as modes of governance. Furthermore, comparing urban modes of governance requires distinguishing those informal political relationships that determine how cities are governed (DiGaetano and Lawless 1999; Pierre, 1999). The five modes of governance identified by DiGaetano and Strom (2003) are presented in the following [table 2].
It is said that the weakness of governance theory are that it often fails to focus on issues of power, conflict and interest (Kjaer, 2006). Therefore, in order to reflect these key factors, the various modes of governance under their respective models can be measured in terms of the following indicators to determine their strengths and weakness: efficiency, democracy, power, role of the local state, role of the urban bureaucrat. Moreover, since this shift also implies a shift towards network governance, empirically there is a need to analyze ways in which different actors conceive of politics; which actors participate; what they see as effective political action; how actors frame conflict and to what extent the classical – modernist institutions indeed hamper finding effective solutions to problems people want to see resolved (Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003).

**Shift from managerialism to entrepreneurialism in urban governance**

Urban governance has become important because urbanization has become a powerful force in developing countries and is a development that has taken place quickly and comparatively recently in Asia, Africa and Latin America (Harpham and Boetang, 1997). According to Harvey (1989), urbanization is regarded as a spatially grounded social process in which a wide range of different actors with quite different objectives and agendas interact through a particular configuration of interlocking spatial practices. In recent years urban governance has become preoccupied with the exploration of new ways in which to foster and encourage local development and employment growth – an entrepreneurial stance in contrast with the managerial practices of earlier decades (Harvey, 1989). He further argues that this transformation of urban governance these last two decades has had substantial macro – economic roots and implications.

Moreover, in recent years in particular, there seems to be a general consensus emerging throughout the advanced capitalist world that positive benefits are to be had by cities taking an entrepreneurial stance to economic development (Harvey, 1989). Therefore the main focus of this paper questions this general consensus in a specific area of urban governance which is housing for the urban poor. Hence the main research question for this paper is,

Has the shift in urban governance from managerialism to entrepreneurialism in the specific case of provision of land and housing really made positive benefits in the lives of the urban poor?

The following [table 3] illustrates the implications of this shift in terms of housing policies, more specifically in case of developing countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Economic model</th>
<th>Urban governance model</th>
<th>Implication on housing policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>Keynesian</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>State provided support for housing development (limitations led to change in policy towards aided self build)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 1970s – early 1980s</td>
<td>Self help ('autonomous' form of housing)</td>
<td>Sites and Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s – early 1990s</td>
<td>Neo - liberal</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td>Whole new housing finance institutions (enabling ‘support approach’); Enabling markets to work (‘help themselves’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case Presentation**

**Brief case background**

Nepal is a relatively small, densely populated country, landlocked between two global giants of South Asia, India and China. The territorial boundaries of this country spread over an area of 147,181 square kilometers with an approximate population of 25 million citizens (CBS, 2006). Most of the overall urbanization status of the country is contributed by its capital – Kathmandu with a population of approximately 1.6 million over an area of 899 square kilometers (CBS, 2003b). The following [table 4] illustrates a timeline of the major events in the political history of Nepal and its implications.
The above table reflects the extent of substantial macro – economic and political roots in the transformation of one of the key areas of urban governance – housing policy making. Although individual nations develop their housing and urban policies within their own political, economic and cultural conditions, the World Bank and other international aid agencies have had powerful impacts in promoting and applying their favored (and changed) theories and practices of housing (Pugh, 2001, p. 400). Similarly, the Global Shelter Strategy adopted by the United Nations has provided a strong guidance as well as assistance in the formulation of the Nation Shelter Policy (National Shelter Policy, 1996). Although lack of food and clothing are important elements of basic needs, it is inadequate shelter that is often the most visible indicator of poverty in Asian urban settlements (Laquian, 2004); this is also the case for Nepal. Housing qualities are still poor, with inadequate infrastructure and remain inaccessible and unaffordable to a large section of urban population (Adhikari, 1998). The role of public planning has changed throughout the history as a dependent pattern of the ruling elite; however provision of land for housing for the urban inhabitants has never been a governmental responsibility (Bjonness, 1988).

Only a fraction of the housing in Kathmandu is institutionally sponsored by the government, educational institutions and other agencies as site and services, or planned employee housing (Adhikari, 1998), therefore most of houses are built by the owners themselves. Here, the issue of both the access to land and housing comes into considerations, which becomes critical especially in the case of low income urban dwellers. Access - both in terms of the necessary financial resources and the availability of land as natural resource in the urban areas. Land in Nepal has traditionally represented the principal form of wealth, symbol of social status and source of economic and political power (Mathema, 1999). Therefore land is both scarce and extremely expensive especially in the capital which makes it inaccessible especially for low income urban families. There is also a lack of opportunities available for the low income urban families as most of the financial institutions cater to the needs of the middle and high income families (Pokharel, 2006). This lack of access to land and housing is one of the main reasons for the existence of ‘squatter’ settlements in the context of Nepal; at present approximately 7.3 percent live in squatters (National Shelter Policy, 1996).

**Origin of squatter settlements: eviction and resettlement**

In the context of Nepal, squatter settlements are defined as informal settlements of urban poor, marginalized and immigrants on non-claimed land (Joshi and Bjonness, 1987) and the inhabitants are known as ‘squatters’ or ‘sukumbasis’. This Nepali term, *sukumbasi*, is important as it can be used interchangeably with the English word squatter, but has a more specific meaning, it does not refers to every person occupying unused buildings or land without legal arrangements, but rather only to those who are quite literally landless (Tanaka, 2009). Despite recognizing that the fulfillment of shelter needs has become a complicated problem for the majority of families, especially for families with limited and low income the National Shelter Policy (1996) does not specifically refer to squatters (Lumanti, 2002). There is absence of a strong national policy on squatters and eviction (Lumanti, 2002); therefore the government officials still consider squatters to be ‘illegal’ and there is a degree of pessimism and stigma attached to these issues.
The origin of these settlements in the Kathmandu Valley can be traced back to the 1950s when the rural migrants began to move into the capital, in search of a better livelihood (Lumanti, 2002). The number of squatter settlements increased from 17 in 1985 (Tanaka, 2009) to 45 in 2001 (Lumanti, 2001) consequently increasing the population from approximately 2134 in 1985 to approximately 11,862 in 2000 (KMC, 2001). The squatter settlements in the Valley are heterogeneous not only in terms of the ethnicity or caste of their residents, but also in terms of origin, present occupation and income, family structure and the reason for squatting (Tanaka, 1999). The location of these squatter settlements are usually on small non-claimed strips of land along riversides or on slope; areas prone to landslides and flooding (Lunde, 1994). Out of the 45 present squatter settlements, 29 of these settlements are located along riverbanks, where they are vulnerable to flood, pollution of the river, etc (Tanaka, 2009).

This defines the level of vulnerability in terms of natural calamities; however, the threat of eviction is a recent phenomenon in the context of the Valley. Due to the lack of legal land title document (called lalpurja in Nepali), the residents of these squatter settlements not only face difficulty in getting access to basic services, but are also subjected to eviction. Prior to the year 2001, evictions in the Kathmandu Valley were rare. One of the reasons for this has been the increase in the implementation of major development and infrastructure projects in the capital (Lumanti, 2002). However, the political instability has also led to a number of cases of eviction in urban as well as rural areas across the country. One of the most disturbing evictions took place in January 2002, along the Bagmati River where squatter settlements were evicted as part of the government’s plan to heighten security for the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) summit to be held in the capital (Lumanti, 2002). In a short period of time between the years 2001 until 2002, a number of eviction cases have been witnessed in the capital, most of which were not followed by a resettlement project except the unique case of Bishnumati Link Road eviction followed by Kirtipur Housing Project.

Kirtipur Housing Project

Kirtipur Housing Project was the first ever NGO led housing resettlement project for evicted squatter families in the history of Nepal. In 1999, the inhabitants of three squatter settlements (Dhumakhel, Tankeshwari and Kalimati) along the Bishnumati Corridor in the heart of Kathmandu Valley were given the first eviction notices for the construction of the Bishnumati Link Road (Lunde, 1994). Kirtipur Housing Project was conceptualized by Lumanti (a local NGO), the Kathmandu Municipality and the ‘genuine squatters’. The objectives of the project as stated by the local NGO was: “to relocate Bishnumati Link road affected families”. Whereas, the main goal was:

“to eradicate the psychological burden of being a squatter from the people’s minds and to give people the opportunity to become fully free citizens with the right to decide over their lives, property and employment”. (Lumanti, 2005)

The project was financed by the Urban Community Support Fund (UCSF) which was launched in Kathmandu in May 2004 as a joint effort of Lumanti, ACHR (Asian Coalition for Housing Rights), SDI (Slum Dwellers International) and the KMC (Kathmandu Municipal Corporation) with the idea to create a new financial tool for poor slum and squatter communities in the Valley (ACHR, 2007). A timeline of events along with the respective the project planning processes and the various stakeholders involved at all stages are as follows:

---

1 Adapted from the framework of alternative planning process (Bjonness, 1982) and adjusted according to the processes of Kirtipur Housing Project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Project Planning Process</th>
<th>Stakeholders and events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>First eviction notice</td>
<td>All the squatters of Bishnumati Corridor (Eviction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Second eviction notice</td>
<td>Squatters and the CBOs (Post Eviction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Raising of social consciousness</td>
<td>Squatters, CBOs and Lumanti (NGO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Planning and organizational efforts</td>
<td>Squatters, CBOs, Lumanti and KMC Conceptualization of Kirtipur Housing Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Planning and decision making</td>
<td>Squatters, CBOs, Lumanti and KMC Conceptualization of Kirtipur Housing Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Resource mobilization</td>
<td>Establishment of UCSF (donors added)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Selection of genuine squatters</td>
<td>UCSF and genuine squatters (became residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Planning and designing</td>
<td>Establishment of KHMC (resident members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>UCSF, architects and KHMC (few residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Management of the project</td>
<td>UCSF, Lumanti and KHMC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In detail the stakeholders are:

- All the squatters of Bishnumati Corridor
- CBOs (Community Based Organizations): Nepal Basobas Basti Samrakchran Samaj and Nepal Mahila Ekata Samaj
- Local NGO (Non Government Organization): Lumanti Support Group for Shelter
- KMC: Kathmandu Metropolitan Corporation
- UCSF: Urban Community Support Fund
- Donors: ACHR (Asian Coalition for Housing Rights), SDI (Slum Dwellers International), Action Aid, Water Aid, DUDBC (Department of Urban Development and Building Construction), UN Habitat, CIUD (Center for Integrated Urban Development), etc
- “Genuine squatter”: residents of Kirtipur Housing Project
- Architect: Astra Development Network Private Limited
- KHMC: Kirtipur Housing Management Committee

The implementation of the project began with the purchase of six ropanis\(^2\) (32,856 square feet) of land at Paliphal in Kirtipur around 10 kilometers from the core city center of Kathmandu. Kirtipur is one of the three municipalities within the capital Kathmandu. This is also one of the oldest settlements in Kathmandu Valley, primarily inhabited by the Newars, who are also known as the early inhabitants of the Valley. The population of the area is approximately 49,606 and it is uniquely located on top of a steep rocky hill covering an area of 570 ha (Pradhan, 2001). A total of 44 two story houses were constructed in the six ropanis of land, with active participation from the inhabitants in terms of nature and type of houses, materials and facilities, etc (Sengupta and Sharma, 2007). The land costs were subsidized by the UCSF and the price of each house was tagged at NRs. 3, 30,000/- and NRs. 3, 50, 000/- depending on the location of the toilet (Sengupta and Sharma, 2007). The funds for the houses were borrowed through UCSF and were to be repaid at an affordable level, decided upon by the community representatives. The inhabitants set a reasonable monthly payment of NRs. 2000/- for a period of 15 years at an interest rate of 3% (Sengupta and Sharma, 2007). A number of major national and international organizations also contributed for the provision of services for Kirtipur Housing Project such as Water Aid (water and sanitation); Department of Urban Development and Building Construction (stone paving); UN Habitat – rain water harvesting; Center for Integrated Urban Development (Water filter), etc (Lumanti, 2005). The inauguration of the houses of this project took place on 25\(^{th}\) December, 2005 (Lumanti, 2008).

Reflecting on the shift from managerialism to entrepreneurialism

As mentioned in the above section, prior to Kirtipur Housing Project, squatter settlements were evicted without any resettlement. This was a direct consequence

---

\(^{2}\) 1 ropani = (74 X 74) square feet
of the managerial practices adopted by the governing authorities in correspondence to old governance model. However Kirtipur Housing Project reflects a new era of entrepreneurialism in the patterns of the governing authorities of Nepal which tries to correspond to the new governance model. One of the key indicators of this shift of urban governance toward entrepreneurialism is the involvement of a large number of stakeholders throughout the project planning process [fig. 1]. This project is considered a joint effort of all these stakeholders – public, private and civil society organizations.

Nevertheless, now referring back to the main research question of this paper, Has the shift in urban governance from managerialism to entrepreneurialism in the specific case of provision of land and housing really made positive benefits in the lives of the urban poor?

The definition of the term positive benefit is debatable; however the main findings of this research which was to evaluate the success of Kirtipur Housing Project clearly reflects the nature of the benefits of this shift in the lives of the urban poor. A summary of the main findings are as follows:

1. Kirtipur Housing Project as a resettlement project for the urban poor represents only a symptom and fails to address the root cause
2. The failure to address more vulnerable groups of evicted squatter families
3. Selection of only 44 genuine squatters as compared to the 142 evicted families
4. Resettlement benefiting only those who were able to afford the new housing
5. Locked houses indicate absentee owners in Kirtipur Housing Project
6. The prevalence of more negative impacts of the project on the residents
7. Kirtipur Housing Project is not a low cost housing project
8. The issue of land ownership in Kirtipur Housing Project still remains unsolved and conflicting
9. Participation was limited to a degree of tokenism (Arnstein, 1969) at various stages of the project process
10. Lack of transparency, accountability and power play

Similarly, comparing the specific case of Kirtipur Housing Project in comparison to prior cases, with reference to the indicators are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Indicators</th>
<th>Old governance model (Managerialism)</th>
<th>New governance model (Entrepreneurialism)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(prior cases of eviction without resettlement)</td>
<td>(Bishnumati Link Road eviction and Kirtipur Housing Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Efficiency</td>
<td>Secured through bureaucratic hierarchy</td>
<td>Secured through cooperation and partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Democracy</td>
<td>Secured through elected parliament</td>
<td>Secured through participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Power</td>
<td>Visible and located in the centre of government</td>
<td>Dispersed and fragmented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Role of local state</td>
<td>Steering and control</td>
<td>Enabler and Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Who participates</td>
<td>Key decision makers</td>
<td>A range of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Accountability</td>
<td>State is held responsible</td>
<td>No clear party takes sole responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transparency</td>
<td>Most decisions were made behind closed doors</td>
<td>Participation was limited to a degree of tokenism and key decisions were still made behind closed doors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These above findings and indicators illustrate that in spite of an entrepreneurial stance to urban governance the project had its limitations in terms of making positive benefits in the lives of the urban poor. Therefore, the finding may simply corroborate with the following theoretical standpoints:

*Inspite of the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders; in some cases the way in which they operate may actually widens the physical gap separating the centres of decision - taking and those affected by the decisions* (Cassen, 2000).

*Coalitions and alliance formation is so delicate and difficult a task that the way is open here for a person of vision, tenacity and skill (such as a charismatic mayor, a clever city administrator, or a wealthy business leader) to put a particular stamp upon the nature and direction of urban entrepreneurialism, perhaps to shape it or even, to particular political ends* (Harvey, 1989).

**Conclusion**

The shift towards entrepreneurialism has by no means been complete (Harvey, 1989); this is still true in the case of most developing countries. There is immense pressure both in terms of economic and political stability for countries to adopt this shift; however developing nations such as Nepal fail to let go of the managerial past to fully adopt the entrepreneurial future. This may be regarded as a transition period in which positive benefits are limited.
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