

**“The evolution of Rio de Janeiro’s housing policy governance:
new roles and new communities”**

Hector Becerril*

© by the author

(*) hector.miranda.09@ucl.ac.uk

Paper presented at the RC21 International Conference on “The Ideal City: between myth and reality. Representations, policies, contradictions and challenges for tomorrow's urban life” Urbino (Italy) 27-29 August 2015. <http://www.rc21.org/en/conferences/urbino2015/>

Abstract:

In Brazil, at the end of the 80's, municipal governments were given the responsibility for designing and implementing housing policies. In Rio de Janeiro, the municipal government started the design and implementation of its housing policy in the 1990s. Despite the extensive literature in the case, there is a little understanding on how the governance of Rio's housing policy governance evolved. Aiming to address this gap the paper explores this issue during the past 20 years through the Political Sociology of Public Policy Instruments (PPI) approach (Lascoumes & Le Galès 2004). This entails the analysis of Rio's housing "policy instrumentation" i.e. the constitution and use of "policy instruments", revealing the governance functioning.

Based on municipal archives, policy documents, interviews and field visits, the paper argues on the one hand that Rio's housing policy governance entails a divers network of State and non-State actors in which the municipal government adopted a mobilizing and coordinator role, seeking to build alliances in order to materialize the housing policy (as opposed to an interventionist role). On the other it contents that the interactions among the different actors involved the development of a "technical rationality" (understood as a rational process that enables to determine the relevant means to achieve a predetermined goal) which has consolidated of a community of experts and created knowledge and know-know (within and outside the municipal government) that have lead and influenced Rio's housing policy materialization and evolution.

The paper seeks to enrich the discussions on "cities on paper" vs. "the complexity and unpredictability of everyday life" and in particular "urban governance and housing policies in the Global South". This by exploring, through the analysis of Rio's case "how governance processes are organized" and "what concepts and theoretical ideas are useful for explaining urban governance".

1 Introduction

The modes of governance of housing policies in countries of the Global South have changed significantly in the past decades, in particular due to decentralization and democratization processes. In Brazil, the constitution of 1988 gave to the municipal governments the responsibility for designing and implementing housing policies. In Rio de Janeiro, from 1990s onwards the municipal government has developed its local housing policy.

Rio's housing policy has generated an extensive literature which has followed two main streams over the past two decades (Becerril 2014)¹. The first one relates to evaluative analyses and represents the bulk of the existing literature. These studies aimed primarily to assess Rio's housing policy efficiency and effectiveness (IBAM 1996; Cardoso 2002; Pamuk & Cavallieri 1998; Brakarz et al. 2002; Aduan & Brakarz 2004; TCMRJ 2005; Soares & Soares 2005; TCMRJ 2006; BID 2007; Abiko et al. 2007; Rojas 2009; Abramo 1998). The second stream relates to studies that seek to explain policy functioning using sociological approaches. This second stream includes two main types of studies: studies whose main objective is to unveil hidden processes or interests (Bahia 2000; Broudehoux 2001; Randolph 2004; Silva 2006; Simpson 2013) and studies such as Fiori et al. (2000) and Burgos (2003) that focused on how the case of Rio de Janeiro fits into the wider context of housing policies' evolution and change.

The existing literature has contributed greatly to the understanding of this case. However, the examination of the modes of governance of Rio's housing policies has receive little attention. By governance this paper understands "*the interactions between the State and the society and to the modes of coordination to make possible the action of the State*" (Le Galès 1995: 59)². This gap in the literature is significant because this examination can

¹ This review does not include studies such as (Perlman 2010) as they focus on favelas and dwellers' representations and the theory of marginality rather than on housing policy per se.

² This understanding also relates to Marques (2013: 16) definition of governance: "sets of State and non-State actors interconnected by formal and informal ties operating within the policy-making process and embedded in specific institutional settings".

contribute to better understand the changes in the role of local governments and the way housing policy processes are organized.

Aiming to address this gap the paper explores the modes of governance of housing policies in Rio de Janeiro from 1993 to 2012. This through the analysis of Rio's housing policy "instrumentation" (Lascoumes & Le Galès 2007) (see next section).

The paper argues on the one hand that Rio's housing policy governance entails a divers network of State and non-State actors in which the municipal government adopted a mobilizing and coordinator role, seeking to build alliances in order to materialize the housing policy (as opposed to an interventionist role). On the other it contends that the interactions among the different actors involved the development of a "technical rationality" (understood as a rational process that enables to determine the relevant means to achieve a predetermined goal) which has consolidated of a community of experts and created knowledge and know-know (within and outside the municipal government) that have lead and influenced Rio's housing policy materialization and evolution.

In the following part the paper presents the analytical lenses, then in the third part presents Rio's policy analysis instrumentation.

2 Analytical lenses and methods

The Political Sociology of Public Policy Instruments approach (PPI) argues that a public policy is "*a socio-political space constructed as much through techniques and instruments as through aims or content*" (Lascoumes & Le Galès 2007: 4). Accordingly, it argues that "policy instrumentation" understood as the process through which "policy instruments" are constituted and used is "*a means of orienting relationship between political society (via the administration) and civil society (via its administered), through intermediaries in the form of devices that combine technical (measuring, calculating, the rule of law, procedures) and social components (representation, symbols)*" (Kassim & Le Galès 2010: 5).

This understanding is based on Foucault's "governmentality". Lascoumes (2004) highlighted that Foucault's analysis of power differentiated three different dimensions: the states of domination that related to what is usually understood as "power"; the strategic relations that

included the dynamics that aim at shaping actors behaviours; and the government techniques. Lascoumes pointed out the analysis of the technologies of government is important as it can reveal how “*through such techniques that the states of domination are established and maintained*” (idem). Thus, the analysis of policy instrumentation is relevant to understand how governance process are organized (the actors involved and the ways they relate to each other).

Based on municipal archives, policy documents, interviews and field visits the research follows the “detective work” as method. Austrin & Farnsworth (2005) argued that the 'detective work' was conceptualized as a hermetic method by Latour and Serres and included “*explication and unpleating: tracing and unfolding complex arrangements to reveal the implicate, unforeseen elements and practices that constitute them*’ (ibid: 148). Accordingly, the investigation entailed the tracing of Rio’s housing policy instrumentation through a micro-processing of facts, revealing its mode of governance.

3 Rio’s housing policy: inception and development

In 1993 the municipal administration commanded by Cesar Maia started the development of Rio’s housing policy through the creation of the Executive Group of Special Programmes for Popular Settlements (GEAP). Under the Municipal Urbanism Secretariat (SMU), the GEAP included representatives from others municipal bodies: the Municipal Attorney General Office (PGM), the municipal urbanization company RioUrbe, the Municipal information technology and planning - IplanRio and the Municipal Secretariats of Works (SMO) Government (SMG), Social Development (SMDS), and Treasury (SMF) (Municipal Decrees No.12205/1993, No.12296/1993, No.12.432/1993). Sergio Magalhães, who since the arrival of Luiz Paulo Conde at the head of the SMU worked at the irregular housing estate regularization office and IplanRio was appointed to the head of the GEAP.

The constitution of the GEAP represented a shift within the municipal administration as previously only the SMDS focused on favelas and their urbanization which were considered to be Rio’s main housing issue (Becerril 2014). The GEAP built on the municipality’s previous experiences, existing regulations (Master plan enacted in 1992) and debates on housing. At the end of 1993 the GEAP proposed the “Municipal housing policy bases” that included 6 different programmes ranging from housing construction to

slum upgrading. However, the latter was prioritized as being the most suitable approach for facing Rio's housing problem: the favelas.

At the beginning of 1994 Maia created the Municipal Extraordinary Housing Secretariat (SeMH) and appointed Sergio Magalhães as Extraordinary Secretary. The SeMH was formed with people from other municipal bodies. In particular, the SMDS staff involved in urban development were transferred to the SeMH, incorporating technical expertise in the urbanization of Rio's favelas previously developed through the Mutirão programme. The SMDS staff were interested on SeMH initiatives as they represented an opportunity to develop further their work during the 1980s and to scale up the Mutirão experience (Becerril 2014). In March 1994, the Municipal Decree No.12719/1994 rendered official this transfer and established the competency for the development of the housing policy to the SeMH. Following the SMDS previous functioning, the SeMH started working in a matrix-based system around two types of management offices: programme and function.

The first programme to be implemented by the SeMH was the slum upgrading programme called Favela-Bairro. This choice was informed by the experience the municipality had in favelas' urbanization through the Mutirão programme. Lucia Petersen who had worked on this programme during the 1980s became Favela-Bairro programme manager. In addition, the choice of the slum upgrading was supported by the consensus it generated among most of the housing policy actors as an effective and suitable instrument for addressing Rio de Janeiro's housing issues. Lastly, the choice of the slum upgrading was encouraged by the municipality as it could afford Favela-Bairro programme launch without financial aid from national or international actors.

The first Favela-Bairro project was implemented in Andaraí favela. In March, at the same time the SeMH was being instituted with the transfer of the SMDS staff, the Favela-Bairro programme started to take shape. The municipality announced a first investment of URVs\$12 million for its development. However, taking into account that the municipal financial situation was bad and that the municipality could not afford alone the implementation of the municipal housing policy, the municipal executive sought to engage discussions with the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) for contracting a loan to develop Rio de Janeiro's housing policy (ibid). In particular, the discussions between the municipality and the IDB were around the financing of slum upgrading called Urbanization Programme of Popular

Settlements - PUAP/BID (PCRJ 1994a; 1994b). However, at that time a BID loan appeared unachievable as the municipality did not have anything to negotiate with.

To interest the bank the municipality elaborated a classification matrix. This device allowed to classify the favelas in the city setting priorities according to the feasibility of each favela's urbanization. This work resulted in the selection of 15 favelas to be urbanized as first step. At the same time the municipality launch the implementation of Favela-Bairro in Acarai, and together with the IplanRio and the Brazilian Institute of Architects-Rio de Janeiro (IAB-RJ), it organized an architectural contest to select architects that would develop slum upgrading projects in the selected favelas. By June 1994, 15 architectural practices were selected and in the following months contracts were signed. The municipality also sent to the municipal council a bill for the creation of the Municipal Housing Secretariat (SMH). The bill was approved and the SMH was created at the end of 1994.

During 1995 on the one hand the alliance with architects and private contractors that were hired to do the works promoted the development of norms and regulations about slum upgrading programme and projects implementation such as the "requirements catalogue" (cuadernos de encargos) . On the other the successful negotiation of a loan of USA \$300 million to implement slum upgrading redefined the Favela-Bairro programme into the 'Urbanization Programme of Popular Settlements' (PROAP-RIO) which included the consolidation of normative and cognitive frames. In particular, the loan contract (BID 1995) and the Municipal Decree No.14332/1995 established among others the selection criteria, the role of different actors involved (Table 1), projects' items and implementation regulations and processes such as projects' phases and participation methods (Table 2).

The know-how and knowledge around the instrument were being further developed through municipal government publications (PCRJ 1995; PCRJ 1996a), academic works like the book organized by researchers at Rio de Janeiro Federal University (UFRJ) about the 1994 architectural competition (Duarte et al. 1996), and events such as the course organized by the municipality in partnership with the International Housing and Urban Development studies (IHS) on planning and management of urban projects in informal settlements (PCRJ 1996b). In addition, during the conference the municipality signed the

agreement for creating and hosting the UN-HABITAT Regional Office (Jornal do Brasil 1996). This agreement contributed to support the convergence in Rio de Janeiro of debates and research about Latin America human settlements, including slum upgrading approaches.

Table 1 Public actors' role. Source (BID 1995). Elaborated by the author.

Public Sector body	Responsibilities
SMH	To coordinate the programme and to contract and execute projects.
SMDS	To support child care facilities design and to operate and maintain them
Municipal Environmental secretariat named SMAC	To assess environmental and reforestation projects' aspects.
SMU	To support the drawing up of urban norms and regulations.
SMO	To approve drainage projects.
IPLANRIO	To monitor and evaluate the programme, and to compile, manage and analyse the data on the favelas beneficiaries.
RioUrbe	To execute the contracting and execution of projects and works assigned to the SMH if needed.
Geo-Rio	To execute hillside stabilization.
COMLURB	To secure garbage collection and street cleaning.
RioLuz	To approve, operate and maintain street lighting system projects.
CEDAE	To support, approve, operate and maintain water supply and sewage systems projects.
PMG	To work in land regularization.

Table 2 Project's design phases. Source (BID 1995). Elaborated by the author.

Phase	Description
1	Elaboration by the architectural practices of a diagnostic of the Favela
2	Elaboration of an urban development plan named ' Intervention plan' (plano de intervenção) and approval of the draft plan by the SMH and the community through general assemblies and small consultative meetings.
3	Elaboration of preliminary drawings and the cost estimations and approval by the SMH.
4	Elaboration of detailed plans based on the preliminary drawings
5	Final technical analysis and approval by the SMH

During Conde's administration (1997-2000), the housing policy was further developed by the launch of 'Grandes Favelas' and 'Bairrinho' programmes directed at larger and small favelas respectively. Grandes Favelas programme emerged with the successful negotiations between the municipality and the Federal Government that started back in 1995. By May 1997, Conde signed with the CAIXA an agreement of R\$17 million for implementing the first Grandes Favelas project in Jacarezinho that was expected to start in 1998 (Jornal do Brasil 1997) and other projects through Bairrinho programme emerged with the association of the European Union. In 1997 the municipality signed an agreement with an Italian NGO funded by the European Union for implementing slum upgrading projects in Vila Canoas and Pedra Bonita (Magalhaes & Conde 2004).

In addition, the first Urban and Social Orientation Office (POUSO) was implemented. Created at the end of Maia's administration and instituted by Municipal Decree No.15.259/1996, the POUSO sought to create urban regulations in favelas and control their built environment and land use. (PCRJ 2008). Other projects and ideas were also developed and linked to the instrument. Specifically, agreements with universities, CBOs NGOs and other organizations (Magalhaes & Conde 2004).

During the second half of Conde's administration Rio's housing policy and in particular Favela-Bairro faced problems and criticism; however, they did not gain strength (Becerril 2014). Furthermore, despite the several controversies, Rio's experience continued to arise interest and gained the support and recognition of various organizations. For instance, besides the visit of several delegations from around the world (Magalhaes & Conde 2004), the use of the instrument was supported and encouraged by the BID (Jornal do Brasil 1998; Jornal do Brasil 1999a). Moreover, the Favela-Bairro programme was selected for the 2000 world fair in Hanover; and its architectural design was recognized: the architectural practice led by Jorge Mario Jáuregui was awarded a Harvard urban design prize for its interventions within the Favela-Bairro programme such as Favela-Bairro project in Vidigal favela

The instrument's capacity to gather together actions and people increased with the materialization of two other major financial agreements besides the BID and CAIXA loans that enabled the SMH budget to be tripled and maintained and aroused even more

interest in the instrument than before. The first financial agreement for R\$ 16 million was signed with the European Union for the instrument's implementation in small favelas through the Bairrinho programme (Jornal do Brasil 1999b). The second one was the approval of a second BID loan for R\$ 520 million that was negotiated from 1998 (Jornal do Brasil 1999c). The major difference between the first and this second contract was the investment in social programmes. This adaptation resulted from the instrument's implementation and included the development of employment creation and income generation programmes and social projects directed at children and youth (Jornal do Brasil 1999c).

The various associations generated by the use of the instrument contributed to the consolidation of different actors' capacity and expertise. For example, through the association with the BID the SMH was expanded and consolidated as Secretariat with the creation of a managerial professional structure and systematic procedures (Freire et al. 2009).

This part illustrated that through Rio' housing policy instrumentation and in particular through the constitution and use of the slum upgrading instrument a diverse network of actors was generated that contrast with previous period in which the SMDS was the only involved in slum upgrading. The diversity included state and non-state such as SMH, SMO, IplanRio, CEDAE, CAIXA, EU, IADB, architectural practices, construction companies, favelas' resident associations, NGOs, and other actors/groups/institutions such as Footballer Ronaldinho and the Catholic Church that participated in ad hoc basis.

This part also described how the municipal government in order to materialize the housing policy, it sought to build alliances with other actors through contracts and agreements. This mode of governing relates to the abandon by the State of its traditional role and ways of exerting its power identified by Lascoumes & Le Galès (2007). These authors argued that the State has tended to create contractual synergies: *'the interventionist state is therefore supposed to be giving way to a state that is prime mover or coordinator, noninterventionist and principally mobilizing, integrating and bringing into coherence'* (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007:12).

Lastly, this part showed that Rio's housing policy instrumentation entailed the development of a technical rationality thought the development of norms, processes, and regulations, consolidating a shift as Rio's previous housing experience related more to ad hoc solutions and political interest such as the Mutirão programme which at its inception emanated from dwellers' association demands and political will (Becerril 2014). Moreover, the development of this technical rationality enhanced the knowledge and know-how of different actors such as SMH, architects and construction companies, constituting a community of experts on housing policy and in particular on slum upgrading programmes and projects.

4 Continuation despite erosion

At the beginning of the first decade of the 2000 an important politico-administrative fragmentation occurred. Conde and Maia fought for the mayor's office weakening housing policy political support. Maia won the election and several people in the left the SMH as Magalhães was Conde's ally and most of the SMH staff were behind them. This shift together with housing policy controversies and Maia's new political interests weakened Rio's housing policy and in particular slum upgrading initiatives (Becerril 2014).

Nevertheless, the network of actors, the way the municipal government was operating and the community of experts did not fall apart.

Within the SMH not everybody left the administration, and Rio's housing policy was mainly related to the Favela-Bairro programme which was regulated by the IADB contract. Thus, only minor changes occurred. In addition, new knowledge and know-how were developed. The SMH Projects' Office lead an initiative aiming to reflect on how to intervene in Rio largest favelas as the main focus at that time was on medium and small favelas through Favela-Bairro and Bairrinho. This initiative resulted in the elaboration of a master plan for Alemão Complex that included a diagnostic study and several urban development proposals developed by Jorge Mario Jáuregui whose architectural practice had managed several Favela-Bairro projects. In addition, the Projects' Office also

commanded Jáuregui to elaborate a proposal for Manguinhos Complex. However, none of them were implemented.

At municipal level, the Urban Cell office also sought to improve Favela-Bairro interventions (Freire et al. 2009: 98). Created in 2001 within the Mayor's cabinet, this office managed by Lucia Petersen (former Favela-Bairro programme manager), used cells' evolution processes as a conceptual anchor. Specifically, Petersen, together with Dietmar Starket (a local architect) proposed to create micro-interventions that could contribute to foster the endogenous urban, social, political, economic and environmental development of favelas. The urban cell interventions aimed at triggering the integration process of favelas; thus, they were planned at medium and long term. The Urban Cell concept was first developed in Jacarezinho in a collaboration with the Bauhaus School. The open air museum at Providência was the second intervention developed by the Urban Cell Office from 2001 (PCRJ 2003). The project was financed by the SMH and linked to the Favela-Bairro project developed by architect Fernanda Salles.

The regional state of Rio de Janeiro also got involved in housing initiatives in Rio during the first decade of the 2000s. After Conde and Magalhães' defeat in 2000, they joined the regional State government headed by Garotinho and developed projects directed at Rio de Janeiro's favelas. In 2001 the state of Rio de Janeiro developed a slum upgrading project in Cantagalo through the State Secretariat of Environment and Urban Development (O Globo 2001). During Rosinha Garotinho's administration (2003-2007) Luiz Paulo Conde became vice-Governor and State Secretary of Environment and Urban Development, and Sergio Magalhães Deputy Secretary of the same State department. Through this Secretariat that incorporated SMH staff who worked in the Favela-Bairro during the 1990s such as former SMH project manager Helio Aleixo and former Favela-Bairro programme manager Andrea Cardoso, the state of Rio de Janeiro continued the development of slum upgrading initiatives in the municipality.

The state of Rio resumed the slum upgrading project in Dona Marta agreed by the municipality when Conde was Mayor but which was interrupted after his defeat (Jornal do Brasil 2000). In 2004 the regional state commissioned the Brazilian Institute of Architects of Rio de Janeiro (IAB-RJ) to organize an architectural contest (similar to the

Favela-Bairro's in 1994) which was won by the architect Fernanda Sales (Jornal do Brasil 2004). Then, at the end of 2005 the State commissioned an architectural competition for elaborating a slum upgrading proposal for Rocinha (IPHAN 2006).

During the Maia's third administration (2005-2008) Rio's housing policy was involved in several controversies that called into question its efficiency and effectiveness and resulted in a collective abandon (Becerril 2014). However, this situation started to change with the comeback of the federal government in the local housing sector. After an institutional restructuring of the sector with the creation of the Ministry of Cities and in particular the creation of the National Housing Secretariat, the federal government heavily funded housing-related initiatives. In 2007 it launched the Growth Acceleration Programme (PAC) which included the development of slum upgrading projects.

The State Secretariat of Public Works (SEOB) and the State Construction Company (EMOP) directed by Ícaro Moreno Júnior, focused on preparing slum upgrading proposals that could be financed through PAC. Ícaro Moreno had experience on slum upgrading as he directed RioUrbe that conducted some Favela-Bairro projects during the 1990s as the SMH was unable to cope with all the work (Becerril 2014). Besides the Rocinha project, the regional state of Rio de Janeiro did not have other projects to submit to the Federal Government. Thus, it contacted the SMH and found out the existence of the two urban development plans for the Alemão and Manguinhos complex. These proposals were approved for PAC investments.

In 2009 Eduardo Paes became the Mayor of Rio de Janeiro. Paes appointed Jorge Bittar as Secretary of SMH. Bittar brought some of the staff who had moved away since 2001 from the SMH. For example, Adriana Cardoso, Augusto Verissimo and Isabel Tostes who were part of the SMH staff when Sergio Magalhães was head of that department between 1995 and 2000. The integration of this staff allowed the municipality to integrate past expertise. The housing policy pushed by Paes' administration included housing construction and slum upgrading. The housing construction programme was possible because the federal government launched in 2009 My Home My Life Programme (MCMV) which sought to construct 1 million houses in two years, mobilizing R\$ 34 billion in investments.

In 2010 the municipality launched the Morar Carioca Plan aiming at urbanizing all favelas by 2020. This plan emerged as the housing Olympic Legacy. Its elaboration included, as previously, the definition of classification matrix. This new classification allowed the reorganization of the 1020 favelas identified by the IPP (Municipal Institute of Urbanism - previously IplanRio) in 2009, into 625 favelas, out of which 481 were 'isolated' favelas and 144 'complex' (formed by 539 favelas). The classification enable the SMH to calculate the investment needed for the urbanization of each favela, prioritizing the favelas located near the Olympic Clusters.

The elaboration of Morar Carioca also included the identification and inclusion of different municipal bodies whose actions related to the materialization of the slum upgrading instrument like the SMU as it controlled the POUSO and approved construction permits, the Municipal Environment Secretariat (SMAC) which monitored the expansion of favelas on natural preserved areas, the Municipal Education Secretariat (SME) that managed schools and childcare centres, the SMO that was responsible for public works and services, the SMDS involved in social programmes and the IPP that supported among other activities the city's urban development.

Through their involvement since the inception of the proposal, the SMH sought to secure the coordination of these bodies during the implementation of the instrument. This objective was the same as the one that underpinned the creation of the GEAP that involved several municipal bodies in the formulation of the municipal housing policy basis back in the 1990s. The SMH held meetings with several departments to discuss the Morar Carioca plan regulations. The involvement of the different departments since the beginning of the elaboration of the Morar Carioca plan secured their support and willingness to work together with the SMH. In addition, the SMH discussed with the CEDAE the terms of an agreement for implementing and maintaining water and sanitation services in favelas. At national level, the SMH met with the Ministry of Cities, 'Casa Civil' (Chief of Staff Office) and Ministry of Sports.

The development of Morar Carioca included a contract with the IAB-RJ worth R\$ 8 million (O Globo 2010). This agreement aimed primarily at organizing an architectural competition to select practices to develop the slum upgrading projects. (IAB-RJ 2010)

like the one organized in 1994, and reproduced for the upgrading of Dona Marta and Rocinha by the state of Rio de Janeiro in 2004 and 2005 respectively. At the beginning of December 2010, 40 architectural practices were selected to develop urbanization projects that included primarily: the delineation of settlements, the production of a physical, social and legal diagnosis and the production plans and designs and urban parameters. Several architectural practices and people that participated in the competition had been involved in Favela-Bairro projects. Thus, the development of the Morar Carioca plan was supported by the expertise of these architectural practices that consolidated their know-how through the use of the slum upgrading instrument.

The SMH signed another agreement with the Brazilian Institute of Social and Economic Analyses (IBASE) to invigorate community participation in the design and implementation of the Morar Carioca projects. IBASE was an NGO founded in 1981. IBASE was hired for its expertise acquired through different works, including the project called 'Pact for Citizenship' realized in the context of PAC 1 in 2008. The objective of IBASE in the context of the Morar Carioca was to enable civil society to influence the planning process (IBASE 2012). The agreement included the elaboration of participative social diagnosis, the collection and dissemination of favela information for the architectural practices and public institutions and for publications. In order to avoid Favela-Bairro participation issues, IBASE aimed to interact with the architectural practices responsible for the urban projects before the beginning of works. In the same spirit an agreement was also signed with PUC University for doing research in favelas.

By the end of 2012, Rio's housing policy was financed as follows: housing construction mainly through MCMV and slum upgrading by PAC, Pro-Moradia, FNHIS, municipal resources and the BID loan. As for the latter, in February 2012, the Senate approved the BID loan (BAND 2012) and in July 2012 the municipality signed the contract

This part describes that despite Rio's housing policy erosion, a diverse network of state and non-state actors continued to support Rio's housing policy. This time however, the SMH did not control all the housing related initiatives within and outside the municipal administration. It also noted that the type of relations included agreement and contracts

and the municipal government continued to play a coordinator and mobilizing role as in the 1990s.

In addition, this part described how knowledge and know-how continued to be developed such as Urban Cell, PAC and Morar Carioca initiatives, developing furthermore Rio's housing policy technical rationally consolidating knowledge and know-how, and the community of expert (that operated within and outside the municipal administration), shaping Rio's housing policy.

5 Conclusion

The paper sought to reveal the evolution of the modes of governance of Rio's housing policy by tracing policy instrumentation and in particular the constitution and use of the slum upgrading instrument. The first part described how from 1993 to 2000 Rio's housing policy governance entailed a network of state and non-state actors such as SMH and other governmental bodies (SMU, SMO, RioUrbe, Geo-Rio, COMLURB, RioLuz and PMG), private sector actors (architectural practices, construction companies), and national and international institutions (BID, IAB-RJ, CAIXA, European Union), NGOs and residents' associations and other actors/groups/institutions that participated on ad hoc basis. This part also noted that the municipal government adopted a coordinator and mobilizing role seeking to build alliances with the mentioned actors through contracts and agreements, abandoning an interventionist mode of governing. Lastly, it described how Rio's policy instrumentation entailed the development of a technical rationality that resulted in the constitution of a community of experts with a specific knowledge and know-how.

Then, the second part showed that despite Rio's housing policy erosion, its governance continued to entail state and non-state actors. It also highlighted that the type of relationships were similar to the ones established in the 1990s such as contracts and agreements and that the role of the municipal government continued to be the same: prime mover, mobilizer. This part also showed how the community of expert continued to operate leading the further development of Rio's housing policy, and how the accumulated knowledge and know-how continued to frame Rio's experience.

Based on this elements, the paper substantiates the argument that Rio's housing policy governance includes a network of state and non-state actors in which the municipal

government adopted a less interventionist mode of governing. In addition, its substantiates the idea that governance interactions entailed the development of a technical rationality that resulted in the creation of knowledge and know-how, and consolidation of a community of experts and ways of operating (norms, regulations and processes) that have lead and organized Rio's housing policy.

These characteristics of Rio's housing policy governance enables to reflect on two main elements. Firstly, the identification of role the municipal government has adopted can contribute to better understand and explain State limitations in the materialization of Rio's housing policy as this process depends on a variety of actors and actions of all the actors involved. Secondly, the identification of the development of the technical rationality can contribute to understand the limitation of community participation.

Lastly, on the question about possible concepts and theoretical ideas that could be useful for explaining urban governance, the paper suggests that the analysis of policy instrumentation can be a relevant entry point to analyse how governance processes of public policies in the Global South are constituted and organized. This because it allows to move beyond an analysis of who is involved, enabling to explore the characteristics of the relations and roles each actor adopts.

6 Reference

- Abiko, A. et al., 2007. Basic costs of slum upgrading in Brazil. *Global Urban Development*, 3(1), pp.1–23.
- Abramo, P., 1998. *Impacto do Programa Favela-Bairro no mercado imobiliário de favelas da cidade do Rio de Janeiro*, Rio de Janeiro: IPPUR / UFRJ.
- Aduan, W.E. & Brakarz, J., 2004. *Favela-Bairro-Scaled-up urban development in Brazil*, Washington: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank.
- Austrin, T. & Farnsworth, J., 2005. Hybrid genres: fieldwork, detection and the method of Bruno Latour. *Qualitative Research*, 5(2), pp.147–165. Available at: <http://qrj.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/1468794105048651> [Accessed June 9, 2013].
- Bahia, M.D.P., 2000. *Política de intervenção urbana: uma leitura crítica sobre os programas Rio Cidade e Favela Bairro*. UFRJ.

- BAND, 2012. RJ: Senado aprova investimento para favelas. Available at: <http://noticias.band.uol.com.br/brasil/noticia/?id=100000488785> [Accessed March 21, 2013].
- Becerril, H., 2014. *Slum upgrading role for housing governance and policy transformations. From Favela-Bairro to Morar Carioca, investigating the case of Rio de Janeiro in Brazil*. University College London.
- BID, 1995. Rio de Janeiro urban upgrading program (BR-0182).
- BID, 2007. Programa de Urbanização de Assentamentos Populares do Rio de Janeiro – PROAP (BR-0250). Relatório de término de projecto.
- Brakarz, J., Greene, M. & Rojas, E., 2002. *Ciudades para todos. La experiencia reciente en programas de mejoramiento de Barrios*, Washington: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Broudehoux, A.-M., 2001. Image making, city marketing, and the aesthetization of social inequality in Rio de Janeiro. In N. Alsayyad, ed. *Consuming tradition, manufacturing heritage. Global norms and urban forms in the age of tourism*. London: Routledge, pp. 273–297.
- Burgos, M., 2003. Dos parques proletários ao Favela-Bairro. In A. Zaluar & M. Alvito, eds. *Um século de favelas*. Rio de Janeiro: FGV, pp. 25–60.
- Cardoso, A.L., 2002. O Programa Favela-Bairro - Uma Avaliação. In R. M. Zenha & C. G. Luz de Freitas, eds. *Anais do Seminário de Avaliação de projetos IPT em habitação e meio ambiente: assentamento urbanos precário*. São Paulo: Habitare, pp. 37–50.
- Duarte, C.R., Luiz Silva, O. & Brasileiro, A., 1996. *Favela, um Bairro: propostas metodológicas para intervenção pública em favelas do Rio de Janeiro*, São Paulo: Pro-editores.
- Fiori, J., Riley, E. & Ramirez, R., 2000. *Urban Poverty Alleviation through Environmental Upgrading in Rio de Janeiro: Favela Bairro*, London.
- Freire, A. et al., 2009. *Lu Petersen: militância, favela e urbanismo*, Rio de Janeiro: FGV.
- Le Galès, P., 1995. Du gouvernement des villes à la gouvernance urbaine. *Revue française de science politique*, 45(1), pp.57–95.
- IAB-RJ, 2010. Plano Municipal de Integração dos Assentamentos Informais Precários – Morar Carioca. Available at: <http://www.iabRJ.org.br/plano-municipal-de-integracao-dos-assentamentos-informais-precarios---morar-carioca> [Accessed March 16, 2013].

IBAM, 1996. *Avaliação institucional do programa Favela-Bairro: a vertente do poder público*, Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Brasileiro de Administração Municipal.

IBASE, 2012. IBASE lança “Morar Carioca Cidadania Ativa.” Available at: <http://www.ibase.br/pt/2012/06/ibase-lanca-morar-carioca-cidadania-ativa/comment-page-1/#comments> [Accessed March 17, 2013].

IPHAN, 2006. Concurso nacional escolheu projeto de reurbanização da Rocinha. Available at: <http://www.labjor.unicamp.br/patrimonio/materia.php?id=153> [Accessed March 20, 2013].

Jornal do Brasil, 1996. Angra vai representar o Rio na Habitat. May 12. , p.35.

Jornal do Brasil, 1997. Conde abre licitação para nova etapa do Favela-Bairro. May 20. , p.23.

Jornal do Brasil, 1998. BID elogia Favela-Bairro. July 17. , p.20.

Jornal do Brasil, 1999a. Favela Bairro aumenta investimentos sociais; Da remoção à integração. October 29. , p.19.

Jornal do Brasil, 1999b. Parceria com europeus. June 28. , p.14.

Jornal do Brasil, 1999c. Bid tira do papel Favela-Bairro 2. July 23.

Jornal do Brasil, 2000. Acordo beneficiará Dona Marta. January 8. , p.18.

Jornal do Brasil, 2004. Dona Marta vai ter plano inclinado. March 2. , p.22.

Kassim, H. & Le Galès, P., 2010. Exploring Governance in a Multi-Level Polity: A Policy Instruments Approach. *West European Politics*, 33(1), pp.1–21. Available at: <http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=article&doi=10.1080/01402380903354031&magic=crossref||D404A21C5BB053405B1A640AFFD44AE3> [Accessed September 27, 2010].

Lascoumes, P., 2004. La Gouvernamentalité: de la critique de l’État aux technologies du pouvoir. *Le portique*, 13-14. Available at: <http://leportique.revues.org/index625.html>.

Lascoumes, P. & Le Galès, P. eds., 2004. *Gouverner par les instruments*, Paris: Presse de Science Po.

Lascoumes, P. & Le Galès, P., 2007. Introduction: Understanding Public Policy through Its Instruments—From the Nature of Instruments to the Sociology of Public Policy Instrumentation. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 20(1), pp.1–21. Available at:

<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/118497138/abstract> [Accessed August 16, 2010].

Magalhaes, S. & Conde, L., 2004. *Favela-Bairro: uma outra história da cidade do Rio de Janeiro*, Rio de Janeiro: ViverCidades.

Marques, E., 2013. Government, Political Actors and Governance in Urban Policies in Brazil and São Paulo: Concepts for a Future Research Agenda. *Brazilian Political Science Review*, 7(3), pp.8–35.

O Globo, 2001. Urbanização de favela vira motivo de disputa. July 9. , p.16.

O Globo, 2010. Prefeitura lança novo plano para favelas, que prevê controle, gabarito, conservação e choque. July 24. Available at:
<http://oglobo.globo.com/rio/prefeitura-lanca-novo-plano-para-favelas-que-preve-controle-gabarito-conservacao-choque-2974915#ixzz2NuGRFUIo>.

Pamuk, A. & Cavallieri, F., 1998. Alleviating urban poverty in a global city: new trends in upgrading Rio de Janeiro's Favelas. *Habitat International*, 22(4), pp.449–462. Available at: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0197397598000228>.

PCRJ, 1995. *Política habitacional da cidade do Rio de Janeiro*, Rio de Janeiro: Secretaria Municipal de Habitação.

PCRJ, 1996a. *Integração de Favelas no Rio de Janeiro*, Rio de Janeiro: Prefeitura da Cidade do Rio de Janeiro.

PCRJ, 1996b. *Planejamento e gestão de projetos de urbanização de assentamentos informais*, Rio de Janeiro: Prefeitura da Cidade do Rio de Janeiro.

PCRJ, 2003. *Das remoções à célula urbana. Evolução urbano-social das favelas do Rio de Janeiro*, Rio de Janeiro: Prefeitura da Cidade do Rio de Janeiro.

PCRJ, 2008. *Posto de orientação urbanística e social*, Rio de Janeiro: Prefeitura da Cidade do Rio de Janeiro.

Perlman, J., 2010. *Favela. Four decades of living on the edge in Rio de Janeiro*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Randolph, R., 2004. Arenas políticas e agenciamentos governamentais: uma discussão de novos formatos a partir da experiência do programa Favela-Bairro e do plano estratégico da cidade do Rio de Janeiro. In A. C. T. Ribeiro, ed. *El rostro urbano de América Latina. O rostro urbano da América Latina*. Buenos Aires: CLASCO, pp. 273–300.

Rojas, E., 2009. *Construir Ciudades, Mejoramiento de barrios y calidad de vida urbana* E. Rojas, ed., Washington: BID Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Silva, L.C., 2006. *O programa Favela-Bairro e as políticas habitacionais do Banco Interamericano de Desenvolvimento*. UFRJ.

Simpson, M., 2013. *Urbanising favelas, overlooking people: Regressive housing policies in Rio de Janeiro's progressive slum upgrading initiatives*, Londo.

Soares, F. & Soares, Y., 2005. *The Socio-Economic Impact of Favela-Bairro : What do the Data Say ?*, Washington.

TCMRJ, 2005. *Política habitacional I Ação Bairrinho*, Rio de Janeiro: Tribunal de Contas do Município.

TCMRJ, 2006. *Política habitacional II Ação Favela-Bairro*, Rio de Janeiro: Tribunal de Contas do Município.