

Stakeholder Participation for Managing Historic Urban Areas in India: The Case of HRIDAY Cities

Rajdeep Routh¹ and Piyush Pandya²

¹Ph.D. Scholar at Department of Public Administration, School of Liberal Studies, PDEU

²Associate Professor, APJ Abdul Kalam School of Environmental Design

Corresponding Author Email: Rajdeep Routh (routhrajdeep@gmail.com)

Corresponding Author Phone: Rajdeep Routh (+91 9898390175)

Corresponding Author Postal Address: Rajdeep Routh, B/92, Sujan Tower, Shastrinagar, Naranpura,, Ahmedabad – 380063 Gujarat, India

Abstract

This study examines public policies with the specific case of the HRIDAY scheme to explore the extent and weightage of public participation in the management of the historic core of Indian urban areas. The study analyzes stakeholder participation in three cities of Ajmer, Amritsar, and Varanasi. The research methodology is based on the literature review for understanding the scenario of stakeholder participation in heritage management. Secondly, the analysis includes the study of the Detailed Project Reports for the mentioned cities and the review of media reports and articles.

Indian cities consist of a web of overlapping heritage that is natural, cultural, movable and immovable, tangible and intangible, living and historic. While we celebrate Indian cities as engines of development, we cannot afford to overlook the role of culture and heritage in forming cities' identities, economies, and physical development. Due to the fast-paced urban development, the historical cities come under rough use and are abandoned in a dilapidated state. While most Indian cities don't have a dedicated cell or department for heritage, it is difficult to expect a brighter fate for urban heritage. Moreover, there is practically no mechanism to bring the expertise of central authorities dedicated to heritage in federal urban planning and management processes. While all the development activities call for people's participation, culture and heritage are a highly people-centric phenomenon, and inevitably, its management should start at the community level with people as a bottom-up approach.

The case studies presented here point out that although the communities are gradually moving to center stage in the heritage management process, the roles are still unclear. The HRIDAY cities have positively tried to engage their stakeholders, community supporters, and visitors in a new agenda. This new plan is more exciting, fulfilling, refreshing, and participatory than before. In establishing an environment for mutual exploration, investigation, and learning at the urban heritage sites, the conservation of cultural heritage assets will be secure, for the time being at least.

Keywords: Cultural Governance, Participatory Governance, Culture Heritage, Sustainable Urban Heritage Management, World Heritage City, Civil Society Organisations, Social Capital, Capacity Building

1. Introduction

The historic cores in India are home to various stakeholder groups holding varying interests. Hajialikhani (2008) defined stakeholders as

"individuals and organizations that are actively involved in the works, or whose interests may be affected as a result of works execution or completion," many of which tend to have certain

clout and influence over the decision-making. These stakeholder groups include people living within the historical areas (local communities), people who depend on the historic cores for business or tourism (private bodies), regional and national authorities governing these areas, local and supranational organizations like ICOMOS, and other civil society organizations.

Thus, coordination amongst these stakeholders with varied interests needs an understanding of their expectations from local heritage and how best they could be involved in the management process of cultural heritage. Such alliances could help create livable historic cores while maintaining cultural identity for present and future generations. But it is also very pertinent when the decision-makers should involve the stakeholders. Involving stakeholders in the initial stages of the heritage management process usually helps in improving the project acceptance and implementation and overall stakeholder satisfaction (ICOMOS, 2008).

Indian cities consist of a web of overlapping heritage that is natural, cultural, movable and immovable, tangible and intangible, living and historic. While we celebrate Indian cities as engines of development, we cannot afford to overlook the role of culture and heritage in forming cities' identities, economies, and physical development. The fast-paced urban development within Indian cities has resulted in unguarded reckless, unorganized, and informal development around the areas mentioned above. Consequently, it comes under rough use and is abandoned in a dilapidated state. While most Indian cities don't have a dedicated cell or department for heritage, it is difficult to expect a brighter fate for urban heritage. Moreover, there is practically no mechanism to bring the expertise of central authorities dedicated to heritage in federal urban planning and management processes. While all the development activities call for people's participation, culture and heritage are a highly people-centric phenomenon, and inevitably, its management should start at the community level with people as a bottom-up approach.

2. Stakeholder Participation In Managing Historic Urban Areas

Managing heritage resources requires integrating a wide range of complex and interrelated management considerations, which arise from within and out with the aid itself. While tourism activity at some sites is well developed and recognized, at others, it is marginal and not a significant management consideration. However, external factors, such as improvements in infrastructure, increased propensity to travel, and political instability means that growth in visitor access may be inevitable. The very significance of the heritage resources means that the sites all require individual approaches to their effective management.

2.1. The Need For Managing Historic Precincts

Urban heritage is gradually becoming a significant issue of concern for municipal authorities in terms of its conservation and sustainable management. In the case of living historic cities, which are numerous in India, the system at hand for heritage management is proving to have shortcomings. Such issues are happening, as there is no common ground for stakeholders, decision-making authorities, and funding mechanisms to interact and make decisions in unison. Most historic cores face illegal construction, negligence, and overburdened infrastructure, resulting in a loss of cultural identity and a disagreement between authorities and local communities. Currently, there is a global consensus that it is of utmost importance to involve the local communities in decision-making powers, engage them in the funding mechanism, and take their consent in policy formulation.

It is a known fact that the heritage management practices in India are very minimal, and the ones from other parts of the globe would be out of context and inapt for Indian cities. Thus, it becomes more of a necessity to understand the needs of Indian historic cities and formulate indigenous systems and policies for management for them. Such measures would be more contextual and serve sustainable development and proper management for numerous historic towns and cities across India.

In India, a few management plans are being evolved and followed, but the need for a sustainable approach to management is gaining prominence. This is so as the present systems lack sustenance in the long run because of various loopholes on the policy and economic level decisions and don't incorporate the stakeholders' views. As an outcome of this, the research would strongly try to figure out the best platform to bring together the three nodal points of the management system. The three points in the discussion would be the policy and legal system, financial system, and the public participation system. Such a scenario or platform would lead to urban heritage management, which would be sustainable. The responsibility of local communities should not be confined to participating in surveys and meetings. Still, they should be involved with heritage professionals and decision-making authorities to make policy-level decisions and changes. It is also essential for the funding mechanisms to work with the local community, as both systems must end up with a mutually benefiting outcome. It is also vital for the governing authorities to encourage the financial systems to generate funds, as the financial crunch cripples the conservation projects on an urban scale. This will also benefit the local community as the proper funding mechanism would lead to economic subsidies and better infrastructure in the urban cores.

2.2 Heritage Management and Community Participation

In India, a quiet sea change is taking place in the management of historic urban cores in the 21st century. Traditionally, heritage management is a top-down approach, with governments establishing the norms and paths. In usual cases, the decision-making generally involves government authorities and conservation experts. The local community and other relevant stakeholders are left out of the processor only consulted when needed. During such an approach, the local community is usually excluded, leading to many conflicts due to various reasons like neglect, displacement, etc. (Sharpley & Telfer, 2002; Wall & Black, 2005).

However, the focus of responsibilities concerning the protection and conservation of built and urban heritage is shifting from a forum of conservation experts and national and local government representatives to a partnership approach involving an expanded list of local and regional stakeholders covering a broad spectrum of interests. Based on the definition given by EuroCities, stakeholder involvement in urban heritage is also about including stakeholders who are indirectly impacted by the heritage management process (EuroCities, 2021). These new stakeholders include private sector businesses, developers, owners, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and community groups. There is also a consensus that acknowledges that there must be a link between universal and local values for a historic precinct to have a sustainable future.

2.3 Areas of stakeholder involvement

The general vision for stakeholder involvement in urban heritage is to ensure that they benefit from safeguarding the urban heritage and connect socially, culturally, or economically with "their" urban heritage. The stakeholder involvement can be grouped into five main categories (Göttler and Ripp, 2017):

1. Involvement in the inscription process of urban heritage to regional, national, or international lists due to the awareness about the values, local heritage knowledge, significance of the urban heritage, and understanding of its current state and safeguarding needs.
2. Involvement in developing urban heritage policies to ensure that the needs and interests of all stakeholders are reflected and linked to the safeguarding, management, and use of the urban heritage. It is done to ensure the proper understanding and support of policies, raise awareness about the significance of the urban heritage's preservation needs, and engage in the safeguarding and careful use of it.
3. Activities to emotionally attach local communities to the urban heritage to raise their awareness and understanding of the values. Such steps help the local community care for their heritage and pass the values to the next generation.
4. Engaging stakeholders in the management of heritage, in physical conservation, to incite

proper rehabilitation and careful use of urban heritage, to raise the awareness about safeguarding regulations and procedures and including them in the monitoring, the detecting of risks, problems, and opportunities of the urban heritage.

5. To ensure a beneficial use of the urban heritage for local communities without compromising the integrity and vitality of the heritage.

3. HRIDAY

Let us go briefly through the complexities of cultural governance in India. The diversity and complexities of Indian cities translate into the management frameworks prepared by the government. Out of 54 ministries of the union government of India, nine ministries directly engage with culture and heritage. It further branches out at the federal and local levels. For example, the Ministry of Culture is focused and responsible for managing the culture and heritage of the country has more than 30 organizations that are responsible for the different tangible and intangible heritage of the country. If we select only monuments and sites, for example- The Archaeological Survey of India, the government body responsible for protecting the built heritage has notified 3963 monuments as centrally protected since its inception. Similarly, federal states have the department of archaeology as an extension of a central body to further reach out to more structures.

The Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) are also responsible for managing the local heritage mandated by respective legislative frameworks. Such sites and monuments have an intimate association with intangible cultural and natural heritage. Thus, such monuments and sites often stand as epicenters of culture in particular areas and thus form the cultural districts as a part of the broader cultural landscape of the region. With such a complex system, several authorities, overlapping responsibilities, varied focus areas, urban heritage still faces poor management approaches.

Since 2006, the Ministry of Urban Development (MoUD) has undertaken numerous steps to

preserve the heritage within various Indian cities. However, many of these activities are conducted in isolation, without merging them with the local urban planning and development plans. Furthermore, there are no linkages with the local economy too. This creates a situation where, though the focus is on heritage, the heritage areas end up lacking or keeping up with essential services and infrastructure like sanitation, water supply, parking, etc. (Shanker, 2016). To overcome these issues and undertake comprehensive development of the historic cities, the Govt. of India launched National Heritage City Development and Augmentation Yojana (HRIDAY).

The HRIDAY Scheme, launched in 2015, is intended to conserve and revitalize India's rich cultural heritage. The scheme offered a great opportunity towards inclusive and sustainable heritage management and developing India's heritage cities. HRIDAY, unlike other schemes, was a step towards integrating the needs of urban planning and heritage conservation in an integrated fashion. Apart from the focus on heritage, it also looked into the aspects of livelihood, cleanliness, accessibility, and service delivery of the government programs (MoUD, 2015).

One of the prime components of HRIDAY is the involvement of stakeholders, especially the local community and private sector, to improve the infrastructural amenities in the heritage cities. The broad approach is to link the infrastructural needs of the heritage areas with the infrastructure development in other parts of the city (MoUD, 2015).

4. Stakeholder Participation In HRIDAY Cities

The preparation of the City HRIDAY Plan involved stakeholder consultations throughout its preparation period. Meetings were held individually with various government departments, academic institutes, individuals, stakeholder groups, and the tourists visiting the city. These meetings were documented and analyzed to identify multiple issues and their suitable solutions. HRIDAY itself is rooted in the belief that the active engagement of local

governments is critical for sustained progress in a city. The invitation for Expression of Interest (EOI) for HRIDAY City Anchors (HCAs) emphasized that a "series of stakeholders' consultations are required to identify the issues and problems at the grass-root level." This EOI further underscored that "vigorous public consultation (organized or isolated)" should be undertaken with "citizens, city officials, and other stakeholders" (MoUD, 2015).

4.1 Ajmer

The development of the Ajmer HRIDAY plan involved extensive stakeholder consultations employing various tools for community participation. These consultations were undertaken for four months and were held at different parts of Ajmer (DRONAH and ICLEI, 2015). These consultations included stakeholder meetings to gauge the infrastructure and service gaps. Furthermore, informal interactions were also held with locals during site visits to specific heritage areas and surveying them using closed-ended questionnaires.

The following consultations were held with the stakeholder groups:

- a) Official meetings with all concerned departments
- b) The city anchor conducted meetings and way-finding discussions with various stakeholder groups to understand the current gaps in infrastructure and services.
- c) Apart from closed-ended survey questionnaires, the local stakeholders were also indulged in numerous informal interactions to in-depth about the issues in local heritage and tourism and their views and suggestions.

4.1.1 Highlights of Stakeholder Involvement

1. The stakeholders' consultation process was carried out throughout the Detailed Project Report (DPR) and in the implementation stages.
2. The consultation with stakeholders, both authorities, and the local community helped the HCA to identify five priority zones, along with their significance and heritage components.
3. The surveys and consultation meetings helped understand residents' current capacity and awareness about the need for heritage areas. Many of the residents made suggestions like road widening and increased parking area, which

might damage the cultural identity of Ajmer. Thus, heritage awareness and capacity-building programs are a must for the locals.

4.2 Amritsar

As part of the Amritsar HRIDAY plan, local stakeholders were engaged with the entire gamut of project development work- from conceptualization, detailing, implementation, operation, and maintenance. Amritsar HCA acknowledged that heritage-based development requires understanding the needs and aspirations of various interest groups - from both the public and private sector - to ensure that the process is inclusive and offers a platform for a participatory approach. Strategies that allow for heritage to be looked after by the citizens themselves ensure sustainable maintenance management. HCA also tried involving communities as custodians to ensure that this program for HRIDAY is not a one-time government intervention. This was only possible with the active engagement of multiple stakeholders working in a collaborative spirit with a shared vision for the city. Amritsar HRIDAY program tried to make the public and private sector work in tandem as each offered varied opportunities for engagement with heritage- as users, caretakers, potential incubators, and investors. Stakeholders from the private sector were also motivated to some vital roles like investors, both in philanthropic or commercial interest.

4.2.1 Highlights of Stakeholder Involvement

1. Institutional mechanisms were recommended to be developed to enable private sector engagement and the role of community forums, educational institutions, and non-government organizations. Institutions to play the role of incubators for skill development and appreciation of heritage were recommended. These institutions have been proposed with specific mandates, with some focused on cultural and commercial activities and others towards skill development and entrepreneurship.
2. There is an immense opportunity to collaborate with the private sector through Public-Private Partnerships (PPP), especially for maintaining heritage sites through activities focused on tourist amenities and services.

3. For instance, while the proposed refurbishment of the Rambagh gate would create an essential asset for the city, mechanisms for operation and maintenance of the rooftop restaurant and other parts of the building through private sector engagement are an opportunity to be considered. Collaboration with the local hospitality industry would be beneficial to showcase the cuisine and hospitality services for which the city is very well known. Revenue generation through this project could pave the way for similar projects of this nature in the city. The local government should consider sustainable mechanisms for conserving public assets more owned explicitly by the local government and provide further technical guidance to the local community in this sector.

4.3 Varanasi

Situated along the banks of Ganga, Varanasi represents a unique case of harmony with the holy river. Manifestation is evident in its rich cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible. Attributing its rich heritage, Varanasi has been a part of many schemes. Under the HRIDAY scheme, stakeholder participation was an integral part of identifying the heritage assets and preparing the City HRIDAY Plan (CHP). A participatory approach was adopted to ensure the relevance of the CHP while raising awareness of the city's heritage assets and their values. A series of actions were taken to this end.

1. First, the critical local stakeholders were identified and clustered according to their relation to the city's heritage assets. Varanasi stakeholders vary in nature and have different degrees of association with the city's heritage.

2. Then, focus groups discussions, city-level workshops, and interviews were carried out, followed by a SWOT analysis.

3. Workshops were organized with Varanasi Municipal Corporation (VMC), Varanasi Development Authority (VDA), and experts to identify the heritage zones. Periodic formal consultations were also scheduled with officials and other concerned stakeholders to receive feedback and suggestions on work progress conducted during proposal preparation.

Stakeholder Participation Process

1. Pre-CHP stage: For identification of priority assets and zones

- Identification of stakeholders
 - Mapping of stakeholders
 - Consultations through workshops, one-on-one interviews, and focus groups discussions
2. CHP preparation stage: For identification of the area of intervention in the identified zones
- Identification of the area of intervention and components through focus groups discussions and workshops with:
 - Residents, owners, and tenants within the community, shopkeepers, women, children
 - Groups/associations, religious trusts, Self Help Groups, NGOs
 - Service providers and businesses, government officials, vegetable sellers, etc.
 - Interviews with key stakeholders to assess willingness and association with the project in the preparation, implementation, or O&M stages
 - Focus groups discussions on community assets and links to heritage and tourism-related activities, challenges and problems in the neighborhood, access, and condition of essential services, improvements required in and around the area, suggestions

Four levels of stakeholders were identified in the process:

1. Central and state-level agencies: ASI, State Archaeology, housing, and urban development departments, and other line departments

2. City level agencies: ULB, government agencies, NGOs, eminent personalities, and leaders Individuals and independent organizations involved in heritage and city development such as INTACH Varanasi Chapter, religious trusts, self-help groups, trade unions, market associations, and NGOs

3. Residents, especially women, children, and the youth.

4. Non-residents who depend upon local customers for their livelihood, such as vendors of traditional crafts and cuisine, government officials, etc.

4.3.1 Highlights of Stakeholder Involvement

1. Consultation with shopkeepers at Dasashwamedh Bazaar for the up-gradation of shop boards with a uniform shop signage vocabulary to be carried out. For the same, the shopkeepers and Varanasi Municipal Corporation can work together on the design,

based on which making and installing the signage(s) shall be undertaken with the assistance of the funding agency with coordination and agreement with the shopkeepers. In contrast, the operation and maintenance (O&M) will be the local authority's (MCV) responsibility.

2. Focus Groups Discussions with residents were conducted in and around the interventions to solicit the stakeholders' perceptions and suggestions on local issues and their urban renewal aspirations. Formal and informal interviews were carried out at various stages of the process along with opinion-makers to understand better the critical issues affecting the city and later the selected heritage zones and areas of intervention. The interviewees were area-specific, the residents were interviewed, and their requirements were discussed based on which proposals were formulated. In a few places, informal community interactions were held regularly with boatmen, street vendors, shop keepers, rickshaw drivers, security personnel, women, elderly and youth, pujaris, and devotees who visited the areas of intervention to perform religious rituals.

3. Infrastructure up-gradation and development in Peeli Kothi Area - Consultations carried out to understand the root level issues faced by the residents and weavers in Peeli Kothi. Significant infrastructure problems were identified, focusing on stormwater drainage and solid waste disposal. The proposals of introducing tourist activity in the mohalla were also discussed with the residents and weavers.

5. Stakeholder Collaborations: Findings From The Case Studies

As mentioned in the previous section, stakeholders identified in the above HRIDAY cases range from government departments and non-government organizations (NGOs) to local management authorities, the private sector, and of course, the local communities and landowners. The different City HRIDAY Plans (CHPs) have shown that understanding complexities and acknowledging and balancing stakeholder relationships prove difficult in a historic precinct. The preparation of CHPs saw effective stakeholder collaboration, with critical stakeholders interacting and sharing knowledge

towards a sustainable heritage management proposal.

5.1 Stakeholder Objectives for HRIDAY Cities

Identifying differing stakeholder objectives is necessary to understand why collaboration can be complex. The Government of India (represented by the Ministry of Culture and Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs), the Urban Local Bodies (represented by the respective municipal bodies, HRIDAY City Anchors, City level Advisory and Monitoring Committees and City Mission Directorates); the Advisory Bodies (represented by the National Advisory Committee and National Technical Committee); the private sector (in these cases essentially the tour operators); a prominent NGOs; and representatives of the local communities are the six key stakeholder groups. Due to the private land ownership in the case study, cities, the local communities, landowners, and their relationship with the other stakeholders are critical.

In the CHPs, HCAs have worked on the evolution of community involvement, thereby recognizing these members as critical stakeholders and valuable tools in managing cultural heritage. Specifically, the city heritage plans focus on communities and their participation in designing and planning various proposals in protected areas. After identifying the key stakeholders and completing the interviewing process, objectives were extracted from the data. These objectives demonstrate the vast scope of vested interests of each stakeholder group.

Another critical stakeholder identified by the individual HCAs was the tourist community, as all three cities are important religious destinations. The recent increase in pilgrims and tourist numbers shows that the need to work on the tourist facilities in all three cities is rising. As the majority of the pilgrimage centers are in the historic core, there was an urgent need to decongest the area. The stakeholders directly affected by the strengthening of the industry always have a different focus than stakeholders living in the area. Generally not accepted as an essential aspect in the heritage-planning tool,

they have been used to demonstrate that as the tourist site develops and moves through each phase, the involvement and objectives of stakeholders increase and change. The model depicts a tourism destination's development as the number of tourists increases over a while.

The interaction with this stakeholder group began at the exploration stage, and after a period of design and development, the rejuvenation path for the tourism hotspots was chalked out. While the model was designed to describe the development of areas concerning tourist numbers, it can also be applied to the range of critical stakeholders and their involvement and the current stage of participation in development. Based on the analysis of primary and secondary activities, the statutory bodies of individual cities have identified the growth potential, recognized the importance of stakeholders towards development, and devised heritage management programs based on stakeholder group capacities.

On the other hand, through their community workshops and project focus, the city HCAs would be considered to be moving from the involvement to the development stage of the product life cycle. They have run workshops in the communities asking them to think about a five-year and a ten-year vision of where they want to see their communities going. From this point, the city anchors focused their project design around community visions and are now implementing development programs in building conservation, area development, street facelift, and community development. The local communities are currently situated at the involvement stage of the management plan, and people participate in the same basic activities that they are very familiar with, without any proper tourism and hospitality training.

For the HRIDAY cities, the historic core development and activities have just started. There are still many opportunities for growth in people's roles in supporting this industry. The representatives of the national and city-level agencies all agree that the involvement of the local communities and stakeholders in development is critical. The collaboration

process requires stakeholders to be on equal and similar levels, particularly concerning their focus on heritage management development. It will be necessary for the future development of the heritage industry that involvement from stakeholders is equal and the direction of development is concurrent between each group.

5.2 Stakeholder Attribute Identification

While traditionally, governments and policymakers hold the majority of the power, in these HRIDAY management plans, the landowners and communities are also influential players. The powerful stakeholders, such as the government, at the national and local level, need to work with and for these strong communities; without their acceptance, progress will be slow. Protests made by the communities have proven this in the past. They stopped supporting the initiative when the landowners believed they had not been consulted or were unhappy with the management plan.

The second attribute of legitimacy is fundamental regarding the powerful community landowners. The management plans for HRIDAY cities discuss how communities' opinions should be considered in planning and management, which is essential. Legitimizing the landowners required other influential stakeholders to 'acknowledge and appreciate that communities have the necessary capacity and skills to plan and manage their resources. Although all stakeholders have a high legitimate stake, the communities will be most affected by decisions made regarding urban heritage.

6. Conclusion

The case studies presented here point out that although the communities are gradually moving to center stage in the heritage management process, the roles are still unclear. The HRIDAY cities have positively tried to engage their stakeholders, community supporters, and visitors in a new agenda. This new agenda is more exciting, fulfilling, refreshing, and participatory than before. In establishing an environment for mutual exploration, investigation, and learning at the urban heritage sites, the conservation of cultural heritage assets will be secure, for the time being at least.

Close examination of the current interactions between the key stakeholders in this study helped better understand recent collaboration. Understanding stakeholder attributes was developed to help make the relationships more successful. Proper lines of communication were developed, and they differed from organization to organization and stakeholder to stakeholder. This created a web of relationships, which helped identify the existing lines of communication and distinguish the known, unknown, and weak lines of communication between the key stakeholders. The scheme made it pertinent that local stakeholders be engaged with the entire gamut of project development work- from conceptualization, detailing, implementation, operation, and maintenance. The stakeholder consultations were required to evaluate the following:

- i. City needs,
- ii. Infrastructure,
- iii. Visitor amenities,
- iv. Signage and other visual communication systems,
- v. Assess the impact of visitors on the city

Consultations have been conducted on various platforms: at meetings with decision-makers, talks with various government and private stakeholders to understand past, ongoing and proposed development initiatives and with local resource people towards understanding community needs and with the local community to share and discuss ideas. Meetings have also been undertaken with community groups to present the plan.

The HCAs were at the heart of the ground management team. It worked on the ground and was a critical link between the governments, communities, and other stakeholders. The HCA in each city is responsible for developing the proposal and dealing directly with the landowners. As the city anchor for the scheme, its 'number one strategy during the work has been to build trust' with the varied stakeholders and communities, which is an essential step in the intermediary process. The HCA's intermediary role includes communicating information amongst all key stakeholders,

including appropriate government agencies. It is also responsible for reporting information from the ground and the communities to the higher governing authorities. There is also a meaningful relationship and constant interaction between the HCA and the private sector. They have the delicate task of juggling private sector interests with resident needs and maintaining the community's economic health and sustainable development. This communication is vital for managing the religious and historic precinct, particularly maintenance and community issues.

The private sector in this study consists of tour operators and hotel owners who are constantly in touch with the visitors and hold the majority of fiscal might in the area; thus, more attention needs to be paid to their voices. Businesses operating in the area for over 20 years have established relationships with the local community that is functioning and trusting. With their regional knowledge and close partnership with local communities, they are a valuable resource in collaboration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bott, A. L. et al. (2011). Stakeholder Collaboration in a Prospective World Heritage Area: The case of Kokoda and the Owen Stanley Ranges. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies Journal*, 3(2), 35-54
- CRCI (2015). *City HRIDAY Plan for Amritsar Vol. I – V*. New Delhi: CRCI (India) Pvt. Ltd.
- Desai, J. et al. (2017). *HRIDAY Reflections, A Monograph on Heritage City Development and Augmentation Yojana*. Ahmedabad: CEPT University and ICOMOS India.
- DRONAH (2015). *City HRIDAY Plan – Ajmer*. Gurugram: DRONAH.
- Gottler, M. and Ripp, M. (eds.) (2017). *Community Involvement in Heritage Management Guidebook*. Regensburg, Germany: City of Regensburg.
- Hajialikhani, M. (2008). *A Systematic Stakeholders Management Approach for Protecting the Spirit of Cultural Heritage Sites*. Quebec. Canada: ICOMOS.

- INTACH (2015). Preparation Of City Hriday Plan Including Civic Infrastructure Development Plan. New Delhi: INTACH
- Kumar, S. (2022). Strategic management of carbon footprint using carbon collectible non-fungible tokens (NFTS) on blockchain. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 21(S3), 1-10
- Kumar, S. (2021). Review of geothermal energy as an alternate energy source for Bitcoin mining. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research*, 23(1), 1-12
- Ritika Malik, AarushiKataria and Naveen Nandal, Analysis of Digital Wallets for Sustainability: A Comparative Analysis between Retailers and Customers, *International Journal of Management*, 11(7), 2020, pp. 358-370.
- Aarushi, Naveen Nandal, Parul Agrawal. AN EXPLORATORY RESEARCH IN PRODUCT INNOVATION IN AUTOMOBILE SECTOR. *JCR*. 2020; 7(2): 522-529. doi:10.31838/jcr.07.02.98
- Leask, A. and Fyall, A. (2006). *Managing World Heritage Sites*. Burlington, USA: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- PWC and CII. (2018). *Transforming Urban India: Art and Culture to Play a Pivotal Role*. New Delhi, India: PWC and CII.
- MoUD, GoI. (2015). *Operational Guidelines for HRIDAY*. New Delhi, India. New Delhi: Ministry of Urban Development
- MoUD, GoI, and NIUA. (2015). *HRIDAY – Template for Preparation of City HRIDAY Plan including Civic Infrastructure Development Plan*. New Delhi: Ministry of Urban Development
- Ripp, M. et al. (eds.) (2011). 'The Road to Success' - Integrated Management of Historic Towns. Regensburg, Germany: City of Regensburg.
- Sharpley, R. and Telfer, D.J. (2002). *Tourism and Development: Concepts and Issues*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications,
- UNESCO (2005). *Tangible Cultural Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO
- Wijesuriya, G. and Court, S. (2015). *People-centred approaches to the conservation of cultural heritage: living heritage*. ICCROM