

# PARLIAMENTARY WATCH REPORT

AN ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONS ASKED ON URBAN  
ISSUES IN THE INDIAN PARLIAMENT IN 2021



**Suggested citation:**

Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action (YUVA). (2022).  
Parliamentary Watch Report: An analysis of questions  
asked on urban issues in the Indian Parliament in 2021.  
Mumbai: India.

**Published by**

Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action (YUVA)  
YUVA Centre, Plot 23, Sector 7, Kharghar  
Navi Mumbai – 410210 (India)

# PARLIAMENTARY WATCH REPORT

---

**AN ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONS ASKED ON URBAN  
ISSUES IN THE INDIAN PARLIAMENT IN 2022**



Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action (YUVA) is a non-profit development organisation committed to enabling vulnerable groups to access their rights and address human rights violations. YUVA supports the formation of people's collectives that engage in the discourse on development, thereby ensuring self-determined and sustained collective action in communities. This work is complemented with advocacy and policy recommendations on issues.

**Contributors:**

Shalaka Chauhan

**Research & documentation support:**

Lalit Kunjeyan, Souptika Das and Sunanya Deka

**Copy Editor:**

Doel Jaikishen

W: [www.yuvaindia.org](http://www.yuvaindia.org)

E: [info@yuvaindia.org](mailto:info@yuvaindia.org)



@officialyuva



@officialyuva



yuvaindia84



@yuvaonline



officialyuva



officialyuva

**Published by:**

YUVA (Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action)

YUVA Centre, Sector 7, Plot 23, Kharghar,

Navi Mumbai – 410210 (INDIA)

July 2022

**Designed by:**

Manoj Hodawadekar

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Abbreviations</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>iv</i>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1   PRADHAN MANTRI AWAS YOJANA-URBAN</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2   ATAL MISSION FOR REJUVENATION AND URBAN TRANSFORMATION</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3   SWACHH BHARAT MISSION-URBAN</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4   SMART CITIES MISSION</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>CHAPTER 5   DEENDAYAL ANTYODAYA YOJANA-NATIONAL URBAN LIVELIHOODS MISSION</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>CHAPTER 6   LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT</b>	<b>53</b>
<i>References</i>	<i>63</i>

# ABBREVIATIONS

<b>AHP</b>	Affordable Housing in Partnership	<b>GMIS</b>	Geospatial Management Information System
<b>AMRUT</b>	Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation	<b>Gol</b>	Government of India
<b>ARHC</b>	Affordable Rental Housing Complex	<b>ICCC</b>	Integrated Command and Control Centres
<b>BJP</b>	Bharatiya Janata Party	<b>IEC and PA</b>	Information, Education and Communication and Public Awareness
<b>BLC</b>	Beneficiary Led Construction	<b>IHHL</b>	Individual Household Latrine
<b>BOC</b>	Building and Other Construction	<b>ISSR</b>	In-situ Slum Redevelopment
<b>BOCW</b>	Building and Other Construction Workers	<b>LIG</b>	Low Income Group
<b>CB and A&amp;OE</b>	Capacity Building and Administrative & Office Expenses	<b>MIG</b>	Middle Income Group
<b>CCTV</b>	Closed Circuit Television	<b>MIS</b>	Management Information System
<b>CLSS</b>	Credit Linked Subsidy Scheme	<b>MoHUA</b>	Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs
<b>CSR</b>	Corporate Social Responsibility	<b>MP</b>	Member of Parliament
<b>CT</b>	Community Toilet	<b>MSW</b>	Municipal Solid Waste
<b>CWBP</b>	City Water Balance Plan	<b>MT/D</b>	Metric Tonnes Per Day
<b>DAY-NULM</b>	Deen Dayal Antyodaya Yojana–National Urban Livelihoods Mission	<b>NDA</b>	National Democratic Alliance
<b>DBT</b>	Direct Benefit Transfer	<b>NSSO</b>	National Sample Survey Office
<b>DW</b>	Domestic Worker	<b>NULM</b>	National Urban Livelihoods Mission
<b>EPF</b>	Employees' Provident Fund	<b>ODF</b>	Open Defecation Free
<b>EWS</b>	Economically Weaker Section	<b>PLFS</b>	Periodic Labour Force Survey
<b>FY</b>	Financial Year	<b>PMAY</b>	Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana
<b>GIS</b>	Geographic Information System	<b>PMJDY</b>	Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana

<b>PMSBY</b>	Pradhan Mantri Suraksha Bima Yojana
<b>PM SVANidhi</b>	Pradhan Mantri Street Vendor's AtmaNirbhar Nidhi
<b>PMSYM</b>	Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Maandhan Yojana
<b>PPP</b>	Public Private Partnership
<b>PT</b>	Public Toilets
<b>PwD</b>	Person with Disability
<b>QR</b>	Quick Response
<b>RFP</b>	Request for Proposals
<b>SBM</b>	Swachh Bharat Mission
<b>SCM</b>	Smart Cities Mission
<b>SCP</b>	Smart Cities Proposals
<b>SHG</b>	Self Help Group
<b>SPV</b>	Special Purpose Vehicle
<b>SUH</b>	Scheme of Shelter for Urban Homeless
<b>SWM</b>	Solid Waste Management
<b>TG</b>	Technical Group
<b>TPD</b>	Tonnes Per Day
<b>UC</b>	Utilisation Certificate
<b>ULB</b>	Urban Local Body
<b>UT</b>	Union Territory

# LIST OF TABLES

Table	Details	Page	Table	Details	Page
<b>1.1</b>	HOUSING SHORTAGE ESTIMATED BY TG -12 AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 12TH PLAN PERIOD VERSUS ASSESSED HOUSING DEMAND AFTER VALIDATION UNDER PMAY-U, STATE/UT-WISE	4	<b>2.1</b>	FUNDS RELEASED AND UTILISED DURING THE LAST THREE YEARS AND CURRENT YEAR UNDER AMRUT MISSIONS	17
<b>1.2</b>	HOUSES SANCTIONED, GROUNDED FOR CONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETED/ DELIVERED UNDER PMAY-U AS ON 06.12.2021, STATE/UT-WISE	6	<b>2.2</b>	STATUS OF WATER SUPPLY GROUNDED UNDER AMRUT, STATE/UT-WISE	18
<b>1.3</b>	DETAILS OF HOUSES COMPLETED/ DELIVERED DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS UNDER PMAY-U, 2016-2021, STATE/ UT-WISE AND YEAR-WISE	7	<b>2.3</b>	STATUS OF WATER AND SEWER CONNECTIONS PROVIDED THROUGH AMRUT AND CONVERGENCE, STATE/UT-WISE	19
<b>1.4</b>	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE SANCTIONED, RELEASED AND UTILISED DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS UNDER PMAY-U, STATE/UT-WISE AND YEAR-WISE	9	<b>2.4</b>	STATUS OF SEWERAGE AND SEPTAGE MANAGEMENT PROJECTS GROUNDED UNDER AMRUT, STATE/UT-WISE	20
<b>1.5</b>	DETAILS OF HOUSES CONSTRUCTED UNDER DIFFERENT VERTICALS OF PMAY-U DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS, FY 2016-17 TO FY 2020-21, STATE/UT-WISE	11	<b>3.1</b>	SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT WISE COMPLETION OF SBM-U	22
<b>1.6</b>	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE/SUBSIDY RELEASED UNDER PMAY-U CLSS DURING 2017-20, STATE/UT-WISE	12	<b>3.2</b>	TARGETED, CONSTRUCTED AND IN PROGRESS LATRINES UNDER IHHL AND CT, STATE/UT-WISE	24
<b>1.7</b>	DETAILS OF EXISTING GOVERNMENT FUNDED VACANT HOUSES CONVERTED INTO ARHCS FOR THE BENEFICIARIES UNDER MODEL 1 OF THE SCHEME AS OF 02.12.2021, STATE/UT-WISE	13	<b>3.3</b>	MISSION ALLOCATION (COMPONENT -WISE) UNDER SWACHH BHARAT MISSION, STATE/UT-WISE	25
<b>1.8</b>	DETAILS OF ARHC UNITS SANCTIONED FOR CONSTRUCTION BY PUBLIC/PRIVATE ENTITIES UNDER MODEL 2 OF THE SCHEME AS OF 02.12.2021, STATE/UT-WISE	14	<b>3.4</b>	BREAK-UP OF ODF, ODF+ AND ODF++ CERTIFIED CITIES, STATE/UT-WISE	26
			<b>3.5</b>	ALLOCATION/UTILISATION OF FUNDS IN INR CRORE UNDER SBM-U, STATE/ UT-WISE	28
			<b>3.6</b>	SUMMARY OF PROGRESS IN WASTE COLLECTION PRACTICES	29
			<b>3.7</b>	SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT UNDER SBM-U, STATE/UT-WISE	30

Table	Details	Page	Table	Details	Page
<b>3.8</b>	DETAILS OF TREATED AND UNTREATED WASTE IN URBAN AREAS OF THE COUNTRY, STATE/UT-WISE	31	<b>5.9</b>	REASON-WISE BREAK-UP OF APPLICATIONS RETURNED UNDER PM SVANIDHI	50
<b>3.9</b>	SWACHH SURVEKSHAN-2022: CRITERIA	32	<b>5.10</b>	DETAILS OF SHELTERS FUNCTIONAL UNDER DAY-NULM, STATE/UT-WISE	51
<b>4.1</b>	DETAILS OF FUNDS RELEASED BY CENTRAL GOVERNMENT AND UTILISATION THEREOF BY SMART CITIES, STATE/UT/CITY-WISE	35	<b>6.1</b>	REGISTRATIONS UNDER E-SHRAM, STATE/UT-WISE	54
<b>4.2</b>	LIST OF ENVIRONMENTAL SENSORS INSTALLED BY SMART CITIES, STATE/UT-WISE	37	<b>6.2</b>	SCHEMES AS COVID-19 RECOVERY MECHANISM UNDER MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT	55
<b>4.3</b>	KEY COMPONENTS OF COVID-19 WAR ROOMS AND OTHER INITIATIVES TAKEN BY SMART CITIES	38	<b>6.3</b>	PENSION ENROLLMENT, STATE/UT-WISE	57
<b>5.1</b>	CANDIDATES SKILL TRAINED SINCE THE 5LAUNCH OF DAY-NULM	40	<b>6.4</b>	CODES AND STATES/UTS THAT HAVE PREPUBLISHED DRAFT RULES	58
<b>5.2</b>	CANDIDATES TRAINED AND PLACED DURING 2017-18 TO 2019-20, STATE/UT-WISE	41	<b>6.5</b>	STATUS ON CASH RELIEF PROVIDED TO BOC WORKERS DURING THE PANDEMIC, STATE/UT-WISE	59
<b>5.3</b>	SHGS FORMED SINCE THE LAUNCH OF DAY-NULM, STATE/UT-WISE	43	<b>6.6</b>	NUMBER OF DOMESTIC WORKERS, STATE/UT-WISE	60
<b>5.4</b>	LOANS GIVEN TO SHGS UNDER BANK 5LINKAGE PROGRAMME SINCE THE LAUNCH OF DAY-NULM	44			
<b>5.5</b>	SHGS GIVEN REVOLVING FUND SINCE THE LAUNCH OF DAY-NULM	45			
<b>5.6</b>	BENEFICIARIES ASSISTED FOR SETTING UP INDIVIDUAL/GROUP MICRO ENTERPRISES SINCE THE LAUNCH OF DAY-NULM	46			
<b>5.7</b>	STREET VENDORS IDENTIFIED AND CERTIFIED, STATE/UT-WISE	47			
<b>5.8</b>	DETAILS OF SANCTIONED AND DISBURSED LOANS UNDER SVANIDHI, STATE/UT- AND GENDER-WISE	48			

# INTRODUCTION

---

As stated by the United Nations' 2011 Revision of the World Urbanisation Prospects, by 2050 India is going to be the second-largest urban country with a population of 0.9 billion. It will record the world's highest urbanisation rate—497 million more residents, as 60 per cent of the country's population will move into its cities (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2011). To accommodate the migrant population, the majority of whom comprise the urban poor, cities need to provide affordable housing, universal basic schemes, and adequate livelihood opportunities. The lack of this critical infrastructure and services forces an integral part of our society into extreme homelessness, unemployment, poverty, and hunger.

The Right to Adequate Housing is a core component of the Right to an Adequate Standard of Living (Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights). The right mandates a range of protections, such as the legal security of tenure, which encompasses protection against forced eviction, harassment, and other threats. **The right also mandates the availability of services, facilities, infrastructure, accessibility and habitability.** The Right to Livelihood (Article 21) says no person shall be deprived of it. From time to time, several schemes and acts have been formed to support and promote the housing and livelihoods of marginal communities.

While campaigning for general elections in 2014, the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) led National Democratic Alliance (NDA) speeches, manifestos and election campaigns were heavily focused on urban development aspects. On winning the elections, the promises were later

converted into the announcement of urban development schemes, namely Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Urban (PMAY–U), Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT), Swachh Bharat Mission–Urban (SBM–U), Smart Cities Mission–Urban (SCM–U), and Deendayal Antyodaya Yojana–National Urban Livelihoods Mission (DAY–NULM). All these schemes intend to address urban issues like housing, livelihoods, sanitation, and civic amenities. Therefore, it is important to critically evaluate their motives, implementation in terms of physical progress and fund utilisation, and most importantly, the schemes' future plans.

With the urban poor relying extensively on the government's legislative schemes and measures, the analysis of its vision and performance is significant. Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action (YUVA) publishes annual Parliamentary Watch Reports to analyse the parliamentary questions and responses given by the relevant Ministry. This report compiles responses to review the implementation and progress made by flagship schemes. This evidence-based approach will help drive accountability from the government. The report highlights the gaps in schemes, so that required action can be taken. Just like other Parliamentary sessions, the session for 2021 was also divided into three periods, namely, budget, monsoon, and winter session. This report gives a detailed analysis of the questions asked and answered in the Parliament as part of five schemes, along with concerns raised around labour and employment.

## KEY HIGHLIGHTS

---

### PRADHAN MANTRI AWAS YOJANA–URBAN (PMAY–U)

1. States/union territories (UTs) have sanctioned more than the targeted/estimated number of houses (1.14 crore) whereas only 47 per cent of the total sanctioned houses have been completed/delivered

(52.88 lakh) and 79 per cent have been grounded for construction (89.62 lakh) in the last six years.

2. 56 per cent of the total sanctioned funds have been released, of which 74 per cent have been utilised.

3. The maximum number of houses are being constructed under the beneficiary-led construction (BLC) component, followed by credit linked subsidy scheme (CLSS), which together account for 84 per cent of the total houses constructed under PMAY-U. In-situ slum redevelopment (ISSR) shares 5 per cent and affordable housing in partnership (AHP) shares 11 per cent of the total constructed houses.
4. Since 2020, under Model 1 of the Affordable Rental Housing Complexes (ARHC) scheme, 4,444 houses have been converted into ARHCs and allotted to beneficiaries. Under Model 2, 78,885 units are sanctioned for construction by public/ private entities.

### **ATAL MISSION FOR REJUVENATION AND URBAN TRANSFORMATION (AMRUT)**

1. In 2018–19, 98.4 per cent of the funds were utilised, whereas in 2019–20 and 2020–21 the fund utilisation rate was 84 per cent and 48 per cent, respectively.
2. A total of 740 water supply projects worth INR 11,531 crore have been completed under AMRUT, of which Kerala and Odisha have been the top-performing states.
3. For the sewage and septage project, Kerala sets an example of optimum utilisation of funds as it completes 84 out of 125 projects amounting to just INR 410 crore. Meanwhile, the states of Uttar Pradesh and Gujarat spend INR 6,978.4 and 2,949.6 crore on 31/160 and 51/ 98 projects, respectively.

### **SWACHH BHARAT MISSION-URBAN (SBM-U)**

1. Construction of individual household latrines and public toilets shows 106 per cent and 121 per cent completion against their respective targets.
2. As of now, out of 4,372 urban local bodies (ULBs), 4,371 ULBs have been declared open defecation free (ODF) (4,316 certified ODF). Further, 3,330 ULBs

have been certified ODF+ and 961 ULBs have been certified ODF++

3. 100 per cent door-to-door collection was reported in 86,403 wards out of 89,061 wards. 98,324 tonnes per day waste was processed. The segregation of waste at source is practiced in 77,415 wards out of 89,061 wards.

### **SMART CITIES MISSION (SCM)**

1. 57 per cent of the promised funds have been released by the Government of India and 82 per cent of the released amount has been utilised till date. 28.7 per cent of the tendered fund for 48.5 per cent of the projects has been utilised till date. 22 of the 100 Smart Cities have utilised 100 per cent of the funds released.
2. A total of 501 environmental sensors have been installed across all states/UTs. 55 per cent sensors are being installed in Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat.
3. 28 smart wastewater projects and 7 solar energy related projects have been completed in 2021–22 under the SCM. There has been a considerable decline in the number of completed/grounded projects since 2020–21, when 34 wastewater and 18 solar energy projects had been undertaken.

### **DEENDAYAL ANTYODAYA YOJANA-NATIONAL URBAN LIVELIHOODS MISSION (DAY-NULM)**

1. 61 per cent of the total trained candidates have been placed in the last three years, as per the data provided by the Ministry.
2. 5,24,930 self-help groups (SHGs) have been formed across all states/UTs, of which 61 per cent of the total registered SHGs have received revolving funds since the launch of DAY-NULM. 5,51,281 beneficiaries have been assisted in setting up individual/group micro-enterprises, of which 32 per cent is based in Tamil Nadu.

3. A total of 54,70,307 street vendors have been identified through the survey across states/UTs while 41 per cent of identified street vendors have been issued vending certificates. Under the Pradhan Mantri Street Vendor's AtmaNirbhar Nidhi (PM SVANidhi Scheme), 30.75 lakh loans amounting to INR 3,095 crore have been sanctioned and INR 27.06 lakh loans amounting to INR 2,714 crore have been disbursed.
4. As per a third-party survey, there are over 2 lakh homeless people in the country and according to government data 1,630 shelters are operational across 35 states/UTs under DAY-NULM.

## LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

1. The Ministry of Labour and Employment has launched the e-Shram portal where more than 11.67 crore unorganised workers have been registered. One of the main objectives of the e-Shram portal is to facilitate the delivery of social security and welfare schemes to informal sector workers.
2. A total of 46,19,840 pension enrolments have been made under Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Maan-Dhan (PMSYM) Yojana across the country. For 2020–21, the pension enrollment dropped down to 84.4 per cent from 2019–2020 and 94 per cent from 2018–19. In 2021–22, it further dropped down by 46 per cent.
3. During the first wave of COVID-19, the state/UT Building and Other Construction Workers (BOCW) Welfare Boards have cumulatively disbursed more than INR 5,618 crore, through direct benefit transfers (DBTs), to the bank accounts of INR 1.83 crore BOC workers during lockdown and thereafter. Further, during the second wave of COVID-19, INR 1,795 crore was disbursed via DBT to the bank accounts of 1.23 crore BOC workers.
4. The Ministry reported that the Labour Bureau under the Ministry of Labour and Employment has launched the fieldwork for the All India Survey on Domestic Workers and Migrant workers on 22 November 2021, which will end by the end of 2022.
5. As per the government's survey on migrant workers, till December a total of 1,14,30,968 migrants made their way back to their home states from various corners of the country

# CHAPTER 1: PRADHAN MANTRI AWAS YOJANA-URBAN

## BACKGROUND

In 2015, the National Democratic Alliance (NDA) government launched the Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana-Urban (PMAY-U), India's flagship housing scheme with the aim to resolve the problem of 'affordable urban housing shortage' by 2022. Under the scheme, the Government of India has been assisting state/union territory (UT) governments in providing pucca houses with basic services to all eligible families in the urban areas of the country. For implementation, the scheme reaches out to the beneficiaries via four components: in situ slum redevelopment (ISSR); credit-linked subsidy scheme (CLSS); affordable housing in partnership (AHP); and, beneficiary-led individual house construction/

enhancement (BLC/E). In 2020, the Ministry launched its sub-scheme, Affordable Rental Housing Complex, which promises to provide the migrants/poor decent rental housing at an affordable rate near their work sites.

Till 2021, a sum of around INR 1.03 lakh crore has been spent by the Centre and INR 52.88 lakh houses were completed/delivered under the PMAY-U scheme. As PMAY-U reaches its goal of implementing the scheme by 2022, it is imperative to study if the scheme addresses the housing needs of the targeted population as per its promise.

## THE HOUSING SHORTAGE CRISIS

The Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (erstwhile Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation) constituted a Technical Group (TG-12) on the estimation of the urban housing shortage of the country for the Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012-17). As per the Report of this Committee, the total housing shortage at the beginning of the 12th Plan period, i.e. in 2012, was 187.8 lakh. Later, considering that the primary responsibility of undertaking surveys and assessments about the need for urban dwellings for different segments of the society lies with the state governments,

on 25 June 2015 the states/UTs were requested to undertake a demand survey for assessing the demand for housing in urban areas. The assessed demand reported by states/UTs was found to be 112 lakh. Table 1.1 presents the housing shortage estimated by TG-12 in 2012 and the demand assessed by states in 2015. As we can see, there is a stark difference of 80 lakh (approx) between both the estimates. Most states have recorded a demand of less than 60 per cent of the actual housing shortage assessed by TG-12 (Unstarred Question No. 600, Lok Sabha, 4 February 2021).

S.NO.	STATE/UT	HOUSING SHORTAGE ESTIMATED BY TECHNICAL GROUP (TG-12) (IN MILLION)	ASSESSED HOUSING DEMAND AFTER VALIDATION UNDER PMAY-U (IN MILLION)
1	ANDHRA PRADESH*	1.27	2.370
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	0.03	0.012
3	ASSAM	0.28	0.130
4	BIHAR	1.19	0.400
5	CHHATTISGARH	0.35	0.254
6	GOA	0.06	0.005
7	GUJARAT	0.99	0.765
8	HARYANA	0.42	0.300

9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	0.04	0.015
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR**	0.13	0.042
11	JHARKHAND	0.63	0.200
12	KARNATAKA	1.02	0.700
13	KERALA	0.54	0.150
14	MADHYA PRADESH	1.10	0.850
15	MAHARASHTRA	1.94	1.175
16	MANIPUR	0.08	0.046
17	MEGHALAYA	0.03	0.007
18	MIZORAM	0.02	0.031
19	NAGALAND	0.21	0.032
20	ODISHA	0.41	0.300
21	PUNJAB	0.39	0.100
22	RAJASTHAN	1.15	0.300
23	SIKKIM	0.01	0.002
24	TAMIL NADU	1.25	0.830
25	TRIPURA	0.03	0.085
26	UTTARAKHAND	0.16	1.500
27	UTTAR PRADESH	3.07	0.050
28	WEST BENGAL	1.33	0.471
29	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0.00	0.001
30	CHANDIGARH	0.02	0.001
31	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	0.05	0.005
32	DAMAN & DIU	0.01	0.001
33	DELHI	0.49	0.079
34	LAKSHADWEEP	0.01	-
35	PUDUCHERRY	0.07	0.015
	<b>ALL INDIA</b>	<b>18.78</b>	<b>11.221</b>

**Table 1.1 | Housing shortage estimated by TG-12 at the beginning of the 12th Plan period versus assessed housing demand after validation under PMAY-U, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 1932, Lok Sabha, 22 September 2020

\* : Andhra Pradesh means the erstwhile State of Andhra Pradesh, i.e., the area now comprising the present-day State of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana.

\*\* : Jammu & Kashmir means (J&K) the erstwhile State of J&K, i.e., the area now comprising the present-day UT of J&K and UT of Ladakh.

## PHYSICAL PROGRESS

Of the estimated demand reported by states/UTs of 112 lakh, a total of 1.14 crore houses have been sanctioned, of which 89.62 lakh houses are grounded for construction and 52.88 lakh houses are completed/delivered as of 6 December 2021. This means that the states have sanctioned more than the targeted/estimated number of houses whereas only 47 per cent of the total sanctioned houses have been completed/delivered in the last six years.

The maximum number of houses have been sanctioned in Andhra Pradesh (20,40,541) followed by Uttar Pradesh (17,67,146) and Maharashtra (13,52,471) with a combined percentage of 44 per cent of the total number of houses sanctioned in India. Together Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu account for a share of 66.7 per cent of the houses completed/delivered in the country. The maximum number of houses have been

sanctioned in Andhra Pradesh (17.8 per cent) followed by Uttar Pradesh (15.5 per cent), Maharashtra (11.8 per cent) Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat (7.5 per cent each). Together, these five states account for a share of 60 per cent of the houses sanctioned in the entire country. Performance-wise, Telangana has completed 90 per cent

of sanctioned houses, followed by Kerala and Gujarat with the percentage 73 per cent each. The data shows that it is Bihar and Haryana with 26 per cent and 30 per cent, respectively, as the slowest moving states (Starred Question No. 230, Lok Sabha, 20 December 2021).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	HOUSES SANCTIONED	HOUSES GROUNDED FOR CONSTRUCTION*	HOUSES COMPLETED/ DELIVERED*
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	20,40,540	16,49,632	4,78,825
2	BIHAR	3,64,086	2,22,856	94,803
3	CHHATTISGARH	2,99,390	2,33,140	1,46,673
4	GOA	4,156	4,123	4,098
5	GUJARAT	8,56,982	7,86,965	6,26,622
6	HARYANA	1,55,696	80,822	46,746
7	HIMACHAL PRADESH	12,682	12,983	6,699
8	JHARKHAND	2,34,778	1,92,203	1,07,136
9	KARNATAKA	6,93,577	4,71,496	2,52,687
10	KERALA	1,39,848	1,25,185	1,02,618
11	MADHYA PRADESH	8,65,129	7,77,837	4,68,311
12	MAHARASHTRA	13,52,471	7,98,700	5,27,648
13	ODISHA	2,05,999	1,38,909	1,00,364
14	PUNJAB	1,10,883	96,517	47,818
15	RAJASTHAN	2,19,535	1,65,464	1,38,996
16	TAMIL NADU	7,19,853	6,23,651	4,54,975
17	TELANGANA	2,33,108	2,38,828	2,08,413
18	UTTAR PRADESH	17,67,146	14,30,068	9,75,064
19	UTTARAKHAND	52,486	31,915	22,075
20	WEST BENGAL	5,56,646	4,545,049	2,80,403
<b>SUB-TOTAL (STATES):</b>		<b>1,08,84,992</b>	<b>85,35,343</b>	<b>50,90,971</b>
21	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	9,135	7,584	3,811
22	ASSAM	1,68,261	1,10,054	34,655
23	MANIPUR	56,095	38,393	5,701
24	MEGHALAYA	5,333	4,051	1,786
25	MIZORAM	39,872	26,131	4,772
26	NAGALAND	32,331	31,935	7,203
27	SIKKIM	637	646	344
28	TRIPURA	92,128	70,283	53,648
<b>SUB-TOTAL (N.E. STATES):</b>		<b>4,03,792</b>	<b>2,89,077</b>	<b>1,11,920</b>
29	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	602	602	43
30	CHANDIGARH	1,582	6,542	6,542
31	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	8,174	7,782	5,532

32	DELHI (NCR)	25,949	66,529	49,929
33	JAMMU & KASHMIR	48,709	36,611	12,171
34	LADAKH	1,373	1,081	536
35	LAKSHADWEEP	-	-	-
36	PUDUCHERRY	14,942	15,632	6,759
SUB-TOTAL (UTS):		1,01,331	1,34,779	81,512
GRAND TOTAL:		1.14 CRORE	89.62 LAKH	52.88 LAKH

**Table 1.2 | Houses sanctioned, grounded for construction and completed/delivered under PMAY-U as on 06.12.2021, state/UT-wise**

Source: Starred Question No. 230, Lok Sabha, 20 December 2021

## YEAR-WISE PROGRESS

The maximum number of houses are constructed in the financial year 2018–19 (18,16,669) followed by the financial year 2020–21 (14,56,511). Together, these two financial years account for 62 per cent of the total number of houses constructed/delivered since the launch. In Uttar Pradesh, with the maximum number of constructed houses (9,75,064), 96 per cent of the houses are constructed after 2018. In Andhra Pradesh, 54 per cent of the houses were constructed solely in the financial year 2018–19. Maharashtra witnessed the construction of 74 per cent houses between the years 2018 and 2021. For Madhya Pradesh, the financial years of 2018–19 and 2020–21 were significant as 72 per cent of the houses were constructed in these periods.

It should be noted that only 2 per cent of the total houses are constructed in the north eastern states (Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim and Tripura) with Tripura and Assam accounting for 79 per cent of the share. Similar to other states, the data from north eastern states shows that the maximum number of houses were constructed in the financial years of 2018–19 and 2020–21. The UTs accounted for only 1.5 per cent of the total construction (Unstarred Question No. 853, Lok Sabha, 6 December 2021).

SR. NO.	STATE/UT	HOUSES COMPLETED/DELIVERED UNITS						
		F.Y. 2015–16	F.Y. 2016–17	F.Y. 2017–18	F.Y. 2018–19	F.Y. 2019–20	F.Y. 2020–21	F.Y. 2021–22
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	-	-	-	20	-	23	-
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	3,758	3,299	29,791	2,60,223	30,100	97,986	49,933
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	144	-	16	1,308	385	1,363	293
4	ASSAM	103	66	381	13,847	3,953	10,414	3,610
5	BIHAR	1,123	12,184	2,100	37,464	13,229	23,610	817
6	CHANDIGARH	2	4,963	57	154	363	938	63
7	CHHATTISGARH	4,620	3,307	3,561	42,096	35,423	48,545	5,861
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	1	106	431	1,458	1,483	1,527	461
9	DELHI	4,499	4,244	2,487	17,579	6,320	5,832	869

10	GOA	1	10	99	392	425	3,056	113
11	GUJARAT	11,562	28,928	48,726	1,95,638	1,11,871	1,67,857	51,956
12	HARYANA	790	549	2,093	10,535	10,644	18,337	2,478
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	8	43	202	1,858	1,268	1,809	588
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	415	203	179	3,286	1,877	3,795	679
15	JHARKHAND	2,473	3,886	26,421	31,343	12,775	24,073	3,550
16	KARNATAKA	5,111	11,920	31,087	94,920	30,591	66,752	8,999
17	KERALA	1,804	301	3,809	42,691	24,314	24,047	2,648
18	LADAKH	62	-	-	280	28	51	81
19	LAKSHADWEEP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	MADHYA PRADESH	5,460	5,316	39,119	2,19,728	50,505	1,15,216	23,072
21	MAHARASHTRA	21,567	13,621	35,162	1,20,918	1,17,042	1,49,467	53,171
22	MANIPUR	42	24	177	2,231	647	1,660	129
23	MEGHALAYA	130	248	27	450	-	636	78
24	MIZORAM	143	118	188	632	1,832	1,360	93
25	NAGALAND	67	494	89	1,394	276	1,552	1,118
26	ODISHA	1,183	2,771	2,376	46,075	15,413	25,625	3,642
27	PUDUCHERRY	151	79	51	1,899	919	2,820	394
28	PUNJAB	1,947	338	1,860	9,335	12,272	16,588	3,298
29	RAJASTHAN	15,045	4,256	8,204	21,641	28,425	40,701	9,899
30	SIKKIM	-	1	2	61	18	81	12
31	TAMIL NADU	18,807	6,593	34,004	1,57,589	66,089	1,20,719	26,888
32	TELANGANA	95	2,792	3,140	58,171	39,144	87,846	14,600
33	TRIPURA	4	161	7,303	28,663	6,261	10,186	386
34	UTTAR PRADESH	8,462	9,639	12,005	2,97,612	1,65,638	2,99,918	1,72,215
35	UTTARAKHAND	264	1,460	1,986	5,669	5,137	5,548	1,095
36	WEST BENGAL	7,612	7,191	30,765	89,509	45,997	76,573	5,866
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,17,455</b>	<b>1,29,111</b>	<b>3,27,898</b>	<b>18,16,669</b>	<b>8,40,645</b>	<b>14,56,511</b>	<b>4,48,955</b>

**Table 1.3 | Details of houses completed/delivered during the last five years under PMAY-U, 2016-2021, state/UT-wise and year-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 853, Lok Sabha, 6 December 2021

## FUNDING PATTERNS

Data shows that only 56 per cent of the total sanctioned funds have been released out of which 74 per cent of funds have been utilised (Starred Question No. 273, Lok Sabha, 16 December 2021 and Unstarred Question No. 813, Lok Sabha, 2 December 2021). Seven states, Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Gujarat,

Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu account for 72 per cent of the total funds sanctioned by the Centre. 3 per cent of the sanctioned houses belong to north-east states and 1 per cent are sanctioned to UTs. Like previous years, there is no data on Lakshadweep (Starred Question No. 273, Lok Sabha, 16 December 2021).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE (IN INR CRORE)		
		SANCTIONED	RELEASED	UTILISED
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	30,995.85	10,168.41	8402.52
2	BIHAR	5,690.62	2,469.36	1344.6
3	CHHATTISGARH	4,629.79	2,732.01	1990.08
4	GOA	94.71	94.17	47.89
5	GUJARAT	16,300.63	12,161.13	9376.45
6	HARYANA	2,719	1,214.51	704.29
7	HIMACHAL PRADESH	225.73	135.97	81.57
8	JHARKHAND	3,595.15	2,461.86	1573.17
9	KARNATAKA	11,304.59	5,247.75	3981.78
10	KERALA	2,295.94	1,514.37	591.43
11	MADHYA PRADESH	13,975.40	10,088.63	7734.1
12	MAHARASHTRA	22,734.42	11,386.65	8670.08
13	ODISHA	3,227.24	1,634.23	1278
14	PUNJAB	1865.08	1,115.45	701.13
15	RAJASTHAN	3,997.88	2,466.25	1825.66
16	TAMIL NADU	11,486.52	7,632.90	5691.58
17	TELANGANA	4,057.14	2,827.41	2476.73
18	UTTAR PRADESH	27,535.58	17,109.73	12851.3
19	UTTARAKHAND	964.31	575.36	362.53
20	WEST BENGAL	8,835.51	5,282.30	3765.97
SUB-TOTAL (STATES)		1,76,531.95	98,318.45	
21	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	192.64	149.06	113.32
22	ASSAM	2,544.92	982.71	898.69
23	MANIPUR	841.88	338.13	185.66
24	MEGHALAYA	85.43	37.57	6.5
25	MIZORAM	608.27	189.90	116.43
26	NAGALAND	510.94	306.91	40.79
27	SIKKIM	9.83	4.97	1.23
28	TRIPURA	1,477.20	1,029.58	643.72
SUB-TOTAL		4,03,792	2,89,077	
29	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	9.21	1.93	0.44
30	CHANDIGARH	35.34	35.34	17.48
31	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	164.53	142.59	91.71
32	DELHI (NCR)	588.20	588.20	526.9
33	JAMMU & KASHMIR	747.01	325.93	110.28
34	LADAKH	30.61	21.72	0.49
35	LAKSHADWEEP	-	-	
36	PUDUCHERRY	237.92	171.98	104.47
SUB-TOTAL (UTS)		1,812.82	1,287.69	
TOTAL		1.85 LAKH CRORE	1.03 LAKH CRORE	76,308.97 CRORE

**Table 1.4 | Central assistance sanctioned, released and utilised during the last five years under PMAY-U, state/UT-wise and year-wise (Starred Question No. 273, Lok Sabha, 16 December 2021)**

## COMPONENT WISE PROGRESS

The maximum number of houses are being constructed under beneficiary-led construction (BLC) (22,36,780) followed by credit linked subsidy scheme (CLSS) (15,90,624) together accounting for 84 per cent of the total houses constructed under PMAY-U. With this, the in-situ slum redevelopment (ISSR) shares only 5 per cent and affordable housing in partnership (AHP) only 11 per cent of the total constructed houses.

Together, Uttar Pradesh (6,52,984), Tamil Nadu (2,54,759), Madhya Pradesh (2,98,189), Andhra Pradesh (1,71,221) and Karnataka (1,13,897) constitute 67 per cent of the total houses under BLC component. On the other hand, Telangana (1,15,865), Gujarat (1,00,331) and Andhra Pradesh (1,91,607) occupy 79 per cent of total houses under the AHP component.

States like Gujarat (35,339), Maharashtra (26,622), Bihar (19,696) and Karnataka (18,678) have managed to build maximum houses under the ISSR component and states like Andhra Pradesh (1,91,607), Gujarat (1,00,331), Telangana (1,15,865) with a total share of 79 per cent are being fastest with AHP component (Unstarred Question No. 2631, Rajya Sabha, 11 August 2021).

As of now there is no data on how many houses were sanctioned under each of these components, because of which it is difficult to compare the actual number of completed houses with their respective targets. Apart from this, the year-wise data of these four verticals are also not requested and hence is not available.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	NUMBER OF HOUSES CONSTRUCTED				
		BENEFICIARY LED CONSTRUCTION (BLC)	AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN PARTNERSHIP (AHP)	IN-SITU SLUM REDEVELOPMENT (ISSR)	CREDIT LINKED SUBSIDY SCHEME (CLSS)	TOTAL
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	21	-	-	22	43
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	1,71,221	1,91,607	10,309	48,262	4,21,399
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	2,117	-	752	203	3,072
4	ASSAM	24,242	-	907	3,512	28,661
5	BIHAR	54,575	-	19,696	14,316	88,587
6	CHANDIGARH	-	-	4,960	1,515	6,475
7	CHHATTISGARH	90,037	13,672	6,996	22,227	1,32,932
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	308	41	96	4,560	5,005
9	DELHI (NCR)	-	-	11,480	24,982	36,462
10	GOA	2	-	-	3,980	3,982
11	GUJARAT	47,876	1,00,331	35,339	3,69,474	5,53,020
12	HARYANA	8,852	-	1,176	32,130	42,158
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	3,639	-	-	1,572	5,211
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	4,982	-	1,498	2,860	9,340
15	JHARKHAND	80,723	516	4,994	12,265	98,498
16	KARNATAKA	1,13,897	19,506	18,678	83,189	2,35,270
17	KERALA	67,094	240	4,283	23,545	95,162

18	LADAKH	298	-	-	61	359
19	LAKSHADWEEP	-	-	-	-	-
20	MADHYA PRADESH	2,98,189	16,768	9,850	1,05,077	4,29,884
21	MAHARASHTRA	27,267	8,782	26,622	3,73,539	4,36,210
22	MANIPUR	4,442	-	8	289	4,739
23	MEGHALAYA	215	-	356	771	1,342
24	MIZORAM	2,866	-	225	1,039	4,130
25	NAGALAND	2,163	-	1,606	36	3,805
26	ODISHA	76,374	-	6,800	9,086	92,260
27	PUDUCHERRY	3,605	-	78	2,085	5,768
28	PUNJAB	9,585	176	522	30,110	40,393
29	RAJASTHAN	624	5,584	14,112	82,907	1,03,227
30	SIKKIM	20	-	33	110	163
31	TAMIL NADU	2,54,759	42,899	5,927	81,409	3,84,994
32	TELANGANA	-	1,15,865	6,866	68,362	1,91,093
33	TRIPURA	48,519	-	1,856	2,199	52,574
34	UTTAR PRADESH	6,52,984	1,312	16,250	1,14,266	7,84,812
35	UTTARAKHAND	3,490	224	2,288	13,798	19,800
36	WEST BENGAL	1,81,794	-	11,375	56,866	2,50,035
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>22,36,780</b>	<b>5,17,523</b>	<b>2,25,938</b>	<b>15,90,624</b>	<b>45,70,865</b>

**Table 1.5 | Details of houses constructed under different verticals of PMAY-U during the last five years, FY 2016-17 to FY 2020-21, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 2631, Rajya Sabha, 11 August 2021

## CREDIT LINKED SUBSIDY SCHEME

Together, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat and Uttar Pradesh received 40 per cent of the total central funds sanctioned. Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra shared 67 per cent of the total interest subsidy disbursed to beneficiaries under CLSS. 60 per cent of the beneficiaries under CLSS belong to the states of Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh.

Till February 2021, the maximum number of applications are filed by the lower income group (LIG)—4,36,515, followed by the middle income group (MIG)—2,96,687 and economically weaker section (EWS)—1,96,580, whereas the maximum loan amount is sanctioned to MIG (92,897.91 INR crore) followed by LIG ( 67,021.87 INR crore) and EWS (17,241.96 INR crore) (Unstarred Question No.1723, Lok Sabha, 11 February 2021).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE RELEASED TO STATES/UTS FOR BENEFICIARIES OTHER THAN CLSS (IN INR CRORE)	INTEREST SUBSIDY DISBURSED TO BENEFICIARIES UNDER CLSS (IN INR CRORE)	TOTAL FUNDS RELEASED/DISBURSED TO BENEFICIARIES (INR CRORE)
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0.43	0.03	0.46
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	6,995.81	468.97	7,464.78
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	53.17	0.72	53.89
4	ASSAM	833.23	21.72	854.95
5	BIHAR	1,443.68	145.70	1,589.38
6	CHANDIGARH	10.04	10.04	20.08
7	CHHATTISGARH	1,652.25	210.18	1,862.43
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	89.13	64.23	153.36
9	DELHI	413.62	413.62	827.24
10	GOA	18.40	18.04	36.44
11	GUJARAT	6,600.25	5,483.17	12,083.42
12	HARYANA	736.26	379.76	1,116.02
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	69.83	13.21	83.04
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	169.14	12.90	182.04
15	JHARKHAND	1,397.09	115.02	1,512.11
16	KARNATAKA	3,004.39	886.83	3,891.22
17	KERALA	1,111.81	219.77	1,331.58
18	LADAKH	10.95	0.43	11.38
19	LAKSHADWEEP	-	-	-
20	MADHYA PRADESH	5,961.18	1,081.38	7,042.56
21	MAHARASHTRA	5,893.50	5,461.53	11,355.03
22	MANIPUR	212.99	1.96	214.95
23	MEGHALAYA	5.82	1.60	7.42
24	MIZORAM	101.58	15.77	117.35
25	NAGALAND	89.50	0.37	89.87
26	ODISHA	874.50	72.12	946.62
27	PUDUCHERRY	106.88	10.62	117.50
28	PUNJAB	433.04	335.73	768.77
29	RAJASTHAN	1,091.01	926.09	2,017.10
30	SIKKIM	3.40	0.54	3.94
31	TAMIL NADU	4,405.42	820.47	5,225.89
32	TELANGANA	1,424.43	702.37	2,126.80
33	TRIPURA	475.53	15.26	490.79
34	UTTAR PRADESH	10,161.99	1,359.98	11,521.97
35	UTTARAKHAND	261.40	146.35	407.75
36	WEST BENGAL	2,945.01	606.20	3,551.21
TOTAL		59,056.67	20,022.68	79,079.35

**Table 1.6 | Central assistance/subsidy released under PMAY-U CLSS during 2017-20, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No.1723, Lok Sabha, 11 February 2021

## AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING COMPLEXES

Launched in 2020, the Scheme for Affordable Rental Housing Complexes (ARHCs), a sub-scheme under Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Urban (PMAY–U) was launched for providing accommodation at an affordable rent to urban migrants/poor near their workplace. Private players are being encouraged to participate in the scheme. The scheme is being implemented through two models, i.e., Model-1: Utilising existing government funded vacant houses to convert into ARHCs through public-private partnerships (PPP) or by public agencies, and Model-2: Construction, operation and maintenance of ARHCs by public/private entities on their own available vacant land. Projects under ARHCs will be applicable for consideration and funding till the PMAY–U Mission period, i.e., March 2022.

Beneficiaries for ARHCs belong to EWS/LIG who

are urban migrants/poor. They include labour, urban poor (street vendors, rickshaw pullers, other service providers, etc.), industrial workers, and migrants working with market/trade associations, educational/health institutions, hospitality sector, long-term tourists/visitors, students, or any other persons of such category.

The target of Model 1 was to utilise 75,000 existing government-funded vacant houses in cities by converting them into ARHCs for a period of 25 years under repair/ retrofit, develop, operate and transfer on a public-private partnership model. As of December 2021, only 4,444 houses have been converted into ARHCs and allotted to the beneficiaries. Model 1 has only been implemented in Gujarat (1,769), Rajasthan (480) and Chandigarh (2,195) (Unstarred Question No. 720, Lok Sabha, 02 December 2021).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	CITY	NO. OF VACANT HOUSES CONVERTED INTO ARHCS	NO. OF BENEFICIARIES ALLOTTED
1	CHANDIGARH	CHANDIGARH	2,195	2,195
2	GUJARAT	SURAT	393	393
3	GUJARAT	AHMEDABAD	1,376	1,376
4	RAJASTHAN	CHITTORGARH	480	480
TOTAL			4,444	4,444

**Table 1.7 | Details of existing government funded vacant houses converted into ARHCs for the beneficiaries under Model 1 of the Scheme as of 02.12.2021, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 720, Lok Sabha, 2 December 2021

Under Model 2, the target was to incentivise private/public entities to construct, operate and maintain ARHCs on their own vacant land. New construction of 40,000 single/double bedroom houses and 1,80,000 dormitory beds are targeted to be operationalised using innovative and alternate technologies. As of December 2021, the

model has been implemented in Tamil Nadu (58,386), Uttar Pradesh (1,112), Chhattisgarh (2,222), Assam (2,222), Gujarat (453), and Telangana (14,490). The information regarding the construction and design is not available (Unstarred Question No. 720, Lok Sabha, 2 December 2021).

S. NO.	CITY/STATE	NAME OF ENTITY	TOTAL UNITS
1	SRIPERUMBUDUR, TAMIL NADU	SPR CITY ESTATES PVT. LTD.	18,112
2	SRIPERUMBUDUR, TAMIL NADU	SPR CONSTRUCTION PVT. LTD.	3,969
3	HOSUR, TAMIL NADU	TATA ELECTRONIC PVT. LTD.	11,500
4	CHENNAI, TAMIL NADU	STATE INDUSTRIES PROMOTION CORPORATION OF TAMIL NADU	18,720
5	CHENNAI, TAMIL NADU	CHENNAI PETROLEUM CORPORATION LTD.	1,040
6	RAIPUR, CHHATTISGARH	INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD.	2,222
7	KAMPUR TOWN, ASSAM	GUWAHATI REFINERY INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD.	2,222
8	PRAYAGRAJ, UTTAR PRADESH	INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD.	1,112
9	SURAT, GUJARAT	MITSUMI HOUSING PVT. LTD.	453
10	CHENNAI, TAMIL NADU	SPR CONSTRUCTION PVT.LTD.	5,045
11	NIZAMPET, TELANGANA	SIVANI INFRA PVT.LTD.	14,490
TOTAL			78,885

**Table 1.8 | Details of ARHC units sanctioned for construction by public/private entities under Model 2 of the Scheme as of 02.12.2021, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 720, Lok Sabha, 2 December 2021

## URBAN POOR

As per the data available till 18.03.2021, Andhra Pradesh (19,89,652), Uttar Pradesh (16,80,356), Maharashtra (9,92,613), Madhya Pradesh (7,77,146), Tamil Nadu (6,39,602) and Karnataka (6,07,524) together account for 50 per cent of the houses sanctioned for EWS beneficiaries (Unstarred Question No. 3886, Lok Sabha, 18 March 2021).

Moreover, around 26 lakh houses have been sanctioned for the beneficiaries belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes categories (till 10 March 2021). Of this, nearly 10.14 lakh houses have been completed.

However, this particular data was not provided with year-wise and state-wise classification (Unstarred Question No. 1843, Rajya Sabha, 10 March 2021)

On the question of the provision of reservation in accommodation for specially-abled people in the construction of the house by government and non-governmental organisations (NGO), the Ministry replied that PMAY-U gives preference to specially-abled people in allotment of houses but the question on its data and details was dodged by the Ministry (Unstarred Question No. 1038, Rajya Sabha, 10 February 2021).

## DATA NOT MAINTAINED BY THE MINISTRY

This year, many questions were raised on the multiple forced evictions and demolition cases of informal settlements across cities. A question asked by Member of Parliament (MP) Sanjay Singh states that as per the report documented by Housing and Land Rights Network at least 83 incidents of forced evictions and home demolitions, affecting over 54,000 people in 22 states and UTs, were observed under central and state governments across urban and rural India during the lockdown imposed for the COVID-19 pandemic (Starred

Question No. 23, Rajya Sabha, 3 February 2021).

To this question, the Ministry replied that the data relating to evictions and demolitions are not maintained by them. The general response of the Ministry is that land and colonisation are State subjects as schemes related to slums are implemented by States/UTs. On the questions related to rehabilitation of evicted settlements, the only response that the Ministry could give was the data on houses sanctioned and constructed under the PMAY scheme.

A question on basic civic amenities for the urban poor in the country received a response that PMAY-U from the past six years has been assisting the states/UTs by providing all-weather pucca houses with basic civic amenities to the urban poor including slum dwellers of the urban areas in the country. Moreover, the Ministry accepted that it does not have allocated funds to provide civic amenities in the slums and for the development of

slums, and also it has no plans to conduct any survey regarding slums in the urban areas and to detect them by adopting remote sensing and geographical information systems (Unstarred Question No. 1776, Lok Sabha, 29 July 2021).

## CONCLUSION

---

2022, which is set as the deadline to achieve the goal of the scheme is here. However, there are still considerable gaps in implementation and targets achieved. Although states have sanctioned more than the targeted/estimated number of houses, only 47 per cent of the total sanctioned houses have been completed/delivered in the last six years. The delayed release of sanctioned funds can also be attributed to the slow progress in achieving the goal set for this year. While in 2019, only 40 per cent of funds had been released under the scheme, this has only increased by 16 per cent in 2022. Given this, even the fund utilisation rate remains low for consecutive years.

While ARHC was a promising sub-scheme to tackle the issue of affordable rental housing for migrants and EWS, the scheme is yet to reach its full potential. The progress has been abysmal in meeting the targets through both the models of the scheme. The timely sanctioning of funds, faster completion rates and better absorption capacities of states is pertinent to meeting the goals of PMAY-U without any more delays. The plight of marginalised communities who have faced frequent forced evictions and demolition of informal settlements also cannot be overlooked while discussing the overall goals of the scheme.

## CHAPTER 2

# ATAL MISSION FOR REJUVENATION AND URBAN TRANSFORMATION

---

Launched by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) in 2015, the aim of Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT) was to provide basic services (e.g. water supply, sewerage, urban transport) to households and build amenities in cities which will improve the quality of life for all, especially the poor and the disadvantaged. After completing five years in 2020, AMRUT 2.0 was launched on 1 October 2021 for the next five years, i.e., from the financial year 2021–22 to 2025–26, to provide universal coverage of water supply to all households through functional taps in all statutory towns in the country and coverage of sewerage/septage management in 500 cities covered in the first phase of the AMRUT scheme. Making the cities 'water secure' and thereby enhancing the ease of living of citizens is a major objective of the Mission.

AMRUT 2.0 aims to promote the circular economy of water through the development of the City Water Balance Plan (CWBP) for each city, focusing on recycling/reuse of treated sewage, rejuvenation of water bodies, and water conservation. Based on the projects identified in CWBP, the Mission envisages making cities 'water secure' through a circular economy of water. The Mission also has a reform agenda on ease of living of citizens through reduction of non-revenue water, recycling of treated used water, rejuvenation of water bodies, augmenting double-entry accounting

systems, urban planning, strengthening urban finance, etc (Unstarred Question No. 3159, Lok Sabha, 16 December 2021).

The targets of AMRUT 2.0 are:

- (i). Universal coverage of water supply from 500 cities to about 4,800 statutory towns.
- (ii). Focus on making the cities 'self-reliant' and 'water secure'.
- (iii). Universal coverage of sewerage and septage management in 500 AMRUT cities.
- (iv). Target to provide 2.68 crore drinking water tap connections and 2.64 crore sewer connections.
- (v). Focus on the financial sustainability of urban local bodies (ULBs) through enhanced credit worthiness and market borrowing.
- (vi). 'Pey Jal Survekshan' will be undertaken in cities to promote healthy competition among them and function as a monitoring tool and Mission accelerator.
- (vii). Technology sub-Mission under AMRUT 2.0 will help in identifying proven and potential global technologies in the water sector.
- (viii). Entrepreneurship/start-ups involved in low-cost indigenous equipment and processes will be encouraged.

## FUNDING PATTERNS

---

The funds released under AMRUT have increased each year from 2018 to 2021, but showed a sharp downfall in 2021–22, with a fall by 80 per cent from the previous year. However, the funds utilised under AMRUT have been declining repeatedly since 2018. In 2018–19, 98.4 per cent of the funds were utilised, whereas in 2019–20 and 2020–21 the fund utilisation rate has been 84 per cent and 48 per cent, respectively. As on 5 August

2021, no utilisation certificate has been received by the Centre in 2021–22 from any of the states/UTs. The only states that could receive funds above INR 10 crores are Karnataka, Punjab, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, and Uttar Pradesh, amounting to 99.5 per cent of the total funds released across all states/UTs (Starred Question No. 256, Lok Sabha, 5 August 2021).

S. NO.	STATES/UTS	F.Y. 2018-19		F.Y. 2019-20		F.Y. 2020-21		F.Y. 2021-22	
		RELEASE (INR CRORE)	UCS* (INR CRORE)	RELEASE (INR CRORE)	UCS* (INR CRORE)	RELEASE (INR CRORE)	UCS* (INR CRORE)	RELEASE (INR CRORE)	UCS* (INR CRORE)
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0.81	0.81	4.31	4.31	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	166.87	130.47	286.57	18.78	9.31	9.31	0.00	0.00
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	11.47	11.47	19.70	19.70	1.28	1.22	0.03	0.00
4	ASSAM	3.93	2.82	16.52	9.10	6.35	1.80	0.15	0.00
5	BIHAR	158.81	144.20	9.67	0.00	685.93	0.00	0.00	0.00
6	CHANDIGARH	16.79	16.13	26.32	16.48	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00
7	CHHATTISGARH	233.37	233.37	179.33	179.33	433.65	15.68	0.29	0.00
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	0.76	0.76	4.27	4.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9	DAMAN & DIU	1.69	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	DELHI	0.00	0.00	151.55	106.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	GOA	0.89	0.00	0.82	0.82	0.27	0.00	0.01	0.00
12	GUJARAT	194.27	188.76	1,127.17	1,116.69	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00
13	HARYANA	9.44	2.96	316.72	301.93	166.12	152.27	0.00	0.00
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	32.41	32.41	67.31	60.11	58.73	1.53	0.05	0.00
15	JAMMU & KASHMIR	11.32	7.12	167.30	55.05	0.82	0.01	0.25	0.00
16	JHARKHAND	94.55	94.55	153.86	95.26	110.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
17	KARNATAKA	602.54	618.69	768.98	783.34	299.24	253.40	125.93	0.00
18	KERALA	31.38	22.38	219.01	203.57	399.52	148.32	1.79	0.00
19	LAKSHADWEEP	0.00	0.00	1.11	0.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
20	MADHYA PRADESH	1,062.17	1,062.17	991.61	822.22	29.96	26.98	0.88	0.00
21	MAHARASHTRA	926.59	926.59	75.16	48.83	1,245.01	401.71	0.00	0.00
22	MANIPUR	63.75	63.75	1.46	0.40	66.43	20.14	0.04	0.00
23	MEGHALAYA	0.70	0.70	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.00
24	MIZORAM	50.65	50.65	2.60	1.00	46.45	1.13	0.03	0.00
25	NAGALAND	9.51	9.51	12.71	12.71	2.21	1.27	0.00	0.00
26	ODISHA	99.88	88.85	342.82	307.92	13.09	6.54	0.00	0.00
27	PUDUCHERRY	1.71	1.71	14.45	13.39	11.36	8.05	0.09	0.00
28	PUNJAB	120.13	120.13	30.42	9.01	125.51	111.89	281.02	0.00
29	RAJASTHAN	479.12	473.13	160.43	42.59	603.28	547.78	0.00	0.00
30	SIKKIM	0.00	0.00	6.31	5.40	0.37	0.00	0.03	0.00
31	TAMIL NADU	794.29	794.29	456.96	456.96	303.54	152.89	799.18	0.00
32	TELANGANA	178.81	178.81	195.77	164.94	361.39	92.02	0.35	0.00
33	TRIPURA	1.05	1.06	1.04	1.04	27.59	36.53	26.21	0.00

34	UTTAR PRADESH	292.75	285.07	279.22	279.22	1,034.29	828.90	33.14	0.00
35	UTTARAKHAND	42.74	42.74	126.59	83.47	113.71	83.07	0.20	0.00
36	WEST BENGAL	474.78	470.17	164.36	123.55	264.33	182.01	1.41	0.00
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>6,169.91</b>	<b>6,076.23</b>	<b>6,383.01</b>	<b>5,349.19</b>	<b>6,420.89</b>	<b>3,084.45</b>	<b>1,271.09</b>	<b>0</b>

**Table 2.1 | : Funds released and utilised during the last three years and current year under AMRUT Missions***Source: Starred Question No. 256, Lok Sabha, 5 August 2021*

## PHYSICAL PROGRESS

740 water supply projects worth INR 11,531 crore have been completed under AMRUT, of which Kerala and Odisha have completed 115 and 119 projects, respectively. Most contracts have been awarded to Uttar Pradesh (89 contracts) and Kerala (55 contracts) with utilisation of INR 3,494.14 and 676.98 crore,

respectively. Together, Uttar Pradesh and Gujarat have a total of 301 water supply projects in hand for INR 5,862 crore, while Kerala and Odisha with 300 projects share only INR 2,647 crore (Unstarred Question No. 1710, Lok Sabha, 29 July 2021).

S. NO.	STATE-WISE STATUS OF WATER SUPPLY PROJECTS GROUNDED UNDER AMRUT ( IN INR CRORE)						
	STATE	WORK COMPLETED		CONTRACT AWARDED		TOTAL	
		NOS.	AMOUNT	NOS.	AMOUNT	NOS.	AMOUNT
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	62	5.49	6	1.12	68	6.61
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	25	560.92	48	1,758.85	73	2,319.77
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	-	-	4	33.12	4	33.12
4	ASSAM	-	-	4	609.73	4	609.73
5	BIHAR	6	241.24	30	1,944.83	36	2,186.07
6	CHANDIGARH	6	34.38	1	1.49	7	35.87
7	CHHATTISGARH	23	469.47	47	1,392.39	70	1,861.86
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	180	866	913	303	2,262	
9	DELHI	6	135.29	3	127.17	9	262.46
10	GOA	1	0.26	-	-	1	0.26
11	GUJARAT	96	1,009.78	37	724.55	133	1,734.33
12	HARYANA	27	403.46	13	366.73	40	770.19
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	19	56.33	6	26.97	25	83.3
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	3	26.44	8	31.71	11	58.15
15	JHARKHAND	5	171.95	10	1,162.23	15	1,334.18
16	KARNATAKA	23	546.64	20	1,671.33	43	2,217.97
17	KERALA	115	434.19	55	676.98	170	1,111.17
18	LAKSHADWEEP	3	2.34	-	-	3	2.34
19	MADHYA PRADESH	23	1,205.8	9	1,035.42	32	2,241.22
20	MAHARASHTRA	13	696.09	25	3,717.4	38	4,413.49
21	MANIPUR	-	-	3	207.37	3	207.37
22	MEGHALAYA	-	-	5	22.7	5	22.7
23	MIZORAM	2	19.56	1	32.12	3	51.68
24	NAGALAND	1	4	1	4	2	8
25	ODISHA	119	1,240.46	11	295.11	130	1,535.57
26	PUDUCHERRY	1	12.05	2	19.32	3	31.37

27	PUNJAB	6	109.4	48	1,138.36	54	1,247.76
28	RAJASTHAN	7	156.16	24	866.31	31	1,022.47
29	SIKKIM	-	-	2	5	2	5
30	TAMIL NADU	7	1,305.62	11	5,667.14	18	6,972.76
31	TELANGANA	25	887.77	2	536.32	27	1,424.09
32	TRIPURA	-	-	6	145.19	6	145.19
33	UTTAR PRADESH	79	634.01	89	3,494.14	168	4,128.15
34	UTTARAKHAND	19	56.92	28	298.31	47	355.23
35	WEST BENGAL	18	1,104.47	26	2,265.26	44	3,369.73
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>740</b>	<b>11,530.49</b>	<b>586</b>	<b>30,319.95</b>	<b>1,326</b>	<b>41,850.44</b>

**Table 2.2 | Status of water supply grounded under AMRUT, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1710, Lok Sabha, 29 July 2021

## WATER AND SEWER CONNECTIONS PROVIDED THROUGH AMRUT AND CONVERGENCE

Under the scheme, the top five states that were able to provide water connections are West Bengal, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, and Uttar Pradesh, sharing 41 per cent of total water connections across states/UTs in India. West Bengal (16,76,021) has the highest number of connections, double the water

connections in Madhya Pradesh (8,74,699) which has the second-highest number. In terms of household sewer connections, Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu alone share 38 per cent of the total sewer connections across all the states/UTs (Unstarred Question No. 1710, Lok Sabha, 29 July 2021).

STATE-WISE STATUS OF WATER AND SEWER CONNECTIONS PROVIDED THROUGH AMRUT AND CONVERGENCE			
S. NO.	STATE/UT	HOUSEHOLD WATER TAP CONNECTIONS	HOUSEHOLD SEWER CONNECTIONS INCLUDING HOUSEHOLDS COVERED UNDER SEPTAGE MANAGEMENT
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	3,83,779	2,17,760
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	750	16,302
3	ASSAM	64,775	3,253
4	BIHAR	5,58,215	13,901
5	CHHATTISGARH	2,92,634	2,37,658
6	GOA	150	352
7	GUJARAT	5,83,333	7,08,596
8	HARYANA	3,67,878	3,06,194
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	17,773	83,534
10	JHARKHAND	2,39,811	13,000
11	KARNATAKA	7,80,509	6,70,960
12	KERALA	2,31,780	92,142
13	MADHYA PRADESH	8,74,699	2,03,150
14	MAHARASHTRA	8,20,234	3,16,841
15	MANIPUR	28,947	4,000
16	MEGHALAYA	183	31,000
17	MIZORAM	56,535	51,911

18	NAGALAND	3,755	2,795
19	ODISHA	1,89,360	3,80,774
20	PUNJAB	2,23,853	1,96,017
21	RAJASTHAN	6,86,704	3,24,818
22	SIKKIM	3,907	17,400
23	TAMIL NADU	8,26,268	14,82,449
24	TELANGANA	5,33,850	86,638
25	TRIPURA	43,137	18,143
26	UTTAR PRADESH	8,37,332	18,41,547
27	UTTARAKHAND	68,458	67,219
28	WEST BENGAL	16,76,021	1,42,610
29	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	7,198	8,212
30	CHANDIGARH	1,77,394	1,77,334
31	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	21,458	25,071
32	DAMAN & DIU	7,000	4,134
33	DELHI	7,53,791	6,33,060
34	JAMMU & KASHMIR	25,932	2,69,059
35	LADAKH	1,620	8,502
36	LAKSHADWEEP	-	-
37	PUDUCHERRY	2,925	5,660
TOTAL		1,13,91,947	86,61,996

**Table 2.3 | Status of water and sewer connections provided through AMRUT and convergence, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1710, Lok Sabha, 29 July 2021

## SEWERAGE AND SEPTAGE MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

The top 3 states engaged in sewerage and septage management projects are Uttar Pradesh (160), Kerala (125) and Gujarat (98), sharing 45 per cent of the total projects across all the states/UTs. However, Kerala sets the example of fund utilisation as the projects are amounting to just INR 410 crores while the states Uttar

Pradesh and Gujarat spend INR 6,978.4 and 2,949.6 crores respectively. Kerala has completed 84 projects out of the total of 125 projects awarded to it, while Uttar Pradesh could finish only 31 out of 160 and Gujarat had completed 51 out of 98 (Unstarred Question No. 1710, Lok Sabha, 29 July 2021).

STATE-WISE STATUS OF SEWERAGE & SEPTAGE MANAGEMENT PROJECTS GROUNDED UNDER AMRUT ( IN INR CRORE)							
S. NO.	STATE	WORK COMPLETED		CONTRACT AWARDED		TOTAL	
		NOS.	AMOUNT	NOS.	AMOUNT	NOS.	AMOUNT
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	4	39.08	36	551.7	40	590.78
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	-	-	2	53.5	2	53.5
3	CHANDIGARH	2	20.2	-	-	2	20.2
4	CHHATTISGARH	21	8.37	9	397.77	30	406.14
5	DAMAN & DIU	1	6.96	1	15	2	21.96
6	DELHI	1	53	4	246.56	5	299.56
7	GOA	-	-	2	9.77	2	9.77
8	GUJARAT	51	1,614.22	47	1,335.46	98	2,949.68
9	HARYANA	30	391.92	14	1,263.31	44	1,655.23
10	HIMACHAL PRADESH	10	36.53	4	63.18	14	99.71

11	JAMMU & KASHMIR	12	97.65	5	44.29	17	141.94
12	JHARKHAND	1	12.7	8	238.8	9	251.5
13	KARNATAKA	38	1,744.22	12	750.82	50	2,495.04
14	KERALA	84	25.85	41	384.41	125	410.26
15	MADHYA PRADESH	11	1,305.66	13	2,327.4	24	3,633.06
16	MAHARASHTRA	1	28.79	28	3,110.19	29	3,138.98
17	MEGHALAYA	-	-	2	57.13	2	57.13
18	MIZORAM	1	4.06	2	9.67	3	13.73
19	NAGALAND	-	-	2	8	2	8
20	ODISHA	13	138.21	-	-	13	138.21
21	PUDUCHERRY	6	5.99	3	5.44	9	11.43
22	PUNJAB	4	135.5	64	1,435.44	68	1,570.94
23	RAJASTHAN	9	544.45	24	1,751.88	33	2,296.33
24	TAMIL NADU	5	893.68	13	4,591.52	18	5,485.2
25	TELANGANA	4	203.3	-	-	4	203.3
26	TRIPURA	-	-	1	11.42	1	11.42
27	UTTAR PRADESH	31	853.63	129	6,124.78	160	6,978.41
28	UTTARAKHAND	29	79.52	15	108.58	44	188.1
29	WEST BENGAL	1	15	2	177.5	3	192.5
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>370</b>	<b>8,258.49</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>25,073.52</b>	<b>853</b>	<b>33,332.01</b>

**Table 2.4 | Status of sewerage and septage management projects grounded under AMRUT, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 1710, Lok Sabha, 29 July 2021

The Ministry dodged the question of whether the Government has assessed the performance of AMRUT phase-I and, if so, the outcome of the assessment and

achievement made and denied if there is any consistent underutilisation of funds allocated to AMRUT (Unstarred Question No. 1026, Rajya Sabha, 28 July 2021).

## CONCLUSION

Revitalising AMRUT with AMRUT 2.0 is a step forward in creating water-secure cities and achieving the Sustainable Development Goals 2030. However, it is difficult to assess the gaps in the implementation of the scheme with the lack of data on the performance of the first phase. Through the assessment of the funding pattern, it is apparent that the utilisation rate has progressively decreased from 2018 with no utilisation report for the period 2021–2022. This points to an urgent need to study these gaps in implementation and the cause of under utilisation of funds allocated for the scheme.

The impact of climate change is becoming more dire annually. With increasing global temperatures and natural calamities, we are likely to see more instances of floods, droughts, and epidemics. In this context, schemes like AMRUT 2.0 could play a role to build resilience, especially among vulnerable communities. To create access to water supply and sewerage systems in our rapidly urbanising country, there needs to be increased public participation, convergence among different urban development schemes and effective implementation on the ground.

## CHAPTER 3

# SWACHH BHARAT MISSION-URBAN

## BACKGROUND

Swachh Bharat Mission–Urban (SBM–U) was launched in 2014 by the National Democratic Alliance (NDA) government with the aim to achieve Clean India by 2019, paying tribute to Mahatma Gandhi on his 150th birth anniversary in 2019. SBM–U had three major objectives: (a) achieving 100 per cent open defecation free (ODF) status, (b) ensuring 100 per cent scientific solid waste management (SWM), and (c) behavior change through ‘Jan Andolan’, by 2 October 2019, in all statutory towns.

The Government of India launched SBM–U 2.0 on 1 October 2021, with the total outlay of INR 1,41,600 crore, including the Central share of INR 36,465 crore, which is nearly 2.5 times the allocation of 14,623 crores out of total outlay of 62,009 crores under SBM–U launched in 2014. It primarily aims to create garbage-free cities and water security during the period of 5 years from 2021–26 (Unstarred Question No. 1677, Rajya Sabha, 13 December 2021).

The salient features of SBM–U 2.0 are:

1. All household and premises segregate their waste

into ‘wet waste’ (from kitchen and gardens) and ‘dry waste’ (including paper, glass, plastic, and domestic hazardous waste and sanitary waste wrapped separately)

2. 100 per cent door-to-door collection of segregated waste from each household/premise
3. 100 per cent scientific management of all fractions of waste, including safe disposal in scientific landfills
4. All legacy dumpsites remediated
5. All used water including fecal sludge, is safely contained, transported, processed and disposed of so that no untreated fecal sludge and used water pollutes the ground or water bodies, in cities with less than one lakh population
6. Phased reduction in the use of single-use plastic (Unstarred Question No. 2026, Lok Sabha, 09 December 2021)

S. NO.	DETAILS	MISSION TARGET	COMPLETED
1	INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLD LATRINES, UNITS	58.99 LAKHS	62.64 LAKHS
2	COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC TOILETS, NO. OF SEATS	5.07 LAKHS	6.21 LAKHS
3	OPEN DEFECTION FREE (ODF) STATUS	AS OF NOW, OUT OF 4372 ULBS, 4,371 ULBS HAVE BEEN DECLARED ODF (4,316 CERTIFIED ODF). FURTHER, 3,330 ULBS HAVE BEEN CERTIFIED ODF+ AND 961 ULBS HAVE BEEN CERTIFIED ODF++	
4	MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT	(I) 100 PER CENT DOOR-TO-DOOR COLLECTION IN 86,403 WARDS OUT OF 89,061 WARDS. (II) WASTE PROCESSING ACHIEVED IS 98,324 TONNES PER DAY (III) SEGREGATION OF WASTE AT SOURCE IS PRACTICED IN 77,415 WARDS OUT OF 89,061 WARDS.	

**Table 3.1 | Summary of the project wise completion of SBM–U**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2464, Rajya Sabha, 20 December 2021

The scheme has clearly overachieved its target by building 62.64 lakh individual household latrines (IHHLs) and 6.21 lakh community and public toilets (CTs/PTs) against the target of 58.99 lakh and 5.07 lakh, respectively. In the case of ODF status and SWM, the Ministry presented that it has achieved the mission of making 100 per cent urban local bodies (ULBs) defecation free and 97 per cent wards are successfully engaged in door-to-door waste collection activity with 87 per cent practicing segregation of waste at source.

In addition, the Ministry, reported that the scheme's objectives is to achieve

(a) 100 per cent ODF status and

(b) 100 per cent scientific processing of SWM generated in the country.

To achieve the objectives, the process of assessing the progress of the scheme includes:

- For individual toilets, geo-tagging at various stages of construction
- For CTs/PTs, urinals and solid waste management projects, the use of management information systems (MIS)
- The use of Swachh Survekshan, the annual cleanliness survey that ranks cities on various cleanliness parameters. From 2020, the Swachh Survekshan has become a continuous assessment exercise with quarterly rankings followed by annual rankings.
- Certification protocols (ODF, ODF+, ODF++, star rating protocol for garbage free cities) through independent third party verification, to certify cities' cleanliness on sanitation and solid waste management parameters  
(Unstarred Question No. 2799, Rajya Sabha, 18 March 2020)

S. NO.	STATE/UT	INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLD LATRINES (IN NOS.)			COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC TOILET SEATS (IN NOS.)		
		MISSION TARGET	CONSTRUCTED	IN PROGRESS	MISSION TARGET	CONSTRUCTED	IN PROGRESS
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	1,93,426	2,43,764	5,990	21,464	17,797	906
2	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	336	336	-	126	603	-
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	12,252	9,743	937	387	46	-
4	ASSAM	75,720	73,747	9,208	3,554	3,350	-
5	BIHAR	3,83,079	3,93,613	99,309	26,439	21,728	5,752
6	CHANDIGARH	4,282	6,117	-	976	2,512	-
7	CHHATTISGARH	3,00,000	3,25,050	-	17,796	18,832	-
	GUJARAT	51	1,614.22	47	1,335.46	98	2,949.68
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	30	391.92	14	1,263.31	44	1,655.23
9	DELHI	5,000	725	238	11,138	28,256	5,121
10	GOA	8,020	3,741	3,798	507	847	-
11	GUJARAT	4,06,388	5,60,046	1,574	31,010	24,149	347
12	HARYANA	71,000	66,427	473	10,393	11,374	87
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	11,266	6,687	-	876	1,567	-
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	59,600	51,235	900	3,585	3,329	1,227
15	JHARKHAND	1,61,713	2,18,580	4	12,366	8,732	-
16	KARNATAKA	3,50,000	3,93,278	-	34,839	36,556	1,027
17	KERALA	29,578	37,207	6,152	4,801	2,803	632

18	LADAKH	400	400	-	194	194	-
19	MADHYA PRADESH	5,12,380	5,77,619	75,608	40,230	19,782	4,451
20	MAHARASHTRA	6,29,819	7,11,353	1,438	59,706	1,66,465	674
21	MANIPUR	43,644	37,593	513	620	512	22
22	MEGHALAYA	5,066	1,604	-	362	152	-
23	MIZORAM	16,441	9,724	1,223	491	581	200
24	NAGALAND	23,427	19,847	2,554	478	235	-
25	ODISHA	1,32,509	1,40,401	33	17,800	12,040	152
26	PUDUCHERRY	5,681	5,162	5,015	1,204	836	-
27	PUNJAB	1,02,000	1,03,683	2,800	10,924	11,388	-
28	RAJASTHAN	3,61,753	3,68,008	476	26,364	31,300	-
29	SIKKIM	1,587	1,066	325	142	163	-
30	TAMIL NADU	4,37,543	5,08,562	14,000	59,921	92,744	1,580
31	TELANGANA	1,63,508	1,56,396	6,942	15,543	15,465	28
32	TRIPURA	19,464	20,269	294	586	1,073	50
33	UTTAR PRADESH	8,28,237	8,96,499	45,481	63,451	69,292	214
34	UTTARAKHAND	27,640	23,545	4,095	2,611	4,642	116
35	WEST BENGAL	5,15,000	2,82,542	1,38,463	26,484	5,746	2,237
	TOTAL	58,99,637	62,56,947	4,27,843	5,07,587	6,15,706	24,823
30	TAMIL NADU	4,37,543	5,08,562	14,000	59,921	92,744	1,580
31	TELANGANA	1,63,508	1,56,396	6,942	15,543	15,465	28
32	TRIPURA	19,464	20,269	294	586	1,073	50
33	UTTAR PRADESH	8,28,237	8,96,499	45,481	63,451	69,292	214
34	UTTARAKHAND	27,640	23,545	4,095	2,611	4,642	116
35	WEST BENGAL	5,15,000	2,82,542	1,38,463	26,484	5,746	2,237
	TOTAL	58,99,637	62,56,947	4,27,843	5,07,587	6,15,706	24,823

**Table 3.2 | Targeted, constructed and in progress latrines under IHHL and CT, state/UT-wise***Source: Unstarred Question No. 2599, Rajya Sabha, 11 August 2021*

A total of INR 3757.03 crore and 654.76 crore had been allocated for the construction of IHHL and CTs/PTs, respectively. In case of IHHL, Uttar Pradesh received a maximum of INR 473.28 crore, while in the case of CT Tamil Nadu has received the maximum funds of INR 93.52 crore, followed by Uttar Pradesh receiving 80.02 crore. For SWM, Maharashtra received the maximum funds of INR 1,081.84 crore. Across all states/union territories (UTs), together Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, West

Bengal, Maharashtra, and Madhya Pradesh share 44 per cent of total funds received for IHHL construction. For CT, Bihar, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh, and Karnataka share 59 per cent of the total funds received. Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Gujarat share 51 per cent of the total funds received across all states/UTs (Unstarred Question No. 2864, Lok Sabha, 05 August 2021).

ANNEXURE REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (A) OF LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO.2864 REGARDING 'SWACHH BHARAT MISSION-URBAN' DUE FOR REPLY ON 05.08.2021 (IN INR CRORE)						
S. NO.	STATE	MISSION ALLOCATION (COMPONENT-WISE) UNDER SWACHH BHARAT MISSION-URBAN (IN INR CRORE)				
		IHHL	CT	SWM	IEC	CB
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0.43	0.10	2.50	0.39	0.10
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	184.08	27.95	308.54	40.61	10.15
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	13.40	0.35	7.25	12.22	3.06
4	ASSAM	81.95	2.31	76.76	66.62	16.66
5	BIHAR	191.90	45.27	259.96	47.64	11.91
6	CHANDIGARH	2.45	0.53	22.24	2.24	0.56
7	CHHATTISGARH	140.76	34.40	131.53	40.93	10.23
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	1.20	0.17	2.27	0.39	0.10
9	DAMAN & DIU	0.29	0.06	1.57	0.53	0.13
10	DELHI	50.16	5.15	263.68	24.61	6.15
11	GOA	3.21	0.48	9.29	3.29	0.82
12	GUJARAT	162.56	32.22	536.22	82.52	20.63
13	HARYANA	56.67	10.61	181.80	30.40	7.60
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	14.02	0.90	15.22	11.05	2.76
15	JAMMU & KASHMIR	71.84	2.58	47.59	14.74	3.68
16	LADAKH	30.79	1.11	20.40	6.32	1.58
17	JHARKHAND	92.41	21.08	122.68	18.03	4.51
18	KARNATAKA	158.35	44.31	512.52	84.62	21.16
19	KERALA	70.62	1.53	121.35	21.19	5.30
20	MADHYA PRADESH	292.79	65.42	434.01	102.26	25.56
21	MAHARASHTRA	359.90	57.57	1,081.84	142.79	35.70
22	MANIPUR	47.46	0.28	14.72	16.51	4.13
23	MEGHALAYA	5.82	0.16	8.69	7.56	1.89
24	MIZORAM	18.08	0.08	13.22	14.11	3.53
25	NAGALAND	26.59	0.19	11.69	12.02	3.00
26	ODISHA	161.33	33.82	138.05	31.06	7.76
27	PUDUCHERRY	6.78	1.57	17.30	2.63	0.66
28	PUNJAB	78.66	8.45	220.97	44.75	11.19
29	RAJASTHAN	225.01	35.73	363.46	65.01	16.25
30	SIKKIM	2.63	0.06	3.42	4.33	1.08
31	TAMIL NADU	184.02	93.52	689.87	186.47	46.62
32	TELANGANA	133.31	20.24	223.43	29.41	7.35
33	TRIPURA	68.65	0.12	15.51	12.87	3.22
34	UTTAR PRADESH	473.28	80.03	940.91	197.41	49.35
35	UTTARAKHAND	30.30	1.59	57.57	18.03	4.51
36	WEST BENGAL	315.33	24.82	487.79	66.72	16.68
TOTAL		3,757.03	654.76	7,365.82	1,462.28	365.57
FLOATING FUND		408.00				
TOTAL		14,013.46				

**Table 3.3| Mission allocation (component-wise) under Swachh Bharat Mission, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 2864, Lok Sabha, 05 August 2021

Note: INR 44.33 crore released to States/Union Territory Administrations from Floating Fund, which is already included in the above releases.

IHHL-Individual Household Latrines; CT/PT-Community/Public Toilet; SWM-Solid Waste Management; IEC&PA-Information, Education and Communication & Public Awareness; CB and A&OE- Capacity Building and Administrative & Office Expenses

## OPEN DEFECATION

Besides releasing the Central share of funds to states and UTs, the Government has introduced ODF+, ODF++ and Water+ protocols to impart further impetus to sustain the ODF outcomes. Under these protocols the entire value chain of sanitation is addressed, including access to toilets, cleanliness of CT/PTs, safe management of faecal sludge and waste water to prevent discharge of untreated liquid waste in open land or water bodies (Unstarred

Question No. 1758, Lok Sabha, 29 July 2021). The top performing state is Chattisgarh with 168 ULBs with certified ODF, ODF+ and ODF ++. 295 and 210 wards of Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra respectively have been certified with ODF++. Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu are 2 states with maximum ULBs certified with ODF. However, only 30 (Uttar Pradesh) and 0 (Tamil Nadu) ULBs are certified with ODF++.

S. NO	STATE/UNION TERRITORY	NO. OF URBAN LOCAL BODIES (ULBS) CERTIFIED ODF	NO. OF ULBS CERTIFIED ODF+	NO. OF ULBS CERTIFIED ODF++
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	1	1	1
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	110	102	7
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	21	0	0
4	ASSAM	96	21	0
5	BIHAR	126	18	0
6	CHANDIGARH	1	1	1
7	CHHATTISGARH	168	168	168
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	3	2	0
9	DELHI	5	4	3
10	GOA	14	14	0
11	GUJARAT	171	161	103
12	HARYANA	81	62	14
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	61	23	2
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	80	17	0
15	JHARKHAND	42	41	3
16	KARNATAKA	271	126	2
17	KERALA	93	25	0
18	LADAKH	2	0	0
19	MADHYA PRADESH	383	380	295
20	MAHARASHTRA	391	386	210
21	MANIPUR	27	1	0
22	MEGHALAYA	10	0	0
23	MIZORAM	23	0	0
24	NAGALAND	18	0	0
25	ODISHA	113	51	16
26	PUDUCHERRY	5	3	0
27	PUNJAB	170	166	65
28	RAJASTHAN	192	94	6
29	SIKKIM	7	3	0
30	TAMIL NADU	666	406	0

31	TELANGANA	74	79	7
32	TRIPURA	20	5	0
33	UTTAR PRADESH	666	626	30
34	UTTARAKHAND	99	45	3
35	WEST BENGAL	85	2	0
	TOTAL	4,295	3,033	936

**Table 3.4 | Break-up of ODF, ODF+ and ODF++ certified cities, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1758, Lok Sabha, 29 July 2021

## SWACHH BHARAT MISSION 2.0

Hon'ble Finance Minister, Nirmala Sitharaman, in her Budget Speech in 2020 announced implementation of Swachh Bharat Mission 2.0, with a total financial outlay of INR 1,41,678 crore for 2021–2026, addressing inter-alia, the processing of municipal solid waste, management of construction and demolition waste and bioremediation of all legacy dumpsites (Unstarred Question No. 1682, Lok Sabha, 29 July 2021).

The financial outlay of SBM 2.0, launched on 1 October 2021, includes the estimated cost of implementation of INR 1,41,600 crore with the Government of India share of INR 36,465 crore (nearly 2.5 times the allocation of INR 14,623 crore out of INR 6,20,069 crore under SBM-U in 2014) (Unstarred Question No. 3150, Lok Sabha, 16 December 2021) and balance cost to be contributed by individuals as beneficiary contribution, states/UTs, ULBs and private sector under public-private partnership. Any remaining cost will be generated through various other sources of funds, including corporate social responsibility (CSR) funds from the public/private sector, external assistance, etc (Unstarred Question No. 702, Lok Sabha, 04 December 2021). Many Central/State public sector undertakings and private corporations have contributed funds to achieve the objectives of SBM-U. However, these contributions have not been routed through the Mission. Therefore, no details are available (Unstarred

Question No. 2864, Lok Sabha, 05 August 2021).

The utilisation of funds allocated to the state/UT administrations and the overall progress of the Mission is assessed and evaluated through a national Management Information System (MIS) portal, which captures the physical and financial progress of all states/UTs and cities; utilisation Certificates (UCs) collected from the states/UTs; monthly video conference meetings with states/UTs; personal visits to states/UTs at various levels, etc (Unstarred Question No. 2864, Lok Sabha, 05 August 2021).

31 states/UTs did not utilise any of the funds allocated for SBM-U in 2020–21. Only 4 states, viz. Maharashtra, Assam, Tamil Nadu and Uttarakhand utilised a total of INR 176.69 crore funds over the previous year while 19 states had received a total of INR 968.92 crore over the 2020–21 period. Only 18.32 per cent of the released funds was utilised over 2020–21. The total mission allocation being INR 14,013.46 crore, the funds utilised in 2020–21 contribute only 1.26 per cent of the total funds. The complete breakdown of the state wise distribution of funds for all the projects, including IHHL, CT, SWM, IEC & PA, CB and A&OE, etc, under SBM-U have been explored in Table 3.5

STATE/UT	MISSION ALLOCATION	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19		2019-20		2020-21	
		AMOUNT RELEASED	UC RECEIVED	AMOUNT RELEASED	UC RECEIVED	AMOUNT RELEASED	UC RECEIVED	AMOUNT RELEASED	UC RECEIVED	AMOUNT RELEASED	UC RECEIVED
ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	3.52	0.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.06	0.95	0.95	0.00	0.00
ANDHRA PRADESH	571.33	204.11	204.11	139.70	139.70	52.87	52.87	57.50	7.57	0.00	0.00
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	36.28	5.73	5.73	3.67	3.67	6.46	6.24	0.00	0.00	5.92	0.00
ASSAM	244.3	14.43	14.43	46.55	46.55	55.90	55.90	83.70	33.74	3.34	1.68
BIHAR	556.68	112.70	112.70	52.45	52.45	123.21	123.21	39.87	0.00	0.00	0.00
CHANDIGARH	28.02	2.57	2.57	0.00	0.00	2.08	2.08	18.79	18.79	0.00	0.00
CHHATTISGARH	357.85	84.77	84.77	104.59	104.59	101.83	101.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	4.13	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.13	0.72	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DAMAN & DIU	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61	0.29	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00
DELHI	349.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	53.13	23.86	3.11	0.00	0.00	0.00
GOA	17.09	2.08	2.08	3.56	3.56	0.00	0.00	3.27	1.21	0.00	0.00
GUJARAT	834.15	240.21	240.21	102.42	102.42	279.46	114.55	0.00	0.00	25.31	0.00
HARYANA	287.08	45.09	45.09	42.40	42.40	5.65	5.65	58.47	0.00	4.83	0.00
HIMACHAL PRADESH	43.95	9.95	9.95	0.00	0.00	6.20	6.20	7.63	0.00	0.00	0.00
JAMMU &	43.95	9.95	9.95	0.00	0.00	6.20	6.20	7.63	0.00	0.00	0.00
KASHMIR	140.441	20.30	20.30	7.11	7.11	65.86	24.91	23.23	0.00	0.00	0.00
LADAKH	60.189	0.00		0.00		0.00		39.50		0.00	
JHARKHAND	258.71	98.19	92.12	47.68	9.82	22.56	4.18	1.77	1.77	2.25	0.00
KARNATAKA	820.96	18.12	18.12	78.76	61.35	312.73	269.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
KERALA	219.99	9.45	7.46	0.00	0.00	52.60	23.39	0.96	0.96	0.00	0.00
MADHYA PRADESH	920.04	270.67	270.67	293.87	275.05	0.00	0.00	26.72	18.68	36.45	0.00
MAHARASHTRA	1677.8	95.06	95.06	272.22	272.13	268.68	173.96	286.63	12.23	153.61	153.61
MANIPUR	83.1	2.47	2.47	3.03	3.03	23.24	23.24	8.50	3.76	17.93	0.00
MEGHALAYA	24.12	0.00	0.00	3.25	3.25	0.00	0.00	3.36	2.80	0.00	0.00
MIZORAM	49.02	0.00	0.00	8.91	8.91	0.00	0.00	12.11	9.57	4.48	0.00
NAGALAND	53.49	0.99	0.99	0.00	0.00	17.72	17.72	9.89	9.82	6.27	0.00
ODISHA	372.02	79.03	79.03	0.00	0.00	40.77	40.77	100.45	100.45	22.12	0.00
PUDUCHERRY	28.94	9.52	9.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.58	0.00	5.79	0.00
PUNJAB	364.02	10.46	10.46	126.33	126.33	0.00	0.00	102.57	6.31	0.02	0.00
RAJASTHAN	705.46	303.69	303.69	184.83	184.83	17.10	17.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

SIKKIM	11.52	0.48	0.48	1.08	0.84	0.00	0.00	0.93	0.00	0.00	0.00
TAMIL NADU	1200.5	258.82	258.82	66.05	66.05	374.49	374.49	236.19	236.19	21.08	21.08
TELANGANA	413.74	91.73	91.73	26.80	26.80	19.62	19.62	0.00	0.00	129.64	0.00
TRIPURA	100.37	7.78	7.78	0.00	0.00	11.46	11.46	20.22	10.57	22.54	0.00
UTTAR	100.37	7.78	7.78	0.00	0.00	11.46	11.46	20.22	10.57	22.54	0.00
PRADESH	1740.98	0.00	0.00	592.14	585.00	359.18	280.63	84.01	40.65	485.13	0.00
UTTARAKHAND	112	2.77	2.77	11.73	11.73	20.96	20.66	20.58	10.84	22.23	0.32
WEST BENGAL	911.34	35.92	9.12	145.15	127.81	111.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FLOATING FUND	408.00	INR INR 44.33 CRORE RELEASED TO STATES/UTS, WHICH IS ALREADY INCLUDED IN THE ABOVE RELEASES.									
TOTAL	14,013.46	2,037.36	2,002.22	2,364.49	2,265.52	2,407.23	1,794.72	1,251.57	526.84	968.92	176.69

**Table 3.5 | Allocation/utilisation of funds in INR crore under SBM-U, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1638, Lok Sabha, 29 July 2021

## SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

All the 4,372 ULBs/cities are practicing scientific disposal of Solid Waste Management (SWM) as per the SWM rules, 2016. The details are as under:

TYPE OF SWM ACTIVITY	PRACTISING WARDS	TOTAL WARDS	PERCENTAGE PROGRESS
DOOR TO DOOR COLLECTION OF WASTE	86,228	88,803	97.10
100 PER CENT SOURCE SEGREGATION OF WASTE	72,493	88,803	81.63

**Table 3.6 | Summary of progress in waste collection practices**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2850, Lok Sabha, 05 August 2021

Out of 1,40,980 tonnes per day (TPD) of municipal waste being generated in the country, 68 per cent, i.e., 96,259 TPD is being processed in a scientific manner. An average of 70 per cent of waste generated is processed. The infrastructure for treating the municipal solid waste (MSW) in the country includes the adoption of the practice of door-to-door collection of waste, 100 per cent segregation at the source and scientific processing of the waste. Various methods for scientific processing of waste include the production of compost and electricity from waste, bio-methanisation, material recovery facilities and recycling of construction and demolition waste, etc. (Unstarred Question No. 2850, Lok Sabha, 05 August 2021).

Most of the waste generated is contributed by

Maharashtra, topping the list with 22,401 metric tonnes of waste per day. However, it processes 92 per cent of the waste which is commendable. It is succeeded by Uttar Pradesh, which generates 14,861 metric tonnes per day and processes 78 per cent of it. Of all the states, only Chandigarh, Chhattisgarh, and Himachal Pradesh process 100 per cent of all waste generated, which lies in the range of 300–2,000 metric tonnes per day for each state. Gujarat, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, and Maharashtra process more than 90 per cent of the waste generated. On the other hand, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland and Puducherry process as low as 0–1 per cent of the waste generated. 97 per cent of the wards have 100 per cent door-to-door garbage collection. 30 per cent of the total waste generated is untreated (Unstarred Question No. 1846, Lok Sabha, 09 December 2021).

SL. NO	STATE/UT	MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT			
		WARD WITH 100 PER CENT DOOR TO DOOR COLLECTION (NOS.)	TOTAL WARDS (NOS.)	TOTAL WASTE GENERATION (MT/D)	TOTAL WASTE PROCESSING (IN %)
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	3,477	3,498	6,063	68
2	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	24	24	55	85
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	406	436	201	25
4	ASSAM	845	943	1,054	63
5	BIHAR	3,392	3,405	4,734	18
6	CHANDIGARH	26	26	541	100
7	CHHATTISGARH	3,216	3,216	1,650	100
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	4.13	0.39	0.72	0.00
9	DELHI	292	293	10,823	82
10	GOA	226	226	136	73
11	GUJARAT	1,382	1,385	9,228	93
12	HARYANA	1,588	1,594	5,316	74
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	527	544	326	100
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	867	1,099	949	38
15	JHARKHAND	921	940	1,978	64
16	KARNATAKA	6,649	6,766	6,158	66
17	KERALA	3,101	3,533	2,400	92
18	LADAKH	26	26	13	0
19	MADHYA PRADESH	7,305	7,591	5,906	98
20	MAHARASHTRA	6,421	6,451	22,401	92
21	MANIPUR	175	305	8	16
22	MEGHALAYA	38	123	1	0
23	MIZORAM	194	195	196	1
24	NAGALAND	189	232	119	0
25	ODISHA	2,025	2,025	1,904	70
26	PUDUCHERRY	126	126	275	0
27	PUNJAB	3,127	3,174	4,054	59
28	RAJASTHAN	7,506	7,526	6,741	26
29	SIKKIM	55	55	70	29
30	TAMIL NADU	12,590	12,834	12,464	53
31	TELANGANA	3,594	3,594	10,125	86
32	TRIPURA	332	334	325	54
33	UTTAR PRADESH	11,988	12,358	14,861	78
34	UTTARAKHAND	1,203	1,203	1,553	56
35	WEST BENGAL	2,527	2,938	7,876	10
TOTAL/AVERAGE		86,403	89,061	1,40,557	70

**Table 3.7 | Solid waste management under SBM-U, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1846, Lok Sabha, 09 December 2021

S. NO.	STATE/UT	TOTAL WASTE GENERATION (IN MT/D)	TREATED WASTE (IN MT/D)	UNTREATED WASTE (IN MT/D)
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	55	47	8
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	6,063	4,123	1,940
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	201	50	151
4	ASSAM	1,054	664	390
5	BIHAR	4,734	852	3,882
6	CHANDIGARH	541	541	0
7	CHHATTISGARH	1,650	1,650	0
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	293	10,823	82
9	DELHI	10,823	8,875	1,948
10	GOA	136	99	37
11	GUJARAT	9,228	8,582	646
12	HARYANA	5,316	3,934	1,382
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	326	326	0
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	949	361	588
15	LADAKH	13	0	13
16	JHARKHAND	1,978	1,266	712
17	KARNATAKA	6,158	4,064	2,094
18	KERALA	2,400	2,208	192
19	MADHYA PRADESH	5,906	5,788	118
20	MAHARASHTRA	22,401	20,609	1,792
21	MANIPUR	8	1	7
22	MEGHALAYA	1	0	1
23	MIZORAM	196	2	194
24	NAGALAND	119	0	119
25	ODISHA	1,904	1,333	571
26	PUDUCHERRY	275	0	275
27	PUNJAB	4,054	2,392	1,662
28	RAJASTHAN	6,741	1,753	4,988
29	SIKKIM	70	20	50
30	TAMIL NADU	12,464	6,606	5,858
31	TELANGANA	10,126	8,708	1,418
32	TRIPURA	326	176	150
33	UTTAR PRADESH	14,861	11,592	3,269
34	UTTARAKHAND	1,553	870	683
35	WEST BENGAL	7,876	788	7,088
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,40,557</b>	<b>98,324</b>	<b>42,233</b>

**Table 3.8 | Details of treated and untreated waste in urban areas of the country, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 857, Rajya Sabha, 06 December 2021

## SWACHH SURVEKSHAN

The Government launched Swachh Survekshan-2022 on 27 September 2021. Other than being an annual cleanliness survey, it is a tool to nudge cities to build systems and processes for improved sanitation outcomes. Under Swachh Survekshan-2022, interventions like digital documentation, geo-tagging of facilities, and quick response (QR) code based citizen feedback has been initiated by way of end-to-end use of SBM-U MIS portal 'Swachhatam', use of apps like the Swachhata app and different digital interventions.

Steps taken to create awareness amongst all sections of the society for cleaner cities in Swachh Survekshan-2022, include:

- (i). Citizen-led engagement to clean, maintain and sustain the monuments/parks associated with the freedom movement
- (ii). District ranking to engage the district administration in supporting smaller cities
- (iii). Empowering citizens to validate the cleanliness status of the city through the Swachhata App
- (iv). Digital/QR code-based citizens' feedback to increase outreach with Covid-19 protocols, etc. (Unstarred Question No. 710, Lok Sabha, 02 December 2021)

S. NO.	TOPIC	MARKS
A.	SERVICE LEVEL PROGRESS: (40 PER CENT)	3,000
B.	CITIZENS VOICE (30 PER CENT)	2,250
C.	CERTIFICATION (30 PER CENT)	2,250
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,500</b>

**Table 3.9 | Swachh Survekshan-2022: Criteria**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 710, Lok Sabha, 02 December 2021

## QUESTIONS DODGED

On the questions related to issues like data regarding formal and informal sanitation workers, the Ministry reported that no such data is maintained (Unstarred Question No. 2599, Rajya Sabha, 11 August 2021). According to the Ministry, the Government of India under SBM-U provides Central assistance to create sanitation infrastructure for the construction of IHHL, CT/PT/urinals and SWM facilities, which in turn improves the working condition of sanitation workers, including waste pickers. Sanitation workers and waste pickers are the frontline workers in the defence against the spread of COVID-19 as they take the charge of sanitation and waste management while exposing themselves to disease and infection in the process. However, they continue

to be unrecognised and unprotected, and face a very high risk of not just COVID-19 but also hunger and immense deprivation as their livelihood has significantly been disrupted over the past two years of the pandemic (IGSSS & YUVA, 2021).

While some states like Delhi, Gujarat and Punjab have taken exemplary steps, like the announcement of insurance covers for such workers, the SBM programme fails to bring the situation of such workers into consideration. The pandemic has exposed gaps in SBM-U. It must be revamped (Dasgupta, Agarwal and Tomar, 2020).

## CONCLUSION

---

While SBM-U may have overachieved its targets related to creating physical infrastructure, there is still a long way ahead to achieve ODF in its true sense. Despite the Mission having a segregated fund allocated for measures like IEC and public awareness, there's no clear assessment of the measures used by States in this regard. Long term behavioral change is key to achieve a higher standard of hygiene and sanitation practice in the country, and merely the presence of toilets will not change that.

The Mission also fails to address major challenges related to sanitation workers and manual scavenging. There is an urgent need to restructure the Mission to

address the challenges plaguing it, firstly through i) improved basic shared infrastructure and hygiene, (ii) expanding waste treatment and (iii) protecting sanitation workers (Dasgupta, Agarwal and Tomar, 2020). The pandemic has reiterated the need to have sustainable and safe sanitation infrastructure, especially in informal settlements in urban areas, which forms the first line of defense against an outbreak of disease. The differential risk in terms of rural and urban complexities and between states which are lagging behind in sanitation and hygiene standards should be factored in while making allocation decisions (Khan, 2018).

## CHAPTER 4 SMART CITIES MISSION

---

### BACKGROUND

---

The government of India launched the Smart Cities Mission (SCM) on 25 June 2015 for the development of 100 cities as Smart Cities. 100 cities were selected through a two-stage challenge, at the state and national level for development as Smart Cities. In the first stage of the challenge process, states/union territories (UTs) shortlisted potential Smart Cities following objective criteria. In the second stage, these potential Smart Cities

competed against each other in 4 rounds of competition between January 2016 to June 2018. The objective of SCM is to promote cities that provide core infrastructure and a decent quality of life to its citizens and a clean and sustainable environment with the application of 'Smart Solutions'. The Mission also aims to ensure that all citizens, including women and children, benefit from the urban transformation taking place in the Smart Cities.

### FUNDING PATTERN

---

As per the SCM statement and guidelines, the government of India has allotted INR 48,000 crore for five years at an average of INR 100 crore per city. The state/urban local bodies (ULBs) contribute an equal amount on a matching basis (Unstarred Question No. 1851, Lok Sabha, 09 December 2021). Of the INR 27,359.6 crore released by the government of India, INR 22,467.81 has been utilised. Since its beginning, Smart City Proposals (SCPs) proposed 5,151 projects worth INR 2,05,018 crore.

The implementation, monitoring and evaluation of SCM at the city level has been extended to special purpose vehicles (SPVs). SPVs are allowed to use 5 per cent of the overall funds for Administrative and

Office Expenses (A&OE) which, inter alia, include the appointment of consultants, pilot studies, capacity building and advertisements, if any. Data of expenditure on advertisements by SPVs are not maintained by the Mission. 2 per cent of funds under the Mission are allowed to be spent on A&OE by the Mission Directorate in the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) which monitors the national implementation as well as the fund allocation of the SCM. Since its inception in 2015, the Mission directorate has incurred an expenditure of INR 9 lakh for advertising and publicity. An online geospatial management information system (GMIS) is used to report the progress and expenditure for the proper implementation of SCM.

### FINANCIAL PROGRESS

---

As of November 2021, 6,452 projects worth INR 1,84,998 crore have been tendered, with work orders issued for 5,809 of them worth INR 1,56,571 crore. However, only 3,131 projects worth INR 53,175 crore were effectively completed (Unstarred Question No. 874, Rajya Sabha, 06 December 2021). Therefore, 28.7 per cent of the tendered fund for 48.5 per cent of the projects has been utilised to date. Only 47 per cent of the Smart Cities have been provided the funds for 2021–22 under the SCM, ranging from INR 49–196 crore per city.

Of the promised INR 48,000 crore, only INR 27,359.6 crore has been released by the government of India and INR 22,467.81 utilised to date. 22 of the 100 Smart Cities have utilised 100 per cent of the funds released. A total of 44 Smart Cities have utilised more than 90 per cent of the allocated funds. 15 of the declared Smart Cities have utilised below 50 per cent of the allocated funds. Port Blair has used the least, i.e., 23.21 per cent of the funds released by the government of India.

In the 20 cities that had been selected in the first round, including Pune, Visakhapatnam, Ahmedabad, Jaipur Chennai, etc., 1,910 projects worth INR 58,880 crores, 1,768 worth INR 47,006 crore, i.e., (80 per cent allocated

fund allocation) are completed or under implementation. The period of implementation has been extended up to June 2023 for the Round 1 cities (Unstarred Question No. 82, Rajya Sabha, 29 November 2021)

S.NO.	STATE/UT	AMOUNT IN INR CRORE								
		2015 -16	2016 -17	2017 -18	2018 -19	2019 -20	2020 -21	2021 -22	TOTAL GOI RELEASE	UTILIZA- TION OF GOI FUNDS
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	380.00	106.00	120.00	568.00	302.20	198.50	149.50	1,824.20	1,657.42
2	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0.00	194.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	196.00	45.50
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	2.00	0.00	18.00	98.00	100.00	86.00	0.00	304.00	157.03
4	ASSAM	2.00	189.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	196.00	61.08
5	BIHAR	6.00	63.00	166.00	275.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	510.00	313.45
6	CHANDIGARH	2.00	71.00	123.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	98.00	294.00	274.98
7	CHHATTISGARH	4.00	94.50	135.50	142.00	0.00	98.00	69.00	543.00	464.22
8	DAMAN &	0.00		0.00	110.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	110.00	31.26
9	DIU	0.00	0.00	0.00	110.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	110.00	31.26
10	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	0.00	2.00	0.00	102.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	104.00	39.71
11	DELHI	2.00	194.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	98.00	0.00	294.00	203.63
12	GOA	2.00	0.00	110.20	83.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	196.00	115.83
13	GUJARAT	12.00	388.00	163.00	713.00	300.00	147.00	147.00	1,870.00	1,772.76
	HARYANA	4.00	92.00	119.00	41.00	0.00	166.00	68.00	490.00	422.00
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	2.00	188.00	24.00	40.00	0.00	117.00	68.00	439.00	368.50
15	JHARKHAND	2.00	92.00	102.00	0.00	196.00	98.00	0.00	490.00	395.46
16	JAMMU & KASHMIR	0.00	2.00	36.00	80.00	0.00	136.00	68.00	322.00	228.80
17	KARNATAKA	12.00	388.00	436.00	319.00	223.00	196.00	639.00	2,213.00	1,682.48
18	KERALA	2.00	194.00	18.00	176.00	1.51	0.00	0.00	391.51	350.77
19	LAKSHADWEEP	2.00	0.00	0.00	58.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	60.00	30.25
20	MADHYA PRADESH	386.00	394.00	240.00	339.00	694.00	153.50	55.50	2,262.00	2,168.00
21	MAHARASHTRA	20.00	818.00	558.00	176.00	119.23	294.00	419.77	2,405.00	2,054.14
22	MANIPUR	2.00	0.00	109.00	6.00	79.00	0.00	0.00	196.00	143.86
23	MEGHALAYA	2.00	0.00	0.00	53.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	55.00	22.01
24	MIZORAM	2.00	0.00	0.00	58.00	0.00	68.00	0.00	128.00	50.89
25	NAGALAND	2.00	0.00	109.00	6.00	79.00	0.00	0.00	196.00	191.58
26	ODISHA	192.00	6.00	188.00	6.00	203.93	0.00	49.00	644.93	588.00
27	PUDUCHERRY	2.00	0.00	98.00	3.00	0.00	8.00	0.00	111.00	40.04

28	PUNJAB	6.00	194.00	54.00	62.00	8.00	0.00	370.00	694.00	384.00
	SULTANPUR LODHI #	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	27.10	0.00	0.00	27.10	0.00
29	RAJASTHAN	353.20	225.80	205.00	0.00	98.00	147.00	637.00	1,666.00	1,283.33
30	SIKKIM	2.00	0.00	126.00	262.00	0.00	147.00	0.00	537.00	536.00
31	TAMIL NADU	24.00	376.00	520.00	1238.00	301.62	791.33	727.67	3,978.62	3376.96
32	TELANGANA	4.00	92.00	18.00	46.00	232.00	0.00	0.00	392.00	350.27
33	TRIPURA	2.00	63.00	131.00	0.00	5.10	49.00	0.00	250.10	229.69
34	UTTAR PRADESH	24.00	66.20	545.80	698.00	86.00	296.00	800.00	2,126.00	2,005.88
35	UTTARAKHAND	2.00	0.00	18.00	40.00	140.64	51.50	0.00	252.14	224.83
36	WEST BENGAL	8.00	0.00	0.00	58.00	136.00	0.00	0.00	202.00	201.69
	TOTAL	1,469.20	4,492.50	4,497.50	5,856.80	3,332.33	3,345.83	4,365.44	27,359.60	22,467.81

**Table 4.1 | Details of funds released by Central Government and utilisation thereof by Smart Cities, state/UT/city-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 874, Rajya Sabha, 6 December 2021

Note: # stands for 'city not selected as smart city'

## PHYSICAL PROGRESS: ACTIVITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION

As of November 2021, 6,452 projects worth INR 1,84,998 crore have been tendered, with work orders issued for 5,809 of them worth INR 1,56,571 crore. However, only 3,131 projects worth INR 53,175 crore were effectively completed (Unstarred Question No. 874, Rajya Sabha, 06 December 2021). Therefore, 28.7 per cent of the tendered fund for 48.5 per cent of the projects has been utilised to date. Only 47 per cent of the Smart Cities have been provided the funds for 2021–22 under the SCM, ranging from INR 49–196 crore per city. Of the promised INR 48,000 crore, only INR 27,359.6 crore has been released by the government of India and INR 22,467.81 utilised to date. 22 of the 100 Smart Cities have utilised 100 per cent of the funds released. A total of 44 Smart Cities have utilised more than 90 per cent of the allocated funds. 15 of the declared Smart Cities have utilised below 50 per cent of the allocated funds. Port Blair has used the least, i.e., 23.21 per cent of the funds released by the government of India.

### NATURE OF ACTIVITIES

The projects proposed under SCM include the instalment

of environmental sensors, smart wastewater projects and solar energy related projects. Solar energy related projects include the installation of rooftop solar panels and solar water heaters in hotels. Smart wastewater projects include the laying of pipes, monitoring of drainage systems, treatment of wastewater and providing hydraulic cranes. In both the previous years, Uttar Pradesh has installed maximum sensors while none of the UTs have contributed to the total figure (Unstarred Question No. 861, Rajya Sabha, 06 December 2021). A total of 28 Smart Wastewater projects and 7 solar energy related projects have been completed in 2021–22 under the SCM programme. There has been considerable decline in the number of completed/grounded projects since 2020–21, where 34 wastewater and 18 solar energy projects had been undertaken. The highest number of environmental sensors have been installed by Uttar Pradesh (142) followed by Gujarat (88) and Madhya Pradesh (46). Together these three states share 55 per cent of the total installed sensors.

SL. NO.	STATE/UT	ENVIRONMENTAL SENSORS INSTALLED BY SMART CITIES	
		2020-2021	2021-2022
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0	0
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	12	0
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	8	0
4	ASSAM	0	0
5	BIHAR	0	5
6	CHANDIGARH	0	1
7	CHHATTISGARH	15	5
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	0	0
9	DAMAN & DIU	0	0
10	DELHI	0	0
11	GOA	1	5
12	GUJARAT	68	20
13	HARYANA	3	0
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	0	0
15	JAMMU & KASHMIR	0	0
16	JHARKHAND	0	0
17	KARNATAKA	2	10
18	KERALA	0	0
19	LAKSHADWEEP	0	0
20	MADHYA PRADESH	20	26
21	MAHARASHTRA	5	40
22	MANIPUR	3	0
23	MEGHALAYA	0	0
24	MIZORAM	0	0
25	NAGALAND	4	0
26	ODISHA	0	0
27	PUDUCHERRY	0	0
28	PUNJAB	0	0
29	RAJASTHAN	16	0
30	SIKKIM	8	1
31	TAMIL NADU	26	0
32	TELANGANA	0	0
33	TRIPURA	0	0
34	UTTAR PRADESH	82	60
35	UTTARAKHAND	0	50
36	WEST BENGAL	5	0
TOTAL		278	223

**Table 4.2 | List of environmental sensors installed by Smart Cities, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 861, Rajya Sabha, 06 December 2021

Note: # stands for 'city not selected as smart city'

## INCLUSIVITY

Concern was raised for the status of accessibility of the government buildings, in general as well as those specifically in the national and state capital cities for persons with disability (PwD). Under the flagship program Sugamya Bharat Abhiyaan (Accessible India Campaign), launched in December 2015, 211 Central Government buildings owned by the MoHUA and 889 buildings belonging to other ministries/departments have been retrofitted by the Central Public Works Department. Property in possession of the State is solely the responsibility of the respective states. 709 railway stations have been identified and equipped with specialised ramps, reserved parking, accessible toilets, drinking water facilities, lifts, 'May I Help You' booths, signages, etc, and such other provisions exclusively for

the disabled. More improvements are in progress. There are a total of 7,325 stations across India, including junction, terminal and central stations. This implies that only 9.67 per cent of all the stations have been made disability-friendly (Unstarred Question No. 860, Rajya Sabha, 06 December 2021).

No questions were asked on the accessibility status of other means of public transport like buses, roads and traffic signals as have been proposed under the campaign's objectives. In 2020–21, at least some questions on gender inclusivity were raised, despite the fact that they were not satisfactorily answered. No questions had been raised on the same in the 2021–22 session.

## SMART CITY IN COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic has greatly impacted the implementation of all government schemes including SCM. The pandemic put to test the true efficiency and readiness of the proclaimed Smart Cities in terms of their capability to handle such unprecedented situations. When questioned about the role of the SCM during the pandemic as well as the effectiveness of the amenities provided by the Smart Cities, the response of these Smart Cities was classified into four areas

namely information, communication, management and preparedness, detailed in Table 4.3. 75 of the 100 Smart Cities which are being operated as Integrated Command and Control Centres (ICCC) have been converted to COVID-19 war rooms by the State/District/City administrations. Digital technology like drones, apps for tracking and mapping the spread of the disease have been put to use. Most of the effective progress towards the SCM commenced after the ceasing of lockdowns.

INFORMATION	COMMUNICATION	MANAGEMENT	PREPAREDNESS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· CCTV SURVEILLANCE OF PUBLIC PLACES AND LOCKDOWNS/PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT</li> <li>· GIS MAPPING OF COVID POSITIVE/SUSPECT CASES</li> <li>· GPS TRACKING OF HEALTHCARE OPERATIONS/ AMBULANCES/ WORKERS</li> <li>· REAL-TIME TRACKING OF DISINFECTION SERVICES</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· HELPLINE NUMBERS OF STATE AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION</li> <li>· ACCURATE TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION BETWEEN STAKEHOLDERS</li> <li>· INTER-DEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION</li> <li>· LEVERAGE SOCIAL MEDIA CHANNELS TO COMMUNICATE WITH CITIZENS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· PANDEMIC MONITORING DASHBOARD WITH ANALYTICS</li> <li>· VIRTUAL TRAINING TO DOCTORS AND HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS</li> <li>· MEDICAL SERVICES THROUGH TELEMEDICINE</li> <li>· MOBILE APPLICATIONS FOR ESSENTIAL SUPPLIES</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· PREDICTIVE ANALYTICS FOR VIRUS SPREAD ANALYSIS/CONTAINMENT</li> <li>· PREDICTIVE NEED FORECASTING FOR EQUIPMENT AND LOGISTICS</li> <li>· CONTINUOUS PEER-TO-PEER LEARNING THROUGH WEBINARS/TECH-CLINICS/HANDHOLDING SESSIONS TO DISSEMINATE BEST PRACTICES</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DEPLOY COVID-19 MOBILE APPLICATIONS FOR EARLY TRACKING, TRACING, AND TREATMENT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DEPLOY PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEMS TO COMMUNICATE WITH MASSES</li> <li>24X7 AVAILABILITY OF MEDICS AT ICCC THROUGH SHIFT SYSTEM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>COLLABORATE WITH HOSPITALS/MEDICAL STORES TO PROVIDE DOORSTEP SERVICES TO CITIZENS</li> <li>USE DRONES TO DISINFECT PUBLIC SPACES, ESPECIALLY THOSE THAT ARE DIFFICULT TO ACCESS</li> <li>PROVISION OF FOOD AND SHELTER TO THE MIGRANT LABOUR, URBAN POOR AND DESTITUTE</li> <li>PROVISION FOR ADEQUATE QUARANTINE/ISOLATION CENTRES</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

**Table 4.3 | Key components of COVID-19 war rooms and other initiatives taken by Smart Cities**

*Source: Unstarred Question No. 707, Lok Sabha, 02 December 2021*

## CONCLUSION

The Smart Cities Mission (SCM) was envisioned to make cities not only more livable but also environmentally sound, digitally robust and economically developed spaces with better living standards. However, even after six years of the mission, only 28.7 per cent of the tendered fund for 48.5 per cent of the projects has been utilised to date. There is also no transparency or uniform data dissemination of the projects proposed, planned or completed under the Mission. Even the decline in the number of projects completed for 2021–22 was overlooked, as fewer relevant questions on the scheme

were asked by Members of Parliament (MPs).

The mission to actually make cities not just smarter but also sustainable and resilient in face of adversities like the pandemic, has to be based on the principles of decentralisation, empowerment of urban local bodies through financial support and autonomy, coupled with participation of its citizenry (Unni, Singh and Panwar, 2021). The focus of the mission cannot simply be the expansion of solar energy and wastewater management projects, it has to encompass basic service delivery.

## CHAPTER 5

# DEENDAYAL ANTYODAYA YOJANA–NATIONAL URBAN LIVELIHOODS MISSION

The Deendayal Antyodaya Yojana–National Urban Livelihoods Mission (DAY–NULM) was launched on 23 September 2013, with the aim to reduce poverty and vulnerability of the urban poor households by enabling them to access self-employment and skilled wage employment opportunities, by building strong grassroots level institutions of the poor. The mission was designed

(i) To enhance employment through skill training and

placement and a self-employment programme, (ii) to provide shelter facilities equipped with essential services to the urban homeless. (iii) to address the livelihood concerns of the urban street vendors by facilitating access to suitable spaces, institutional credit, social security, and skills to the urban street vendors (Unstarred Question No. 3733, Lok Sabha, 18 March 2021).

## COMPONENT-WISE ANALYSIS

### EMPLOYMENT THROUGH SKILL TRAINING AND PLACEMENT AND SELF-EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME

In the Budget session, a question was raised on the implementation of DAY–NULM and it was revealed by the Ministry that a total of 10,09,797 candidates were trained since the launch period. Together, Andhra Pradesh (80,620), Jharkhand (93,157), Madhya Pradesh (1,59,904), Maharashtra (1,77,838) and Uttar Pradesh (1,52,299) account for 66 per cent of the total trained candidates in India. 60 per cent of the candidates are trained in the last three financial years, i.e., 2017–20. However, the financial year 2019–20 (1,29,562) has been detrimental for the best performing states like Andhra Pradesh (0.74 per cent), Jharkhand (8 per cent),

Gujarat (8 per cent), Madhya Pradesh (7 per cent), and Uttar Pradesh (7 per cent) but has been instrumental for Maharashtra, with 36 per cent of its candidates getting trained in the same year. States such as Uttarakhand, Odisha, Karnataka, and Sikkim got only 0 to 2 candidates trained. No data was provided for the states of Nagaland, Puducherry, and Andaman & Nicobar Islands (Unstarred Question No. 591, Lok Sabha, 04 February 2021).

SL. NO.	STATE/UT	CUMULATIVE SINCE LAUNCH OF SCHEME
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	80,620
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	3,041
3	ASSAM	9,904
4	BIHAR	24,753
5	CHHATTISGARH	41,577
6	GOA	4,526
7	GUJARAT	52,636
8	HARYANA	19,980
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	2,907
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR	2,818
11	JHARKHAND	93,157

12	KARNATAKA	3,607
13	KERALA	15,510
14	MADHYA PRADESH	1,59,904
15	MAHARASHTRA	1,77,838
16	MANIPUR	436
17	MEGHALAYA	594
18	MIZORAM	7,089
19	NAGALAND	0
20	ODISHA	17,018
21	PUNJAB	17,342
22	RAJASTHAN	12,117
23	SIKKIM	3,294
24	TAMIL NADU	13,452
25	TELANGANA	24,226
26	TRIPURA	2,042
27	UTTAR PRADESH	1,52,299
28	UTTARAKHAND	18,180
29	WEST BENGAL	46,412
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0
31	CHANDIGARH	2,338
32	DELHI	180
33	PUDUCHERRY	0
TOTAL		10,09,797

**Table 5.1 | Candidates skill trained since the launch of DAY-NULM***Source: Unstarred Question No. 591, Lok Sabha, 04 February 2021*

In the last 3 years, with an aim of providing livelihood, of 6,08,348 candidates with skill training certificates, only 3,71,311 (61 per cent) have been placed, as per the data provided by the Ministry. Among all states and union territories (UTs), around 54 per cent are concentrated in just three states of Maharashtra (85,938), Andhra Pradesh (66,845), and Madhya Pradesh (48,236).

None of these states could even cross 1 lakh candidates getting placed. Amongst these top-performing states, only Andhra Pradesh has a success rate of 90 per cent while the state of Maharashtra could get 53 per cent of the candidates placed (Unstarred Question No. 591, Lok Sabha, 04 February 2021).

SKILL TRAINED CANDIDATES TRAINED AND PLACED DURING THE LAST 3 YEARS			
S. NO.	STATE/UT	CANDIDATES TRAINED (2017-18 TO 2019-20)	CANDIDATES PLACED (2017-18 TO 2019-20)
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	60,345	66,845
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	2,895	949
3	ASSAM	7,031	2,776
4	BIHAR	13,184	4,919
5	CHHATTISGARH	25,217	13,636
6	GOA	3,801	1,727
7	GUJARAT	32,061	26,135
8	HARYANA	19,159	7,973
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	1,586	842

10	JAMMU & KASHMIR	2,755	371
11	JHARKHAND	65,200	27,290
12	KARNATAKA	1,571	0
13	KERALA	13,988	10,679
14	MADHYA PRADESH	61,302	48,236
15	MAHARASHTRA	1,63,067	85,938
16	MANIPUR	389	191
17	MEGHALAYA	569	439
18	MIZORAM	5,731	2,627
19	NAGALAND	0	1
20	ODISHA	627	461
21	PUNJAB	12,172	6,017
22	RAJASTHAN	20,546	5,510
23	SIKKIM	732	246
24	TAMIL NADU	10,488	7,112
25	TELANGANA	18,523	15,050
26	TRIPURA	1,933	239
27	UTTAR PRADESH	19,068	10,147
28	UTTARAKHAND	11,873	4,862
29	WEST BENGAL	40,545	18,917
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0	0
31	CHANDIGARH	2,338	1,155
32	DELHI	93	21
33	PUDUCHERRY	0	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,08,348</b>	<b>3,71,311</b>

**Table 5.2 | Candidates trained and placed during 2017–18 to 2019–20, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 707, Lok Sabha, 02 December 2021

## SELF-HELP GROUPS

The total number of self-help groups (SHGs) formed in 2019–20 was 96,664, which makes it almost equal to the financial year 2018–19 when 92,413 SHGs were formed. The top five states with the largest number of SHGs formed till 2021 are—Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh. Among the 5,24,930 SHGs, 3,19,360 (61 per cent) received revolving funds. In Delhi, Daman and Diu, and Dadar and Nagar Haveli, no revolving funds have been disbursed to SHGs since 2016–17. As per the Ministry, a total of

6,05,745 SHGs were given loans under the SHG–bank linkage programme. However, given that there are only 5,24,930 SHGs registered, it is not possible that 6,05,745 SHGs have received bank loans. There is a clear discrepancy in the data provided by the Ministry. In Goa, Sikkim, Delhi, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Daman and Diu and Dadar and Nagar Haveli, no loans under the SHG–bank linkage programme have been given since 2016–17 (Unstarred Question No. 591, Lok Sabha, 04 February 2021).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	CUMULATIVE SHGS FORMED SINCE THE LAUNCH OF SCHEME
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	57,312
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	382
3	ASSAM	11,952
4	BIHAR	20,559
5	CHHATTISGARH	26,030
6	GOA	566
7	GUJARAT	23,120
8	HARYANA	4,603
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	3,314
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR	1,816
11	JHARKHAND	11,544
12	KARNATAKA	17,217
13	KERALA	15,057
14	MADHYA PRADESH	28,344
15	MAHARASHTRA	66,161
16	MANIPUR	2,717
17	MEGHALAYA	200
18	MIZORAM	1,213
19	NAGALAND	356
20	ODISHA	29,924
21	PUNJAB	6,703
22	RAJASTHAN	21,754
23	SIKKIM	54
24	TAMIL NADU	67,810
25	TELANGANA	25,243
26	TRIPURA	1,530
27	UTTAR PRADESH	33,136
28	UTTARAKHAND	1,587
29	WEST BENGAL	43,671
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	62
31	CHANDIGARH	277
32	DELHI	121
33	PUDUCHERRY	595
TOTAL		5,24,930

**Table 5.3 | SHGs formed since the launch of DAY-NULM, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 591, Lok Sabha, 04 February 2021

S. NO.	STATE/UT	CUMULATIVE LOANS TO SHGS UNDER BANK LINKAGE PROGRAMME SINCE LAUNCH OF SCHEME
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	3,62,039
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	8
3	ASSAM	1,538
4	BIHAR	1,336
5	CHHATTISGARH	7,302
6	GOA	0
7	GUJARAT	7,268
8	HARYANA	224
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	543
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR	28
11	JHARKHAND	884
12	KARNATAKA	1,204
13	KERALA	25,437
14	MADHYA PRADESH	10,113
15	MAHARASHTRA	27,144
16	MANIPUR	18
17	MEGHALAYA	1
18	MIZORAM	157
19	NAGALAND	0
20	ODISHA	7,940
21	PUNJAB	4
22	RAJASTHAN	1,833
23	SIKKIM	0
24	TAMIL NADU	38,854
25	TELANGANA	81,316
26	TRIPURA	71
27	UTTAR PRADESH	4,959
28	UTTARAKHAND	90
29	WEST BENGAL	24,848
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0
31	CHANDIGARH	0
32	DELHI	0
33	PUDUCHERRY	586
TOTAL		6,05,745

**Table 5.4 | Loans given to SHGs under bank linkage programme since the launch of DAY-NULM**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 591, Lok Sabha, 04 February 2021

S. NO.	STATE/UT	CUMULATIVE SHGs GIVEN REVOLVING FUND SINCE THE LAUNCH OF SCHEME
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	30,571
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	229
3	ASSAM	9,077
4	BIHAR	10,830
5	CHHATTISGARH	16,150
6	GOA	481
7	GUJARAT	18,538
8	HARYANA	2,581
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	2,721
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR	962
11	JHARKHAND	7,454
12	KARNATAKA	10,330
13	KERALA	4,912
14	MADHYA PRADESH	16,959
15	MAHARASHTRA	48,390
16	MANIPUR	2,110
17	MEGHALAYA	107
18	MIZORAM	1,288
19	NAGALAND	90
20	ODISHA	18,500
21	PUNJAB	2,172
22	RAJASTHAN	16,173
23	SIKKIM	36
24	TAMIL NADU	39,788
25	TELANGANA	3,108
26	TRIPURA	974
27	UTTAR PRADESH	19,395
28	UTTARAKHAND	717
29	WEST BENGAL	34,068
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	37
31	CHANDIGARH	213
32	DELHI	T
33	PUDUCHERRY	399
TOTAL		3,19,360

**Table 5.5 | SHGs given revolving fund since the launch of DAY-NULM**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 591, Lok Sabha, 04 February 2021

A total of 5,51,281 beneficiaries have been assisted in setting up individual/group micro-enterprises till now. Together, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, and Uttar Pradesh share 71 per cent of total individual/group micro enterprises established across all states/UTs. It should be noted that Tamil Nadu has set up 1,74,894, which

alone is 32 per cent of the total enterprises. However, not even 100 micro enterprises have been set up in Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Goa, Sikkim, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh and Delhi (Unstarred Question No. 591, Lok Sabha, 04 February 2021).

## INDIVIDUAL/GROUP MICRO ENTERPRISES

S. NO.	STATE/UT	CUMULATIVE BENEFICIARIES ASSISTED FOR SETTING UP INDIVIDUAL/GROUP MICRO ENTERPRISES SINCE THE LAUNCH OF SCHEME
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	75,800
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	69
3	ASSAM	1,899
4	BIHAR	6,971
5	CHHATTISGARH	26,888
6	GOA	91
7	GUJARAT	14,184
8	HARYANA	2,906
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	2,319
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR	5,935
11	JHARKHAND	4,759
12	KARNATAKA	12,782
13	KERALA	5,130
14	MADHYA PRADESH	55,513
15	MAHARASHTRA	36,130
16	MANIPUR	6
17	MEGHALAYA	105
18	MIZORAM	1,879
19	NAGALAND	216
20	ODISHA	22,411
21	PUNJAB	6,121
22	RAJASTHAN	21,926
23	SIKKIM	35
24	TAMIL NADU	1,74,894
25	TELANGANA	10,407
26	TRIPURA	342
27	UTTAR PRADESH	51,234
28	UTTARAKHAND	4,560
29	WEST BENGAL	5,434
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	1
31	CHANDIGARH	6
32	DELHI	17
33	PUDUCHERRY	311
TOTAL		5,51,281

**Table 5.6 | Beneficiaries assisted for setting up individual/group micro enterprises since the launch of DAY-NULM**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 591, Lok Sabha, 04 February 2021

## SUPPORT TO URBAN STREET VENDORS

To protect the rights of urban street vendors, regulate street vending activities and ensure uniformity in the legal framework for street vending across states/UTs, the government has enacted the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014. As per the provision of the Act, the Town Vending Committee shall, within such period and in such manner as may be specified in the scheme, conduct a survey of all existing street vendors, within the area under its jurisdiction, and subsequent survey shall be carried out at least once in every five years. The Act also contains provisions relating to the prevention of harassment, by police and other authorities, of street vendors who carry on street vending activities in accordance with the terms and conditions of their certificate of vending. Further, the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) issues advisories to the States/UTs, from time to time, to follow the provisions laid down in the Act, including on the issues relating to eviction and relocation of street vendors and putting in place a 'Dispute Redressal Mechanism' in accordance with the provisions of the Act for addressing grievances of street vendors (Unstarred Question No. 1896, Lok Sabha, 09 December 2021).

For planning purposes, the preparation and amendment of the Master Plan is a state subject. However, for the guidance of States/UTs for incorporating provisions for street vending in the Master Plan, the MoHUA has circulated Model Planning Guidelines for Street Vendors (Unstarred Question No. 1896, Lok Sabha, 09 December 2021).

A total of 54,70,307 street vendors have been identified through the survey across States/UTs while 41 per cent of identified street vendors have been issued vending certificates. It seems that the process has been fastened this calendar year as from 2020 to 2021, a total of 36,44,531 vendors have been added to the survey and 17,72,808 vendors have been given certificates. It should be noted that if we compare this with the cumulative data gathered for the period 2015–20 where 18,25,776 street vendors have been identified across States/UTs through surveys, and 4,94,920 provided certificates of vending, the data for this calendar year 2020–21 alone is double the cumulative data of 2015–2020 (Unstarred Question No. 1201, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	STREET VENDORS IDENTIFIED	NUMBER OF CERTIFICATES OF VENDING ISSUED
1.	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	389	349
2.	ANDHRA PRADESH	3,55,282	2,18,981
3.	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	8,843	818
4.	ASSAM	63,935	1,617
5.	BIHAR	1,28,050	1,00,132
6.	CHANDIGARH	21,650	10,934
7.	CHHATTISGARH	1,23,861	1,748
8.	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	180	866
9.	DELHI	79,952	0
10.	GOA	3,351	1,625
11.	GUJARAT	3,73,728	1,35,062
12.	HARYANA	1,36,080	47,851
13.	HIMACHAL PRADESH	7,542	4,320
14.	JAMMU & KASHMIR	29,655	0
15.	JHARKHAND	83,632	3,247
16.	KARNATAKA	3,08,695	92,841

17.	KERALA	26,924	377
18.	LADAKH	427	427
19.	MADHYA PRADESH	5,65,000	5,04,526
20.	MAHARASHTRA	6,79,554	29,162
21.	MANIPUR	18,254	543
22.	MEGHALAYA	2,052	253
23.	MIZORAM	4,605	3,184
24.	NAGALAND	5,003	1,818
25.	ODISHA	94,002	24,818
26.	PUDUCHERRY	7,762	2,040
27.	PUNJAB	1,73,506	50,228
28.	RAJASTHAN	1,93,568	23,714
29.	SIKKIM	201	0
30.	TAMIL NADU	3,59,825	53,236
31.	TELANGANA	5,83,993	3,56,906
32.	TRIPURA	9,184	8,656
33.	UTTAR PRADESH	9,87,336	5,68,671
34.	UTTARAKHAND	30,795	17,791
35.	WEST BENGAL	783	0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>54,70,307</b>	<b>22,67,728</b>

**Table 5.7 | Street vendors identified and certified, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1201, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020

The MoHUA admitted that the Government has not conducted studies to assess the impact of COVID-19 and lockdown on street vendors. However, it said that it is aware of the adverse impact of the pandemic induced lockdown on the livelihood of street vendors across the country.

Under the Pradhan Mantri Street Vendor's AtmaNirbhar Nidhi (PM SVANidhi Scheme), as of 13 December 2021, 30.75 lakh loans amounting to INR 3,095 crore have been sanctioned and 27.06 lakh loans amounting to INR

2,714 crore have been disbursed. Out of the total 27.06 lakh beneficiaries, 59 per cent are male and 41 per cent are female. As there was no question on the data of applications received for the SVANidhi Scheme, it is not known whether the data on loans sanctioned/disbursed could match the applications received by the states. The top five states that received the highest number of loans were Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Telangana, and Maharashtra, accounting for 76.5 per cent of the total loans across all the states/UTs.

STATE/UT	LOANS SANCTIONED	LOAN SANCTIONED (IN INR CRORE)	LOAN DISBURSED	AMOUNT DISBURSED (IN INR CRORE)	MALE	FEMALE	OTHERS
ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	509	53,19,000	491	50,59,000	275	216	-
ANDHRA PRADESH	1,96,963	1,99,24,24,643	1,83,694	1,84,69,88,644	58,246	1,25,424	24
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	2,929	2,98,65,501	2,595	2,64,45,501	580	2,015	-
ASSAM	21,015	21,21,78,900	18,121	18,23,66,900	10,867	7,253	2
BIHAR	56,543	56,03,11,105	44,325	43,87,53,608	33,091	11,234	-
CHANDIGARH	3,460	3,46,65,626	3,046	3,04,94,626	2,593	453	-

CHHATTISGARH	49,125	49,58,54,090	46,223	46,45,78,090	24,796	21,424	3
DAMAN & DIU AND DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	1,362	1,35,99,525	1,138	1,13,58,525	768	370	-
DELHI	48,288	48,08,45,529	37,891	37,68,39,529	29,244	8,647	-
GOA	1,346	1,44,05,105	1,260	1,33,55,105	655	605	-
GUJARAT	1,95,260	2,00,00,48,699	1,35,569	1,38,34,82,499	80,527	55,042	-
HARYANA	27,398	27,72,54,467	22,019	22,18,76,467	19,786	2,233	-
HIMACHAL PRADESH	3,721	4,04,14,669	3,505	3,75,64,669	2,795	710	-
JAMMU & KASHMIR	14,755	14,99,33,100	13,507	13,67,23,100	13,008	499	-
JHARKHAND	28,466	28,77,28,361	26,297	26,48,63,861	19,025	7,271	1
KARNATAKA	1,50,672	1,53,70,52,968	1,35,012	1,36,70,26,968	69,022	65,978	12
KERALA	10,322	11,35,46,807	9,786	10,56,83,807	7,945	1,841	-
LADAKH	277	28,90,000	268	27,80,000	82	186	-
MADHYA PRADESH	4,67,854	4,84,07,57,504	4,33,672	4,46,85,70,104	3,00,941	1,32,728	3
MAHARASHTRA	2,22,714	2,24,24,85,260	1,87,502	1,88,21,50,263	1,14,706	72,791	5
MANIPUR	9,319	9,32,14,001	8,055	8,05,66,001	499	7,556	-
MEGHALAYA	520	53,00,000	431	43,50,000	124	307	-
MIZORAM	480	49,10,000	470	47,80,000	34	436	-
NAGALAND	1,548	1,58,70,000	1,522	1,56,00,000	185	1,337	-
ODISHA	40,190	40,18,19,241	33,806	33,66,76,541	27,956	5,848	2
PUDUCHERRY	1,453	1,46,86,498	1,243	1,24,56,498	689	554	-
PUNJAB	41,990	41,70,03,864	36,284	36,01,58,364	27,616	8,668	-
RAJASTHAN	75,556	75,31,56,431	66,854	66,58,91,943	52,288	14,566	-
SIKKIM	1	10,000	1	10,000	1	-	-
TAMIL NADU	1,75,900	1,74,76,01,964	1,47,590	1,46,48,26,664	56,137	91,423	30
TELANGANA	3,70,162	3,69,28,96,318	3,46,748	3,44,55,77,130	1,19,564	2,27,144	40
TRIPURA	3,170	3,25,22,325	2,834	2,86,22,325	2,595	239	-
UTTAR PRADESH	8,24,285	8,16,81,79,144	7,32,826	7,24,05,77,411	5,03,561	2,29,260	5
UTTARAKHAND	11,566	11,62,78,368	10,113	10,12,91,368	8,829	1,284	-
WEST BENGAL	16,108	15,91,77,199	11,797	11,62,09,699	9,514	2,283	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30,75,227</b>	<b>30,95,42,06,211</b>	<b>27,06,495</b>	<b>27,14,45,55,209</b>	<b>15,98,541</b>	<b>11,07,827</b>	<b>127</b>

**Table 5.8 | Details of sanctioned and disbursed loans under SVANidhi, state/UT- and gender-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2640, Rajya Sabha, 20 December 2021

A question was asked on the number of applications that were returned by banks under SVANidhi and the reason behind that. The Ministry responded that a total of 6,75,498 applications were returned. For 3,14,125 applications, which means 46.5 per cent of the returned applications, there is no reason provided by the Ministry

as they gave the arbitrary reason of 'others' to it. For the majority of returned applications (2,90,209), it stated that the vendor is not reachable to process the loan and for 71,164, the Ministry claimed that the vendor is not interested in availing the loan benefit.

S. NO.	REASONS	NO. OF APPLICATIONS
1	VENDOR IS NOT INTERESTED IN LOAN	71,164
2	VENDOR IS NOT REACHABLE TO PROCESS THE LOAN	2,90,209
3	OTHERS	3,14,125
TOTAL		6,75,498

**Table 5.9 | Reason-wise break-up of applications returned under PM SVANidhi**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2640, Rajya Sabha, 20 December 2021

## SHELTERS FOR URBAN HOMELESS

As per Deendayal Antyodaya Yojana–National Urban Livelihoods Mission (DAY–NULM), homeless persons include persons who do not have a house, either self-owned or rented, but instead live and sleep on pavements, at parks, railway stations, bus stations and places of worship, outside shops, and factories, at constructions sites, under bridges, inhum pipes and other places under the open sky or places unfit for human habitation (Unstarred Question No. 565, Lok Sabha, 22 July 2021).

Table 5.10 presents the functional shelters and the urban homeless population identified by States/UTs through a third party systematic survey under Shelters for Urban Homeless (SUH) scheme of DAY–NULM. The third-party survey by the local/municipal bodies aims to assess accurately the need for shelters at suitable locations. As per the data, the states have not made any attempt to create additional shelter facilities during the period of lockdown. In 2020, 22 states/UTs conducted a third-party survey through which 2,07,847 urban homeless persons were identified and till 2021 five more states/UTs joined and 2,45,783 homeless people were identified. Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Arunachal Pradesh have completed a survey for identification of urban homeless but reported no homeless identified. Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu have also reported no homeless in the UT. The third-party survey has not been done in 5 States/UTs of Assam, Jammu and Kashmir, Ladakh, National Capital Territory (NCT) of Delhi and Punjab.

With only 1,630 shelters operational in the country, each housing 50–100 individuals, there is clearly a huge gap between the number of urban homeless and the shelters available in the country. As per Census 2011, the total homeless population in urban areas in India is 9,38,348 and the third party survey (excluding the 5 states/UTs) shows the stark difference of 6,92,565.

States like Rajasthan, Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra together account for 51 per cent of the total urban homeless population. However, Rajasthan, Delhi, Madhya Pradesh, and Tamil Nadu have the highest number of homeless shelters and together they share 43 per cent of the total shelters in urban India. 30 out of 35 states/UTs have not been able to construct 100 shelters and 14 states/UTs are still under 10 shelters while 11 states/UTs have more than 10,000 urban homeless populations as per the third party survey, excluding 5 cities of Assam, Jammu and Kashmir, Ladakh, NCT of Delhi and Punjab where no survey has been conducted yet (Unstarred Question No. 565, Lok Sabha, 22 July 2021).

The Ministry announced in the Parliament that the information on deaths of urban homeless persons is not maintained by the Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs (Unstarred Question No. 2457, Rajya Sabha, 20 December 2021).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	SHELTERS FUNCTIONAL UNDER SUH	HOMELESS PEOPLE IDENTIFIED
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	87	11,173
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	0	0
3	ASSAM	1	SURVEY IS NOT DONE
4	BIHAR	80	10,253
5	CHHATTISGARH	24	10,216
6	GOA	3	173
7	GUJARAT	53	35,293
8	HARYANA	51	19,015
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	19	879
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR	1	SURVEY IS NOT DONE
11	JHARKHAND	94	3,043
12	KARNATAKA	48	7,282
13	KERALA	17	3,196
14	MADHYA PRADESH	119	3,257
15	MAHARASHTRA	87	21,882
16	MANIPUR	0	4
17	MEGHALAYA	4	48
18	MIZORAM	94	3,888
19	NAGALAND	2	49
20	ODISHA	44	13,651
21	PUNJAB	24	SURVEY IS NOT DONE
22	RAJASTHAN	209	39,512
23	SIKKIM	1	13
24	TAMIL NADU	175	14,040
25	TELANGANA	35	4,629
26	TRIPURA	5	328
27	UTTAR PRADESH	108	28,409
28	UTTARAKHAND	11	2,202
29	WEST BENGAL	38	10,565
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0	0
31	CHANDIGARH	1	2,064
32	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	0	0
33	DELHI	193	SURVEY IS NOT DONE
34	LADAKH	0	SURVEY IS NOT DONE
35	PUDUCHERRY	2	719
TOTAL		1,630	2,45,783

**Table 5.10 | Details of shelters functional under DAY-NULM, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2457, Rajya Sabha, 20 December 2021

## CONCLUSION

---

As per the third-party survey, there are over 2 lakh homeless people in the country and according to the Ministry's data, 1,630 shelters are operational under DAY-NULM. The number of the homeless is only expected to have increased with the onslaught of the pandemic, which further exacerbated vulnerabilities. Despite a considerable progress in skill development training noted among few states, the rate of placement stands at 61 per cent, which alone can be considered successful, but the majority of this is concentrated in just three states. This disparity in the performance of states

can also be seen in the support for microbusinesses where not even 100 microbusinesses are set up in some states and UTs. Without accountability and assessment of why these states are lagging behind in the implementation of the scheme, the programme will not be able to achieve what it set out to do. The programme has the potential to mainstream the marginalised, but that would only be possible if the existing gaps in the implementation of the scheme are addressed with periodic monitoring and evaluation.

## CHAPTER 6

# LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

---

The mission of the Ministry of Labour and Employment is to improve the working conditions and the quality of life of workers by laying down and implementing policies/programmes/schemes/projects for providing social security and welfare measures, regulating conditions of work, occupational health and safety of workers, eliminating child labour from hazardous occupations and processes, strengthening enforcement of labour laws and promoting skill development and employment services (Ministry of Labour and Employment, n.d.). The main functions of the Ministry are:

- Labour policy and legislation
- Safety, health and welfare of labour
- Social security of labour
- Policy relating to special target groups such as women and child labour
- Industrial relations and enforcement of labour laws in the Central sphere
- Adjudication of industrial disputes through the Central Government Industrial Tribunals cum Labour Courts and National Industrial Tribunals
- Workers' education
- Labour and employment statistics

## UNORGANISED SECTOR WORKERS: ENUMERATION AND REGISTRATION

---

As per the latest Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS) Quarterly Bulletin January–March, 2021, the Labour Force Participation Rate on current weekly status in urban areas has increased from 47.3 per cent (October–December 2020) to 47.5 per cent (January–March, 2021) (Unstarred Question No. 1382, Rajya Sabha, 09 December 2021). As per the PLFS conducted in 2017–18, the total employment in the country was around 47 crore. About 9 crore workers were found engaged in the organised sector and the remaining 38 crore workers were found engaged in the unorganised sector (Unstarred Question No. 2166, Rajya Sabha, 16 December 2021). This makes 81 per cent of the Indian workforce unorganised sector workers.

The Ministry dodged the question where it was asked whether they have collected data to find out the number of persons who lost jobs during the pandemic from 2020–21. Instead, it mentioned PLFS and National Sample Survey Office (NSSO) data and mentioned schemes that it launched during the pandemic (Unstarred Question No. 1369, Rajya Sabha, 09 December 2021).

The Ministry of Labour and Employment launched the

e-Shram portal, a national database of unorganised workers on 26 August 2021. It includes construction workers, migrant workers, gig and platform workers, street vendors, domestic workers, agriculture workers, and other sub-groups of unorganised workers. As of 12 December 2021, more than 11.67 crore unorganised workers have been registered on this portal. One of the main objectives of the e-Shram portal is to facilitate the delivery of social security and welfare schemes to such workers. About 400 occupations under broad categories such as agriculture, construction, domestic work, apparel, manufacturing, automobile and transportation, healthcare etc. are being captured for the unorganised workers in the age group of 16–59 years.

**Objective of the portal:** This portal aims to provide a comprehensive database of workers to the governments for using it during any crises like the COVID–19 pandemic in future. The portal will be available in public for open access, where a worker can self enroll through his Aadhaar and mobile number. The Common Service Centre, through its nation-wide network of over 4 lakh centres and selected post offices of the Department of Posts, will act as registration centres, where workers will

be able to register themselves free of cost.

According to the Ministry, as of 9 December 2021, 10,33,16,996 workers have been registered under the e-Shram portal. Together, West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Odisha and Bihar share 63 per cent of the total registration across all states/UTs (Unstarred Question No. 1389, Rajya Sabha, 09 December 2021).

entitled to get the benefit of an accidental insurance cover of INR 2 lakh for a year, free of cost, through the Pradhan Mantri Suraksha Bima Yojana (PMSBY). The registered workers on e-Shram are also nudged to take the benefit of Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Maan-dhan (PMSYM) and National Pension Scheme for Traders and Self-Employed Persons (Unstarred Question No. 2166, Rajya Sabha, 16 December 2021).

**Benefits:** All eligible registered unorganised workers are

S. NO.	STATE/UT	TOTAL REGISTRATIONS
1	WEST BENGAL	2,19,08,637
2	UTTAR PRADESH	2,01,79,753
3	ODISHA	1,22,95,436
4	BIHAR	1,10,21,243
5	JHARKHAND	52,30,417
6	CHHATTISGARH	45,04,297
7	PUNJAB	38,28,138
8	MADHYA PRADESH	33,46,562
9	RAJASTHAN	25,65,047
10	ASSAM	25,61,219
11	KERALA	24,84,501
12	MAHARASHTRA	23,42,150
13	ANDHRA PRADESH	18,04,584
14	TAMIL NADU	15,87,226
15	GUJARAT	14,19,994
16	KARNATAKA	13,73,489
17	TELANGANA	9,74,180
18	JAMMU & KASHMIR	9,53,776
19	HARYANA	7,03,070
20	TRIPURA	5,22,590
21	DELHI	4,69,192
22	UTTARAKHAND	4,13,697
23	HIMACHAL PRADESH	2,63,092
24	MANIPUR	1,95,080
25	NAGALAND	1,61,481
26	MEGHALAYA	58,995
27	CHANDIGARH	58,783
28	PUDUCHERRY	35,500
29	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	18,166
30	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	11,475
31	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	9,525
32	MIZORAM	5,733
33	GOA	4,385
34	SIKKIM	3,511

35	LADAKH	1,882
36	LAKSHADWEEP	190
TOTAL		10,33,16,996

**Table 6.1 | Registrations under e-Shram, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1389, Rajya Sabha, 09 December 2021

## SOCIAL SECURITY SCHEMES

The Ministry reported that as of 9 December 2021, 1,14,30,968 migrant workers made their way back to their home states from various corners of the country (Unstarred Question No. 1375, Rajya Sabha, 09 December 2021).

The Ministry has laid out the significant schemes that it launched or made functional for unorganised workers in the past few years. According to the Ministry, these

schemes have been pertinent to the workers' welfare, especially in the COVID-19 times. The schemes mentioned in Table 6.2 cater to the health needs, pension, food, cash transfers and livelihood generation for the workers. The maximum number of parliamentary questions in case of unorganised workers were raised with concern for the progress of these schemes. Table 6.2 presents the culmination of answers given by the Ministry on welfare schemes.

SCHEME	DESCRIPTION	PROGRESS	E-SHRAM LINKAGE
PRADHAN MANTRI JEEVAN JYOTI BIMA YOJANA	LIFE AND DISABILITY COVER	AS OF 31.10.2021, 11.67 CRORES BENEFICIARIES	YES
PRADHAN MANTRI SURAKSHA BIMA YOJANA	LIFE AND DISABILITY COVER	AS ON 31.10.2021, 26.85 CRORES BENEFICIARIES	YES
PRADHAN MANTRI SHRAM YOGI MAANDHAN PENSION YOJANA	MONTHLY MINIMUM ASSURED PENSION OF INR 3,000 AFTER ATTAINING THE AGE OF 60 YEARS	AS OF 01.12.2021, 45,78,524 BENEFICIARIES	NO
PRADHAN MANTRI JAN DHAN YOJANA	EX-GRATIA OF INR 500 PER MONTH FOR THREE MONTHS	20.40 CRORES (APPROX.) WOMEN ACCOUNT-HOLDERS	NO
PM GARIB KALYAN ANN YOJANA	ADDITIONAL ALLOCATION OF FOOD GRAIN @ 5 KG PER PERSON PER MONTH FREE OF COST TO ALL BENEFICIARIES COVERED UNDER THE TARGETED PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	-	NO
ATMANIRBHAR BHARAT ROZGAR YOJANA		CREATION OF 39.51 LAKH NEW JOB OPPORTUNITIES BY CREDITING INR 2,583 CRORE IN EPF ACCOUNTS	NO
PRADHAN MANTRI GARIB KALYAN YOJANA		BENEFIT OF INR 2,567 CRORE TO RETAIN 38.91 LAKH LOW WAGE EMPLOYEES	NO
ATAL BEEMIT VYAKTI KALYAN YOJANA	BUILDING AND OTHER CONSTRUCTION WORKERS (BOCW)	FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE OF INR 7,413 CRORE	
59,507 BENEFICIARIES AS ON 31.10.2021	NO		
GARIB KALYAN ROJGAR ABHIYAN	TO BOOST EMPLOYMENT AND LIVELIHOOD OPPORTUNITIES FOR MIGRANT WORKERS	GENERATED 50,78,68,671 MAN-DAYS EMPLOYMENT	NO

BOCW RRELIEF		INR 5,618 CRORE DISBURSED TO 1.83 CRORE BOCW WORKERS AND DURING THE SECOND WAVE INR 1,795 CRORE DISBURSED TO 1.23 CRORE WORKERS	NO
SVANIDHI SCHEME	TO PROVIDE THEM COLLATERAL FREE WORKING CAPITAL LOAN UPTO INR 10,000	30.75 LAKH LOANS AMOUNTING TO INR 3,095 CRORE SANCTIONED AND 27.06 LAKH LOANS AMOUNTING TO INR 2,714 CRORE DISBURSED	NO
20 CONTROL ROOMS	TO RECEIVE AND ADDRESS THE GRIEVANCES OF WORKERS REGARDING WAGES, ETC. DURING THE NATIONAL LOCKDOWN.	NO DATA AVAILABLE	NO

**Table 6.2 | Schemes as COVID-19 recovery mechanism under Ministry of Labour and Employment**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2667, Rajya Sabha, 11 December 2021, and Unstarred Question No. 2173, Rajya Sabha, 16 December 2021

The Ministry dodged the question of whether the Government has launched the e-Shram portal to ensure the last-mile delivery of benefits of various social security schemes to the informal sector workers. It also dodged the question of whether the Ministry is trying to further connect the informal sector workers with existing welfare schemes under this portal. It mentioned that workers can get enrol in other schemes like PM-SVANidhi and Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana (PMJDY) but did

not clarify whether the Ministry is planning to build linkages through the e-Shram portal. It also dodged the question of whether the Government has a plan to aid the registration process of those unorganized workers who are required to e-register on the e-Shram portal themselves but may not have the resources or technical know-how (Unstarred Question No. 774, Lok Sabha, 07 February 2022 and Unstarred Question No. 1052, Rajya Sabha, 10 February 2022).

## PENSION

The Ministry accepted that the outbreak of the pandemic has adversely affected the pension enrolments under the scheme Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Maan-Dhan (PMSYM) Yojana across the country. Till now, a total of 46,19,840 pension enrolments have been made under the scheme. Workers registered under the PMSYM pension scheme are given a minimum assured pension of INR 3,000 per month after attaining the age of 60 years. In case of death of a pensioner, his/her spouse is entitled to a 50 per cent family pension. On exit, the subscriber's contribution with saving bank interest is refundable.

Table 6.3 shows that in 2020–21, the pension enrollment dropped down to 84.4 per cent from 2019–2020 and 94 per cent from 2018–19. In 2021–22, it further dropped down by 46 per cent from 2020–21. The top four states to get the maximum enrollment are Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Haryana, sharing 59 per cent of the total enrollment. Additional bulk enrolment of 5,06,603 has been done in the states/UTs of Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Chandigarh.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	TOTAL
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	1,033	822	277	167	2,299
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	37,444	1,07,248	6,201	843	1,51,736
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	810	1,589	77	21	2,497
4	ASSAM	9,634	7,563	3,876	3,781	24,854
5	BIHAR	1,04,887	74,782	16,924	7,000	2,03,593
6	CHANDIGARH	974	2,906	361	35	4,276
7	CHHATTISGARH	92,631	1,11,930	3,857	2,012	2,10,430
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DIU	953	575	37	9	1,574
9	DELHI	4,791	2,711	608	1,312	9,422
10	GOA	212	728	35	24	999
11	GUJARAT	3,35,279	31,407	2,050	1,666	3,70,402
12	HARYANA	5,62,199	2,22,583	26,049	9,576	8,20,407
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	14,355	26,033	1,362	460	42,210
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	36,735	27,056	6,643	1,490	71,924
15	JHARKHAND	97,735	29,266	2,326	1,192	1,30,519
16	KARNATAKA	39,351	51,925	8,769	10,592	1,10,637
17	KERALA	7,027	2,398	1,136	1,447	12,008
18	LADAKH	889	563	10	6	1,468
19	LAKSHADWEEP	21	0	0	0	21
20	MADHYA PRADESH	80,101	39,089	5,139	4,537	1,28,866
21	MAHARASHTRA	5,27,226	51,830	9,541	4,531	5,93,128
22	MANIPUR	2,350	1,310	237	283	4,180
23	MEGHALAYA	916	1,162	811	271	3,160
24	MIZORAM	436	120	58	45	659
25	NAGALAND	1,432	2,547	739	86	4,804
26	ODISHA	1,04,847	50,621	9,107	6,361	1,70,936
27	PUDUCHERRY	851	322	82	40	1,295
28	PUNJAB	21,915	9,891	1,718	1,328	34,852
29	RAJASTHAN	61,907	37,370	3,303	1,832	1,04,412
30	SIKKIM	61	43	21	16	141
31	TAMIL NADU	40,730	14,016	2,381	1,389	58,516
32	TELANGANA	19,438	18,455	2,612	1,449	41,954
33	TRIPURA	13,680	12,184	3,113	924	29,901
34	UTTAR PRADESH	4,66,310	1,25,565	38,701	11,423	6,41,999
35	UTTARAKHAND	18,629	14,622	1,291	390	34,932
36	WEST BENGAL	35,920	24,055	12,559	15,692	88,226
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>27,43,709</b>	<b>11,05,287</b>	<b>1,72,011</b>	<b>92,230</b>	<b>41,13,237</b>
<b>BULK ENROLMENT IN THE STATES/UTS OF HARYANA, UTTAR PRADESH, MAHARASHTRA, RAJASTHAN AND CHANDIGARH</b>		<b>5,06,603</b>				
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>46,19,840</b>				

**Table 6.3 | Pension enrollment, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 246, Rajya Sabha, 03 February 2022

## LABOUR CODES

The Government has notified four Labour Codes, namely, the Code on Wages, 2019 on 8 August 2019 and the Industrial Relations Code, 2020, the Code on Social Security, 2020 and the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020 on 29 September 2020. Under the Codes, the power to make rules has been entrusted to the Central Government, State Government and appropriate Governments and there is a requirement of publication of rules in their official gazette for a period of 30 or 45 days for public consultation.

As a step towards implementation of the four Labour Codes, the Central Government has published the following draft rules inviting comments of all stakeholders including the general public:

- the Code on Wages (Central) Rules, 2020,
- the Industrial Relations (Central) Rules, 2020,
- the Industrial Relations (Central) Recognition of Negotiating Union or Negotiating Council and Adjudication of Disputes of Trade Unions Rules, 2021,
- the Code on Social Security (Central) Rules, 2020,
- the Code on Social Security (Employee's Compensation) (Central) Rules, 2021; and
- the Occupational Safety Health & Working Conditions (Central) Rules, 2020 draft Rules under section 16 (5) of the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020

NAME OF CODE	STATES/UTS WHICH HAVE PRE-PUBLISHED THE DRAFT RULES
THE CODE ON WAGES	MADHYA PRADESH, BIHAR, UTTARAKHAND, KARNATAKA, UTTAR PRADESH, GUJARAT, ODISHA, PUNJAB, CHHATTISGARH, TRIPURA, RAJASTHAN, JHARKHAND, ARUNACHAL PRADESH, HIMACHAL PRADESH, HARYANA, MAHARASHTRA, GOA, MIZORAM, TELANGANA, ASSAM, MANIPUR, UTS OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR, PUDUCHERRY AND GNCT OF DELHI (24)
THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CODE	MADHYA PRADESH, BIHAR, UTTARAKHAND, UTTAR PRADESH, GUJARAT, ODISHA, PUNJAB, CHHATTISGARH, TRIPURA, KARNATAKA, JHARKHAND, ARUNACHAL PRADESH, HARYANA, HIMACHAL PRADESH, TELANGANA, MANIPUR, ASSAM, GOA, UTS OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR AND PUDUCHERRY (20)
THE CODE ON SOCIAL SECURITY	MADHYA PRADESH, BIHAR, UTTARAKHAND, UTTAR PRADESH, PUNJAB, CHHATTISGARH, ODISHA, JHARKHAND, ARUNACHAL PRADESH, HARYANA, MAHARASHTRA, TRIPURA, HIMACHAL PRADESH, MANIPUR, ASSAM, GUJARAT, GOA AND UT OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR (18)
THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, HEALTH AND WORKING CONDITIONS CODE	UTTARAKHAND, UTTAR PRADESH, MADHYA PRADESH, CHHATTISGARH, ODISHA, ARUNACHAL PRADESH, HARYANA, JHARKHAND, PUNJAB, MANIPUR, BIHAR, HIMACHAL PRADESH AND UT OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR (13)

**Table 6.4 | Codes and states/UTs that have prepublished draft rules**  
Source: Starred Question No. 207, Rajya Sabha, 16 December 2021

## CONSTRUCTION WORKERS

The Ministry informed that during the second wave of Covid-19 between April–June, 2021, the lockdowns were partial and localised in terms of timings, geography, duration, restrictions and relaxations. The construction activities, manufacturing industries, essential services and public transport were generally exempted from lockdowns imposed by the state governments and district administrations and were functioning without disruptions.

In the backdrop of a challenging situation, due to the outbreak of Covid-19, which led to the financial constraints among the Building and Other Construction Workers (BOCW), the States/UTs were issued an advisory to frame a scheme under Section 22(1)(h) of the Building & Other Construction Workers (BOCW) (RE&CS) Act, 1996 for transfer of adequate funds in the bank accounts of construction workers, through direct

benefit transfer (DBT) mode.

Table 6.5 shows that during the first wave of Covid-19, the State/UT BOCW Welfare Boards cumulatively disbursed more than INR 5,618 crore, through DBT, to the bank accounts of 1.83 crores BOC workers during lockdown and thereafter. Further, during the second wave of Covid-19, INR 1,795 crore was disbursed through DBT, to the bank accounts of 1.23 crore BOC workers. It should be noted that during the second wave, 28 states/

UTs did not provide any assistance to construction workers. Only Karnataka, Kerala, Delhi, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Nagaland and Punjab could provide assistance. However, during the first wave, except for Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu, every state/UT made efforts in cash transfers. Uttar Pradesh made progress with 73 per cent of cash transfers from the first wave to the second wave while Delhi jumped by 80 per cent.

STATE/UT-WISE STATUS ON CASH RELIEF PROVIDED TO BOC WORKERS DURING THE PANDEMIC*					
SL. NO	STATE/UT	DURING FIRST WAVE OF COVID-19		DURING SECOND WAVE OF COVID-19	
		TOTAL BOCW WORKERS GIVEN ASSISTANCE	TOTAL AMOUNT DISBURSED (IN INR CRORE)	TOTAL BOCW WORKERS GIVEN ASSISTANCE	TOTAL AMOUNT DISBURSED (IN INR CRORE)
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	19,67,484	196.75	0	0
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	3,000	0.6	0	0
3	ASSAM	2,21,378	44.28	0	0
4	BIHAR	11,07,696	221.54	0	0
5	CHHATTISGARH	2,02,579	0	0	0
6	GOA	5,117	3.07	0	0
7	GUJARAT	3,74,372	37.44	0	0
8	HARYANA	3,10,935	154.68	0	0
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	1,33,090	77.34	0	0
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR (INCLUDING LADAKH)	1,70,131	68.05	0	0
11	JHARKHAND	1,99,226	20	0	0
12	KARNATAKA	13,62,438	681.22	19,48,000	584.40
13	KERALA	6,94,123	69.44	6,96,129	69.61
14	MADHYA PRADESH	8,91,850	178.37	12,00,000	120
15	MAHARASHTRA	9,67,556	483.78	10,33,052	154.95
16	MANIPUR	52,605	5.26	0	0
17	MEGHALAYA	24,730	12.37	0	0
18	MIZORAM	51,451	15.44	0	0
19	NAGALAND	19,046	3.81	20,000	4
20	ODISHA	18,37,000	275.55	0	0
21	PUNJAB	2,90,638	174.38	5,81,202	87.18
22	RAJASTHAN	7,58,102	1799.91	0	0
23	SIKKIM	7,836	1.57	0	0
24	TAMIL NADU	13,70,601	274.12	0	0
25	TELANGANA	8,30,324	124.55	0	0
26	TRIPURA	39,082	11.72	0	0
27	UTTAR PRADESH	18,24,771	353.84	67,00,000	670
28	UTTARAKHAND	2,28,423	45.68	0	0
29	WEST BENGAL	21,98,349	219.83	0	0
30	DELHI	43,945	43.95	2,10,684	105.342
31	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	12,856	7.01	0	0

32	CHANDIGARH	6,670	4	0	0
33	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	0	0	0	0
34	DAMAN & DIU	0	0	0	0
35	LAKSHADWEEP	1,109	1.65	0	0
36	PUDUCHERRY	35,765	7.15	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,82,44,278</b>	<b>5,618.35</b>	<b>1,23,89,067</b>	<b>1,795.482</b>	

**Table 6.5 | Status on cash relief provided to BoC workers during the pandemic, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1849, Rajya Sabha, 04 August 2021

## DOMESTIC WORKERS

On the specific question of the rights of domestic workers, the Ministry said that the Unorganised Workers' Social Security Act, 2008, now subsumed in the Code on Social Security, 2020, provides for social security to all unorganized workers including domestic workers. It has also listed down the schemes as presented in Table no. 6.6 as they are applicable for domestic workers. However, it dodged the question of whether there is any law that protects the rights of domestic workers. It also dodged the question if there is any check/compliance of labour

laws in households for full-time domestic workers.

The Ministry reported that as per Census 2011 data, the number of domestic workers in the country was 47,81,355. It also presented the state-wise data on domestic workers in the country where it is seen that Maharashtra (9,92,040), West Bengal (5,49,335) and Tamil Nadu (6,05,169) have the maximum number of domestic workers (Unstarred Question No. 2194, Rajya Sabha, 16 December 2021).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	NUMBER OF DOMESTIC WORKERS
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	2,085
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	4,66,209
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	2,855
4	ASSAM	38,397
5	BIHAR	39,685
6	CHANDIGARH	23,110
7	CHHATTISGARH	1,08,422
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	1,403
9	DAMAN & DIU	1,503
10	NCT OF DELHI	2,11,767
11	GOA	20,810
12	GUJARAT	2,39,517
13	HARYANA	1,02,476
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	23,128
15	JAMMU & KASHMIR	18,937
16	JHARKHAND	39,371
17	KARNATAKA	3,26,585
18	KERALA	1,65,012
19	LAKSHADWEEP	39
20	MADHYA PRADESH	1,89,170
21	MAHARASHTRA	9,92,040
22	MANIPUR	1,248

23	MEGHALAYA	11,461
24	MIZORAM	1,718
25	NAGALAND	2,470
26	ODISHA	92,714
27	PUDUCHERRY	22,815
28	PUNJAB	1,41,861
29	RAJASTHAN	99,288
30	SIKKIM	3,157
31	TAMILNADU	6,05,169
32	TRIPURA	8,770
33	UTTAR PRADESH	2,01,316
34	UTTARAKHAND	27,512
35	WEST BENGAL	5,49,335
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>47,81,355</b>

**Table 6.6 | Number of domestic workers, state/UT-wise**  
*Source: Unstarred Question No. 2662, Rajya Sabha, 11 August 2021*

On the question on All India Survey on Domestic Workers, the Ministry reported that the Labour Bureau under the Ministry of Labour and Employment has launched the fieldwork for the All India Survey on Domestic Workers on 22 November 2021. The Survey has been launched along with the release of the instruction manual and schedules. The Labour Bureau aims to complete the survey within one year of the launch date. The objective of the Survey on Domestic Workers (DW) are as follows:

- (i) To estimate the number/proportion of DWs at the national and state levels.

- (ii) To estimate the percentage distribution of DWs estimates: live-in/live-out; formal/informal employment; migrant/non-migrant; their wages and other socio-economic characteristics.
- (iii) Household estimates of live-in/live-out DWs.
- (iv) Average number of DWs engaged by different types of households. The survey covers a sample size from All India (37) States/UTs and 742 districts.

(Unstarred Question No. 2187, Rajya Sabha, 16 December 2021)

## DODGED QUESTIONS

The specific questions on organised workers, gig workers and platform workers have been overlooked by putting under The Code on Social Security, 2020 and existing

running welfare schemes. A crucial question on the planning, strategy and extension of welfare schemes for the e-Shram portal has also been dodged by the Ministry.

## CONCLUSION

Covid-19 had an adverse impact on informal workers, the extent of which has not yet been studied or understood in terms of data. During the second wave, the majority of the states failed to provide assistance to construction workers. Though e-Shram aims to consolidate and maintain a registry of workers in the sector, which will help in future crisis situations, the ministry is silent on

how that will be achieved without a plan to link other schemes to this portal.

As the majority of India's workforce is engaged in the unorganised sector, there cannot be one size fits all solution to these different sections of workers. Each category of workers have different needs and challenges,

which have to be understood and met through customised schemes and services encompassing health, education and social security benefits. Though the new labour codes include gig workers and migrant workers in its gambit,

they will only ensure social protection if the portability of benefits, better enumeration, coverage and last mile delivery of service is ensured.

## REFERENCES

---

Dasgupta S., Agarwal N., and Tomar T. (2020). Covid crisis has exposed gaps in urban Swachh Bharat Mission. It must be revamped. *The Print*. Retrieved from

<https://theprint.in/opinion/covid-crisis-has-exposed-gaps-in-urban-swachh-bharat-mission-it-must-be-revamped/410315/>

Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2011). *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2011 Revision*. United Nations, New York. Retrieved from

[https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/urbanization/WUP2011\\_Report.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/urbanization/WUP2011_Report.pdf)

Indo Global Social Service Society (IGSSS) and Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action (YUVA). (2021). *Seeking Justice for Informal Workers During the COVID-19 Second Wave*. Retrieved from

<https://yuvaindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Seeking-Justice-for-Informal-Workers-During-the-COVID-19-Second-Wave.pdf>

Khan S. (2018). Swachh Bharat Mission (Urban): Need vs Planning. CPR Policy Brief. New Delhi: Centre for Policy Research. Retrieved from DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.10084.27527

Lok Sabha (2021). *Parliament of India: Starred and Unstarred Questions, Lok Sabha. Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs. Published by the Government of India*. Retrieved from

<http://loksabha.nic.in/Questions/qsearch15.aspx>

MoDWS SBM(U). (n.d.). Retrieved 2021, from

<https://jalshakti-ddws.gov.in/>

MoHUA AMRUT. (n. d.). Retrieved 2021, from

<http://amrut.gov.in/>

MoHUA DAY-NULM. (n. d.). Retrieved 2021, from

<https://nulm.gov.in/>

MoHUA PMAY(U). (n. d.). Retrieved 2021, from

<https://pmaymis.gov.in/>

Ministry of Labour and Employment. (n. d.). Retrieved 2021, from <https://labour.gov.in/>

Nath, D. (2019). Targets missed, Accessible India campaign's deadline extended. *The Hindu*. Retrieved from

<https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/targets-missed-accessible-india-campaigns-deadline-extended/article30300230.ece>

Press Information Bureau. (2018). Disabled Friendly Stations. Ministry of Railways, Govt. of India. Retrieved from

<https://pib.gov.in/Pressreleaseshare.aspx?PRID=1555678>

Rajya Sabha (2019). *Parliament of India: Starred and Unstarred Questions, Rajya Sabha. Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs. Published by the Government of India*. Retrieved from

[https://rajyasabha.nic.in/rsnew/Questions/Search\\_QnoWise.aspx](https://rajyasabha.nic.in/rsnew/Questions/Search_QnoWise.aspx)

Unni,A., Singh, J. and Panwar T. (2021). India's cities need to be sustainable, not smart. *The Indian Express*. Retrieved from

<https://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/india-smart-city-mission-7383242/>

## ABOUT YUVA

---

Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action (YUVA) is a non-profit development organisation committed to enabling vulnerable groups to access their rights. YUVA encourages the formation of people's collectives that engage in the discourse on development, thereby ensuring self-determined and sustained collective action in communities. This work is complemented with advocacy and policy recommendations. Founded in Mumbai in 1984, currently YUVA operates in the states of Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Assam and New Delhi.

At the community-level, through an integrated 360-degree approach, YUVA delivers solutions on issues of housing, livelihood, environment and governance. Through research, YUVA creates knowledge that enhances capacity building. Through partnerships in campaigns, YUVA provides solidarity and builds strong alliances to drive change.

---