

PARLIAMENTARY WATCH REPORT

**AN ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONS ASKED ON URBAN
ISSUES IN THE INDIAN PARLIAMENT IN 2020**



Suggested citation:

Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action (YUVA). (2021).
Parliamentary Watch Report: An analysis of questions
asked on urban issues in the Indian Parliament in 2020.
Mumbai: India.

Published by

YUVA (Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action)
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 2020**



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:

Ankit Jha, Anuja Sirohi, Niyoshi Parekh, Shalaka Chauhan

Research support:

Jahanvi Yadav, Tarana Adhikari

Edited by:

Doel Jaikishen

W: www.yuvaindia.org

E: 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 2021

Designed by:

Manoj Hodawadekar

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Abbreviations</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>iv</i>
INTRODUCTION TO THE PARLIAMENTARY WATCH REPORT	1
CHAPTER 1 PRADHAN MANTRI AWAS YOJANA-URBAN	4
CHAPTER 2 ATAL MISSION FOR REJUVENATION AND URBAN TRANSFORMATION	14
CHAPTER 3 SWACHH BHARAT MISSION-URBAN	19
CHAPTER 4 SMART CITIES MISSION	28
CHAPTER 5 DEENDAYAL ANTYODAYA YOJANA-NATIONAL URBAN LIVELIHOODS MISSION	38
CHAPTER 6 LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT	52
<i>References</i>	<i>66</i>

ABBREVIATIONS

AHP	Affordable Housing in Partnership	Gol	Government of India
AMRUT	Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation	HPL	Hindustan Prefab Ltd
ARHC	Affordable Rental Housing Complex	ICCC	Integrated Command and Control Centres
BJP	Bharatiya Janata Party	IHHL	Individual Household Latrines
BLC	Beneficiary Led Construction	IISc	Indian Institute of Science
BMTPC	Building Materials and Technology Promotion Council	INR	Indian Rupee
BOC	Building and Other Construction	IoT	Internet of Things
BOCW	Building and Other Construction Workers	IR	Industrial Relations
CBT	Capacity Building and Training	ISP	Innovative and Special Project
CLSS	Credit Linked Subsidy Scheme	ISSR	In-Situ Slum Redevelopment
CNA	Central Nodal Agency	IT	Information Technology
CPWD	Central Public Works Department	LIC	Life Insurance Corporation of India
CT	Community Toilets	LIG	Low Income Group
DAY-NULM	Deen Dayal Antyodaya Yojana–National Urban Livelihoods Mission	MIG	Middle Income Group
EST&P	Employment Through Skills Training and Placement	MIS	Management Information System
EWS	Economically Weaker Section	MNREGA	Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act
FCRA	Foreign Contribution Regulation Act	MoHUA	Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs
GDP	Gross Domestic Product	MoHUPA	Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation
GKRA	Garib Kalyan Rojgar Abhiyaan	MP	Member of Parliament
		MSW	Municipal Solid Waste

MTA	Model Tenancy Act	SUH	Scheme of Shelter for Urban Homeless
NCT	National Capital Territory	SUSV	Support to Urban Street Vendor
NDA	National Democratic Alliance	SVANidhi	Street Vendor's AtmaNirbhar Nidhi
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation	SWM	Solid Waste Management
NSSO	National Sample Survey Office	TPD	Tonnes Per Day
NULM	National Urban Livelihoods Mission	TVC	Town Vending Committee
ODF	Open Defecation Free	ULB	Urban Local Body
OSHW	Occupational Safety, Health and Working Condition	UT	Union Territory
PLFS	Periodic Labour Force Survey	UWIN	Unorganised Workers Identification Number
PMAY-U	Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana-Urban		
PMGKAY	Pradhan Mantri Garib Kalyan Anna Yojana		
PMJJBY	Pradhan Mantri Jeevan Jyoti Bima Yojana		
PMRPY	Pradhan Mantri Rozgar Protsahan Yojana		
PMSBY	Pradhan Mantri Suraksha Bima Yojana		
PMSYM	Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Maandhan Yojana		
PT	Public Toilets		
RFP	Request for Proposals		
SAAP	State Annual Action Plans		
SBM-U	Swachh Bharat Mission-Urban		
SCM	Smart Cities Mission		
SCP	Smart Cities Proposals		
SEP	Self Employment Programme		
SHG	Self Help Group		
SPV	Special Purpose Vehicle		

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Details	Page	Table	Details	Page
1.1	HOUSES SANCTIONED FOR CONSTRUCTION AND OCCUPIED, AND HOUSES CONSTRUCTED OVER THE PAST SIX YEARS UNDER PMAY-U, STATE/UT-WISE	5	3.5	ALLOCATION AND UTILISATION OF FUNDS UNDER SBM-U, STATE/UT-WISE	26
1.2	HOUSES CONSTRUCTED, ALLOTTED/ OCCUPIED, AND IN PROCESS UNDER PMAY COMPONENTS, STATE/UT-WISE	7	4.1	FUNDS ALLOCATED AND RELEASED YEARLY BY THE GOI UNDER SCM TO STATES/UTS	29
1.3	CLSS ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS AND OTHER SALIENT DETAILS	8	4.2	FUNDS RELEASED BY GOI UNDER SCM, STATE/UT-WISE	30
1.4	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE SANCTIONED, RELEASED AND UTILISED AND HOUSES CONSTRUCTED DURING 2017-18, 2018-19 AND 2019-20, STATE/UT-WISE	9	4.3	FUNDS RELEASED AND EXPENDITURE INCURRED UNDER SCM, STATE/CITY-WISE	33
2.1	WORK COMPLETED AND WORK IN-PROGRESS UNDER AMRUT, STATE/UT-WISE	15	4.4	EASE OF LIVING INDEX, 2019 PARAMETERS, INDICATORS AND WEIGHTAGE	34
2.2	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE ALLOCATED FOR AMRUT DURING 2015-20, STATE/UT-WISE	16	5.1	SKILL TRAINED CANDIDATES PLACED, 2016-20	39
3.1	IHHLS CONSTRUCTED/UNDER CONSTRUCTION AS ON JANUARY 2020, STATE/UT-WISE	20	5.2	SELF-HELP GROUPS FORMED, 2016-20	40
3.2	COMMUNITY/PUBLIC TOILETS (CT/PTS) CONSTRUCTED/UNDER CONSTRUCTION AS ON JANUARY 2020, STATE/UT-WISE	22	5.3	SELF-HELP GROUPS GIVEN A REVOLVING FUND, 2016-20, STATE/UT-WISE	41
3.3	NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF WARDS WITH 100% DOOR TO DOOR COLLECTION 100% SOURCE SEGREGATION, STATE/UT-WISE	24	5.4	LOANS GIVEN TO SHGS UNDER THE SHG-BANK LINKAGE PROGRAMME, 2016-2020, STATE/UT-WISE	43
3.4	WASTE GENERATION AND PROCESSING UNDER SBM-U, STATE/UT-WISE	25	5.5	BENEFICIARIES ASSISTED FOR SETTING UP INDIVIDUAL/GROUP MICRO ENTERPRISES, 2016-2020, STATE/UT-WISE	44
			5.6	PHYSICAL TARGETS AND ACHIEVEMENTS UNDER VARIOUS COMPONENTS OF DAY-NULM DURING 2017-18 AND 2018-19	45
			5.7	NUMBER OF FUNCTIONAL SHELTERS UNDER SHELTERS FOR URBAN HOMELESS (SUH) AND HOMELESS POPULATION, STATE/UT-WISE	46

Table	Details	Page
5.8	BENEFICIARIES UNDER SUPPORT TO STREET VENDORS, DAY-NULM, FROM 2014-15 TILL 28 FEBRUARY 2020 (CUMULATIVE)	48
5.9	APPLICATIONS RECEIVED AND LOAN SANCTIONED UNDER PM SVANIDHI (AS ON 14 SEPTEMBER 2020), STATE/UT-WISE	50
6.1	KEY SCHEMES AND REFORMS OF MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT	52
6.2	EXPENDITURE INCURRED ON THE SOCIAL SECURITY SCHEME OF PMJJBY/ PMSBY FROM THE SOCIAL SECURITY FUND MAINTAINED BY LIC, 2016-2019	54
6.3	BUDGET AND EXPENDITURE DETAILS FOR PM-SYM	54
6.4	ENROLLMENTS UNDER PM-SYM TILL JANUARY 2020, STATE/UT-WISE	55
6.5	CUMULATIVE CONSTRUCTION WORKERS IN 2018 AND 2019	56
6.6	MIGRANT WORKERS WHO HAVE RETURNED TO THEIR HOME STATE, STATE/UT-WISE	58
6.7	UNEMPLOYMENT FROM ANNUAL PERIODIC LABOUR FORCE SURVEY, 2013-19	61

INTRODUCTION

As the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) led National Democratic Alliance (NDA) government completes six consecutive years in power, its flagship schemes are held as key parameters to measure performance on effectiveness and development. In the 2014 General Elections, they were key promises in the NDA Government's manifesto. These schemes are broadly based on critical development issues like housing, livelihoods, sanitation and civic amenities and therefore are also usually surrounded by analytical questions on their on-ground implementation, progress and fund utilisation.

Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action (YUVA's) annual Parliamentary Watch Report, with a focus on flagship schemes, analyses parliamentary questions, a critical source of data and information to hold the government accountable for its policies and actions. This legislative tool is useful in further highlighting the gaps in schemes and enabling the administration to take the required action. This report aims to review and visibilize the performance of various flagship schemes through the answers provided by Government Ministries.

In 2020, the Budget Session of Parliament ended on 23 March, shortened by 12 days due to the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. Shortly after, the AatmaNirbhar Bharat Abhiyaan was announced. A total of 12 Bills were passed by Parliament in this session, which includes Budget Appropriations Bills, the Finance Bill, The Direct Tax Vivad se Vishwas Bill, budget of Jammu and Kashmir, and an amendment to the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code. The 18-day Monsoon Session (held between 14 September and 1 October) suspended the question

hour, allowing only written questions, again owing to the pandemic. The Monsoon Session of Parliament 2020 saw 25 key Bills being passed, including the contentious Labour Bills, Foreign Contribution Regulation Act (FCRA) amendments and farm reforms. The Winter Session was not conducted at all.

The pandemic and the ensuing nationwide lockdown has exposed enormous issues regarding the poor and vulnerable sections. It has widened the extreme socio-spatial inequalities and gaps, because of which the burning questions were raised on forced reverse migration, starvation, unemployment and illness. With the launch of an economic relief package worth INR 20 lakh crores called AatmaNirbhar Bharat Abhiyaan, the Government attempted to intervene in providing relief for income, housing, food and loans to the urban poor (majorly informal and migrant workers). On the labour front, the bill for relaxation and dilution of labour laws was passed in Lok Sabha due to which 10 states have brought about changes in the labour laws, mainly in The Factories Act, 1948, The Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, and The Labour Laws (Exemption from Furnishing Returns and Maintaining Registers by Certain Establishments) Act, 1988.

With the urban poor relying extensively on government relief schemes and measures, analysis on the position and progress of these schemes becomes significant. 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.

A QUICK OVERVIEW OF MAJOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES

PRADHAN MANTRI AWAS YOJANA–URBAN

In 2015, the Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Urban (PMAY–U) 'housing for all' was launched. PMAY–U has proved to be an under-achiever in terms of its implementation and fund utilisation. The number of

houses completed by November 2019 rose by 123 per cent compared to 2018, however the overall completion rate was low at 25 per cent. In the same year, only 40 per cent funds have been released under the scheme, of which only 25 per cent has been utilised (YUVA, 2020).

The numbers have again dropped to less than half, with only 8,40,664 houses constructed in 2019–20, and 3,96,525 houses in 2020–21, as of September 2020. On the funds, overall across all states, only 40 per cent of the funds sanctioned have been released, of which 77 per cent have been utilised. However, compared to the funds sanctioned, only 31 per cent have been utilised.

On 14 May, due to COVID-19 and the resulting lockdown, the Finance Ministry announced that under the PMAY-U and AatmaNirbhar Bharat Abhiyaan package, the government will convert government housing complexes lying vacant to be rented out to migrants at concessional rate. Through the model of Request for Proposals (RFPs), a total of 2.95 lakh beneficiaries have been envisaged to be benefitted by this Scheme. A local survey still has to be conducted to set a rent amount.

ATAL MISSION FOR REJUVENATION AND URBAN TRANSFORMATION (AMRUT)

Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT) aims at improving the quality of urban life by focusing on infrastructure and services. The Mission commenced to benefit urban poor and marginalised communities with a fund allocation of INR 77,640 crores. Till 2019, only INR 7,014.89 crores (9 per cent of the total fund) were utilised. Not even one state/union territory (UT) completed 40 per cent of work proposed in its plan (YUVA, 2020).

The current analysis in 2020 raises concerns on the Mission's implementation and financial progress. So far, contracts have been awarded for 5,384 projects costing INR 73,641 crores under the Mission, of which 2,529 projects (47 per cent) costing INR 9,025 crores (12 per cent) have been completed and 2,855 projects (53 per cent) costing INR 64,616 crores (87 per cent) are under implementation. Further, 476 projects costing INR 10,460 crores are at various stages of tendering.

SWACHH BHARAT MISSION-URBAN (SBM-U)

The Swachh Bharat Mission-Urban (SBM-U) was

launched in 2014. In 2019, the parliamentary questions revealed the information on underutilisation of funds and manipulated success rate. With 50 per cent of the utilisation of released funds, the mission has overachieved its targets which were set in a way that a positive performance can be projected (YUVA, 2020).

This report highlights the Parliamentary questions on the construction of individual household latrines and community/public toilets under this scheme. One can see the over-achievement in the construction of household toilets (64 lakh) and public/community toilets (5,82,573) against the target of 58 lakh and 5,08,589 respectively, showing the result of reduction in targets over the years. The data on the state-wise analysis in the report shows the drastic variance and disparity in the scheme implementation. Regarding solid waste management, a question on the performance revealed that only 60 per cent of the target set for October 2019 has been met. Regarding release of funds, in total INR 9692.24 crores has been released to the States over the last four years, out of the budget of INR 14,622.73 crores, accounting for the release of about 66.28 per cent of the total budget.

SMART CITIES MISSION

Launched in 2015, the Smart Cities Mission (SCM) aimed to cover nearly 9.95 crore people in 100 cities through a two-stage competition. The original completion target of five years was ending in 2020, but it was extended till 2023 as only 15 per cent of the mission could be completed till 2019 (YUVA, 2020). The Mission has been widely criticised on multiple counts, from Special Purpose Vehicles (SPV) failing to comply with the 74th Constitutional Amendment to unauthentic government data and information (Ibid.). Moreover, according to a study by Housing and Land Rights Network, an estimated 22,630 people had been evicted due to infrastructure development under the SCM in India between 2017–2019.

The current analysis shows that only 31 per cent of the projects proposed, worth 12.6 per cent of the total proposed projects (INR 2,05,018 crores) have been completed in the last five years, leading to low budgetary utilisation and completion rate. The citizen perception

survey under the Ease of Living Index assessment included meagre public consultation and representation as compared to the country's significant population. Some questions were raised on its intention on inclusivity, and data and security concerns but no clear answer was provided by the Ministry.

DEENDAYAL ANTYODAYA YOJANA– NATIONAL URBAN LIVELIHOODS MISSION (DAY–NULM)

Launched in 2013 and then renamed in 2015, the Mission aims at reducing urban poverty and vulnerability by providing urban poor the access to employment opportunities, entrepreneurship development, skill training, shelter, healthcare, education, and social assistance.

The parliamentary questions in past years unveiled the Mission's unspent budget, slow progress with regards to on-ground implementation (YUVA 2019 and 2020). The 2020 parliamentary session also shows a similar trend with regard to the scheme's implementation this year. If we compare from 2017–18 where 1,03,066 self-help groups (SHGs) were formed, this year only 73,974 SHGs could come into existence and only 58,529 could receive the revolving fund.

On the total population of the homeless and functionality of the homeless shelters, The Parliamentary Watch Report 2020 highlights that according to a third party survey conducted by States/UTs, currently only 1,367 shelters are functional and 2,07,847 urban homeless persons have been identified. This picture is very contradictory to the Census 2011, where it is mentioned that the urban homeless population in the country is 9,38,348 persons. The questions regarding the population of street vendors, their registration and survey were also asked in the Parliament. The report also brings attention to the city-level street vendors survey that was conducted across 2449 cities, where 15,35,240 street vendors have been identified while ID cards were issued to only 9,25,765.

As a relief measure for street vendors, the Government announced a micro-credit programme under their PM Street Vendor's AatmaNirbhar Nidhi (SVANidhi) scheme to financially support these essential service providers.

The report highlights that only about 35 per cent of the applicants have been sanctioned the loans and out of those approved only 25 per cent have received the loan amount.

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

The Ministry of Labour and Employment received multiple questions in Parliament, ranging from the existing legal framework for the unorganised sector to current steps taken by the Government for the unorganised sector during COVID–19. From the total expenditure of INR 352.67 crores incurred in the Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Maan-dhan scheme (PM-SYM), only 35 lakh beneficiaries were enrolled under the scheme till 2020, with the three states of Uttar Pradesh, Haryana and Maharashtra having 50 per cent of the share alone. The Ministry informed the Parliament that it is planning to develop a National Database for Unorganized Workers seeded with Aadhaar. However, this time also there was a tight silence on the development of the legislative framework for domestic workers. Unlike domestic workers, an announcement of financial assistance of INR 50,000 was made for the construction workers but only half of the registered construction workers could receive the amount and only 7.5 per cent of registered workers could receive food packages from the Building and Other Construction Workers (BOCW) cess fund. The Ministry admitted that it has not maintained data on deaths, job losses and registered migrant workers, although it admits that 1.06 crore migrant workers have made their way back to their home states from various corners of the country. While the Ministry informed that there is a 5.8 per cent rise in the unemployment data, it failed to give any data on unemployment from the onset of the pandemic. In addition to this, a few questions were also raised on the bills passed by Parliament to consolidate 44 major Central labour legislations into 4 Labour Codes, i.e., (a) Code on Wages, 2019 ('Code on Wages'); (b) Occupational Safety, Health and Working Condition Code, 2020 ('OSHW Code'); (c) Industrial Relations Code, 2020 ('IR Code'); (d) Code on Social Security, 2020 ('Social Security Code').

CHAPTER 1: PRADHAN MANTRI AWAS YOJANA–URBAN

INTRODUCTION

The National Democratic Alliance (NDA) Government launched the Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Urban (PMAY–U) on 25 June 2015. Pursuing the Government’s vision of ‘Housing for All by 2022’, it aims to provide every poor family with a habitable pucca¹ house by 2022. The objective of the scheme is to grant central assistance to States/union territories (UTs) for providing all weather pucca houses with basic civic infrastructure to all the eligible urban households, i.e., people belonging to the economically weaker sections (EWS), lower income group (LIG) and middle income group (MIG) categories

The scheme initially set up a target of constructing two crore houses by 2022, which was later reduced to 112 lakhs (according to the demand survey conducted in different states). The scheme has 4 components under which a person can avail a house:

1. In–Situ Slum Redevelopment (ISSR): Aims at providing rehabilitation to slum dwellers, providing them with formal and concrete houses using land as a

resource in participation with the private developers, with central assistance of INR 1 lakh.

2. Beneficiary Led Construction (BLC): A beneficiary living in or outside the slum gets central assistance of INR 1.5 lakh for constructing a new house.
3. Affordable Housing in Partnership (AHP): The Central Government, under AHP provides an assistance of INR 1.5 lakh per dwelling unit for the EWS to the developer
4. Credit Linked Subsidy Scheme (CLSS): Beneficiaries receive an interest subsidy of 6.5 per cent for EWS/LIG, 4 per cent for MIG-I and 3 per cent for MIG-II, calculated on housing loan up to INR 6 lakh, INR 9 lakh and INR 12 lakh, respectively, over a loan tenure of 20 years.

This chapter will analyse the progress of the scheme, while highlighting important features of it that were questioned in the 2020 Parliamentary sessions.

PHYSICAL PROGRESS

In 2012, the Technical Group on Urban Housing Shortage, constituted by the erstwhile Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation (MoHUPA) stated a shortage of 1.8 crore housing units over the period 2012–2017. This figure resonated with the initial announcement of construction of two crore houses under the Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Urban (PMAY–U) by the Prime Minister in June 2015 (MoHUA PMAY, n. d.).

However, later, according to the demand survey, a total demand of one crore houses was recorded by all states/UTs. Of the total demand reported, six states (Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh,

Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu) account for 60 per cent of the total housing demand in the country.

Despite being one of the significant schemes of the present government, the PMAY–U struggled to display a high achievement rate in the initial years of its implementation. The Mission picked up pace only in its fourth year of implementation, with 18,16,669 houses constructed in 2018–19, almost three times the amount of houses constructed between 2015–18. However, the numbers have again dropped to less than half, with only 8,40,664 houses constructed in 2019–20, and 3,96,525 houses in 2020–21, as of September 2020 (Unstarred Question No. 1932, Lok Sabha, 22 September 2020).

1/ A pucca house is one which has walls and roof made of the burnt bricks, stones (packed with lime or cement), cement concrete, timber, etc. (MoSPI, 2018) http://mospi.nic.in/sites/default/files/Statistical_year_book_india_chapters/HOUSING-WRITEUP_0.pdf

Of the estimated demand reported by States/ UTs of 112 lakh, a total of 1,07,70,913 houses have been sanctioned; out of which 66,63,979 are at various stages of construction and 37,41,684 are completed/ delivered, as of September, 2020. This means 96 per cent of the houses promised have been sanctioned but only 33 per cent have been completed in five years (Unstarred Question No. 1190, Lok Sabha, 21 September 2020). So far, 34,53,079 houses have been occupied, which is 30 per cent of the total demand. Several responses in the Budget Session mentioned that the aim was to sanction all houses by March/April 2020. When questioned about the slow pace of implementation in the following Monsoon Session, the Minister was certain that the scheme would still fulfill its goals according to its original timeline by March 2022, and that the progress was as planned.

The maximum number of houses have been completed/

delivered in Uttar Pradesh as of 2020 (6,15,696). This is 41 per cent of the total demand assessed by the State (15,00,000), which was the highest demand assessed in the country (Unstarred Question No. 1060, Rajya Sabha, 27 November 2019). In almost all the States, 90 per cent or more of the houses constructed have been occupied. In Delhi, Telangana and Andhra Pradesh, less than 60 per cent of the houses constructed have been occupied.

The maximum number of houses have been sanctioned in Andhra Pradesh (18.8 per cent) followed by Uttar Pradesh (16.3 per cent), Maharashtra (11.7 per cent) Madhya Pradesh (7.4 per cent) and Gujarat (6.7 per cent). Together, these five states account for a share of 61 per cent of the houses sanctioned in the entire country. The percentage share increase in Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh has been recent (Unstarred Question No. 1932, Lok Sabha, 22 September 2020).

SR. NO.	STATE/UT	HOUSES SANCTIONED FOR CONSTRUCTION	HOUSES OCCUPIED AS ON DATE	HOUSES CONSTRUCTED					
				2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	598	22	-	-	-	20	-	2
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	20,20,335	1,91,351	6,634	3,299	29,791	2,60,223	30,100	16,652
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	7,274	2,222	320	-	16	1,308	385	845
4	ASSAM	1,22,326	22,218	897	66	381	13,847	3,953	1,784
5	BIHAR	3,59,896	76,607	4,850	12,184	2,100	37,464	13,229	3,344
6	CHANDIGARH (UT)	716	6,049	2	4,963	57	154	363	137
7	CHHATTISGARH	2,59,237	98,519	6,682	3,307	3,561	42,096	35,423	9,713
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU (UTS)	6,724	4,141	49	106	431	1,458	1,483	614
9	DELHI	21,508	24,717	12,579	4,244	2,487	17,579	6,320	2,279
10	GOA	1,590	1,531	1	10	99	392	425	604
11	GUJARAT	7,20,616	4,22,711	17,758	28,928	48,726	1,95,638	1,11,871	47,459
12	HARYANA	2,75,985	30,016	1,486	549	2,093	10,535	10,644	4,449
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	10,766	3,977	417	43	202	1,858	1,268	120
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	55,134	8,863	1,141	203	179	3,286	1,877	1,929
15	JHARKHAND	2,02,528	82,433	4,012	3,886	26,421	31,343	12,775	4,320

16	KARNATAKA	6,63,193	1,84,329	7,813	11,920	31,087	94,920	30,591	18,150
17	KERALA	1,21,897	79,917	3,911	301	3,809	42,691	24,314	4,313
18	LADAKH (UT)	1,777	370	62	-	-	280	28	-
19	LAKSHADWEEP (UT)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	MADHYA PRADESH	8,06,655	3,51,366	12,564	5,316	39,119	2,19,728	50,505	19,014
21	MAHARASHTRA	12,59,390	3,80,584	37,222	13,621	35,162	1,20,918	1,17,042	49,456
22	MANIPUR	50,159	5,078	772	24	177	2,231	647	518
23	MEGHALAYA	4,703	938	310	248	27	450	-	10
24	MIZORAM	35,227	3,882	481	118	188	632	1,832	202
25	NAGALAND	32,003	5,435	1,866	494	89	1,394	276	75
26	ODISHA	1,56,671	70,206	2,301	2,771	2,376	46,075	15,413	4,229
27	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	13,698	3,894	439	79	51	1,899	919	459
28	PUNJAB	98,817	33,693	2,852	338	1,860	9,335	12,272	4,520
29	RAJASTHAN	2,19,685	1,00,856	25,754	4,256	8,204	21,641	28,425	20,093
30	SIKKIM	563	322	169	1	2	61	18	19
31	TAMIL NADU	6,88,135	2,86,790	37,055	6,593	34,004	1,57,589	66,089	17,127
32	TELANGANA	2,02,541	75,369	2,647	2,792	3,140	58,171	39,144	27,349
33	TRIPURA	85,638	43,002	182	161	7,303	28,663	6,261	432
34	UTTAR PRADESH	17,55,476	6,20,036	14,116	9,639	12,005	2,97,612	1,65,638	1,16,686
35	UTTARAKHAND	39,679	17,170	743	1,460	1,986	5,669	5,137	1,744
36	WEST BENGAL	4,69,773	2,14,465	22,749	7,191	30,765	89,509	45,997	17,878
TOTAL		107,70,913	34,53,079	2,30,836	1,29,111	3,27,898	18,16,669	8,40,664	3,96,525

Table 1.1 | Houses sanctioned for construction and occupied, and houses constructed over the past six years under PMAY-U, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1932, Lok Sabha, 22 September 2020

COMPONENT-WISE PROGRESS

Of the four components under the scheme, the maximum share of houses have been constructed under Beneficiary Led Construction (BLC) (48.7 per cent), followed by Credit Linked Subsidy Scheme (CLSS) (34.4 per cent), In-Situ Slum Redevelopment (ISSR) (15.8 per cent) and Affordable Housing in Partnership (AHP) (1 per cent) (Unstarred Question No. 1890, Lok Sabha, 22 September 2020).

The difference in progress between the components could also be explained by their different timelines.

Usually, the duration of construction varies from 12 months to 36 months for different verticals of the scheme. The tentative time frame for completing the houses approved under the BLC vertical of the scheme varies from 12 to 18 months. Under AHP and ISSR verticals, the tentative time frame is 24 to 36 months (Unstarred Question No. 215, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020). However, the number of houses constructed also needs to be compared with the number of houses sanctioned under each component, on which no updated data was requested or provided in 2020.

STATE/UT	HOUSES CONSTRUCTED AND ALLOTTED/OCCUPIED (NOS.)				HOUSES IN PROCESS OF ALLOTMENT (NOS.)
	BENEFICIARY LED CONSTRUCTION (BLC)	AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN PARTNERSHIP (AHP)	IN-SITU SLUM REDEVELOPMENT (ISSR)	CREDIT LINKED SUBSIDY SCHEME (CLSS)	
ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	17	-	-	5	-
ANDHRA PRADESH	1,09,944	9,567	39,123	32,717	1,81,386
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	1,752	-	420	50	752
ASSAM	17,210	-	3,052	1,956	-
BIHAR	38,053	-	27,972	10,582	-
CHANDIGARH (UT)	-	-	5,333	716	2,526
CHHATTISGARH	62,529	1,253	19,138	15,599	11,167
DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU (UTS)	384	33	144	3,574	6
DELHI (UT)	-	-	3,209	21,508	35,030
GOA	1	-	-	1,530	-
GUJARAT	26,412	19,988	79,530	2,96,781	66,809
HARYANA	3,100	-	2,814	24,102	2,545
HIMACHAL PRADESH	2,525	-	447	1,005	199
JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	4,060	-	2,887	1,916	64
JHARKHAND	64,089	-	9,077	9,267	600
KARNATAKA	93,129	31	32,180	58,989	19,119
KERALA	54,507	-	8,730	16,680	63
LADAKH (UT)	247	-	62	61	-
LAKSHADWEEP (UT)	-	-	-	-	-
MADHYA PRADESH	2,37,381	3,869	39,572	70,544	14,037
MAHARASHTRA	16,738	-	72,525	2,91,321	46,291
MANIPUR	3,408	-	1,489	181	-
MEGHALAYA	213	-	541	149	251
MIZORAM	1,740	-	1,119	1,023	197
NAGALAND	694	-	4,713	28	1,464
ODISHA	58,638	-	5,281	6,287	3,175
PUDUCHERRY (UT)	2,556	-	552	786	286
PUNJAB	6,854	-	5,847	20,992	-
RAJASTHAN	216	-	37,119	63,521	12,215
SIKKIM	20	-	254	48	-

TAMIL NADU	1,87,908	254	41,757	56,871	31,885
TELANGANA	-	-	27,727	47,642	86,864
TRIPURA	39,879	-	2,034	1,089	-
UTTAR PRADESH	5,02,071	-	33,307	84,658	6,463
UTTARAKHAND	3,173	224	3,449	10,324	427
WEST BENGAL	1,43,160	-	34,371	36,934	-
TOTAL	16,82,608	35,219	5,45,775	11,89,436	5,23,821

Table 1.2 | Houses constructed, allotted/occupied, and in process under PMAY components, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1890, Lok Sabha, 22 September 2020

CREDIT-LINKED SUBSIDY SCHEME

Several questions were raised, specifically on beneficiaries facing inordinate delays in receiving subsidies under the Credit-Linked Subsidy Scheme (CLSS) of the Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Urban (PMAY–U). The Minister responded that interest subsidy under CLSS is disbursed to beneficiaries through Central Nodal Agencies (CNAs) namely, National Housing Bank, Housing and Urban Development Corporation and State Bank of India. These CNAs have been provided with sufficient funds in advance from budgetary as well as extra budgetary resources to disburse interest subsidy to the eligible beneficiaries. Disbursement of interest subsidy under CLSS takes place after observing due diligence at all levels, starting from the submission of application for home loan to primary lending institutions and final clearance by CNAs. So far, an amount of INR 21,883.09

crore of interest subsidy has been disbursed by the CNAs to 8,80,942 beneficiaries under CLSS (Unstarred Question No. 1532, Rajya Sabha, 4 March 2020).

The Minister acknowledged that there are some complaints about delay in the receipt of the CLSS subsidy. For more efficient and transparent processing of the claims and seamless disbursement of interest subsidy to the beneficiaries, the Government has recently launched a CLSS Awas Portal. This portal is beneficiary friendly and also has a CLSS Tracker which enables beneficiaries to track the status of their applications (Unstarred Question No. 2806, Rajya Sabha, 18 March 2020).

The eligibility conditions and other salient details of CLSS are given in Table 1.3.

PARTICULARS	EWS	LIG	MIG - I	MIG - II
SCHEME DURATION	17.06.2015 TO 31.03.2022		01.01.2017 TO 31.03.2020	
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME (INR)	UPTO 3,00,000	3,00,001 TO 6,00,000	6,00,001 TO 12,00,000	12,00,001 TO 18,00,000
DWELLING UNIT CARPET AREA (SQ. M.)	30	60	160	200
INTEREST SUBSIDY (% P.A.)	6.5%		4.0%	3.0%
MAXIMUM LOAN TENURE	20 YEARS			
ELIGIBLE HOUSING LOAN AMOUNT FOR INTEREST SUBSIDY (INR)*	6,00,000		9,00,000	12,00,000

Table 1.3 | CLSS eligibility conditions and other salient details
Source: Starred Question No. 139, Rajya Sabha, 4 March 2020

* Loans beyond this limit will be at non-subsidized rate

FUNDING PATTERNS

Seven states—Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat and Karnataka—account for 72 per cent of the funds sanctioned by the Centre and 68 per cent of the total funds released. Overall, across all states, only 40 per cent of the funds sanctioned have been released, of which 77 per cent have been utilised. However, compared to the funds sanctioned, only 31 per cent have been utilised.

Of the 36 States/UTs, only 14 of them have received more than 50 per cent of the funds sanctioned. Two States, Meghalaya and Sikkim, have received less than 10 per cent of the funds sanctioned (Unstarred Question No. 1521, Rajya Sabha, 4 March 2020). There is no data

on Lakshadweep.

To ensure availability of funds, in addition to budgetary resources, the National Urban Housing Fund has been set up with an outlay of INR 60,000 crores for rapid implementation of the Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana—Urban. Moreover, the ‘Affordable Housing Find’ of INR 10,000 crores has been created in the National Housing Bank using priority sector lending shortfalls in banks/financial institutions. The fund is used for micro financing of the housing finance companies and non-banking financial companies, which provide housing loans at reduced interest rates to individual borrowers for promoting home ownership (Starred Question No. 280, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020).

SL. NO.	STATE/UT	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE (INR CRORE)			YEAR WISE COMPLETION OF HOUSES (NOS.)		
		SANCTIONED	RELEASED	UTILISED	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	9.18	0.45	0.05	-	20	-
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	30,286.50	7,496.43	5,338.10	29,791	2,60,223	26,282
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	162.82	109.23	80.68	16	1,308	185
4	ASSAM	1,767.60	663.08	356.89	381	13,847	2,625
5	BIHAR	4,876.26	1,638.40	917.64	2,100	37,464	11,447
6	CHANDIGARH (UT)	7.78	7.78	7.78	57	154	136
7	CHHATTISGARH	3,845.94	1,712.93	1,037.86	3,561	42,096	27,705
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	80.28	63.72	42.44	366	1,167	543
9	DAMAN AND DIU (UT)	25.25	19.86	16.59	65	291	515
10	DELHI	383.69	383.69	383.69	2,487	17,579	4,006
11	GOA	24.38	23.84	23.48	99	392	539
12	GUJARAT	11,346.14	7,185.27	6,253.20	48,726	1,96,550	84,852
13	HARYANA	4,268.59	798.50	385.36	2,093	10,535	6,603
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	177.04	83.43	63.06	202	1,858	1,133

15	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	833.96	194.15	118.32	179	3,286	2,185
16	JHARKHAND	3,027.38	1,698.93	1,230.45	26,421	31,343	12,787
17	KARNATAKA	10,332.25	3,484.75	2,809.33	31,087	94,920	19,644
18	KERALA	2,066.01	1,244.75	907.01	3,809	42,691	22,026
19	LADAKH (UT)	36.67	17.28	9.79	-	280	28
20	LAKSHADWEEP (UT)	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	MADHYA PRADESH	12,312.77	6,569.61	5,237.01	39,119	2,19,728	43,352
22	MAHARASHTRA	18,327.60	5,681.65	5,046.59	35,162	1,20,918	78,855
23	MANIPUR	642.75	237.04	108.80	177	2,231	637
24	MEGHALAYA	70.68	6.78	6.13	27	450	
25	MIZORAM	473.29	125.00	98.96	188	632	2,105
26	NAGALAND	505.95	166.36	101.18	89	1,394	276
27	ODISHA	2,409.37	1,058.48	884.39	2,376	46,075	14,002
28	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	212.51	108.61	60.23	51	1,899	939
29	PUNJAB	1,424.00	463.41	298.75	1,860	9,335	9,028
30	RAJASTHAN	3,403.26	1,334.68	1,125.03	8,204	21,641	20,656
31	SIKKIM	8.19	3.32	1.89	2	61	11
32	TAMIL NADU	11,892.75	4,839.84	3,623.74	34,004	1,57,589	56,856
33	TELANGANA	3,465.25	1,824.30	1,761.93	3,140	58,171	32,617
34	TRIPURA	1,317.32	722.71	640.08	7,303	28,663	6,242
35	UTTAR PRADESH	24,173.54	10,195.97	6,673.89	12,005	2,97,627	99,858
36	UTTARAKHAND	762.04	392.19	303.04	1,986	5,669	5,398
37	WEST BENGAL	6,369.66	3,378.98	2,842.89	30,765	89,509	39,365
	TOTAL	1,64,060.86*	66,667.61*	51,528.24*	3,27,898	18,17,596	710,485^

Table 1.4 | Central assistance sanctioned, released and utilised and houses constructed during 2017–18, 2018–19 and 2019–20, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1521, Rajya Sabha, 4 March, 2020

*State/UT-wise bifurcation of INR 2,732 crore with regard to CLSS is awaited from the CNAs.

^ including 77,047 beneficiaries for which details awaited from CNAs

AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING COMPLEXES

On 31 July, 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 affordable rent to urban migrants/poor. An estimated amount of INR 600 crores has been envisioned as the total outlay

of the Scheme till the Mission period of PMAY–U, i.e., March 2022. Most of the questions in the Monsoon session on PMAY–U were about this new scheme.

The objective of this scheme is to provide dignified living with necessary civic amenities to urban migrants/poor

near their workplace at affordable rent. It also aims to create a conducive environment by incentivising public/private entities to leverage investment for creating affordable rental housing stock, if they have available vacant land. This Scheme will be implemented by following two models:

- Model-1: Utilising 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 public private partnership mode.

CHOOSING BENEFICIARIES

A model Request for Proposal (RFP) has been shared with States/UTs for selection of concessionaire to develop existing government funded vacant housing complexes for Model-1. Mapping and identification of beneficiaries is the responsibility of selected concessionaires/entities. The concessionaire/entity may tie up with local industries/manufacturers/service providers/educational/health institutions/market associations/others employing urban migrants/poor to provide accommodation in block and remit rent by deducting directly from their salary/fees/any kind of remuneration, as feasible. States/UTs/urban local bodies (ULBs)/parastatals will facilitate tie up between the entity/concessionaire and public/private bodies for migrants in factories, industries/institutions requiring rental accommodation for ensuring occupation

- Model-2: Incentivising 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.

A total of 2.95 lakh beneficiaries have been envisaged to be benefitted by this Scheme, initially (Lok Sabha, Unstarred Question No. 905, 21 September 2020).

and continued revenue.

ARHCs are to be kept outside the purview of existing State Rental Laws by States/UTs. These will be governed by the new law of the State which will be legislated on the line of Model Tenancy Act (MTA) or modification of their existing law in the line of MTA for speedy resolution. (Unstarred Question No. 410, Rajya Sabha, 16 September 2020).

Initial affordable rent for these complexes will be fixed based on a local survey. Subsequently, rent will be enhanced biennially by 8 per cent, subject to a maximum increase of 20 per cent in aggregate over a period of 5 years, effective from the date of signing the contract (Rajya Sabha, Unstarred Question No. 1196, 21 September 2020).

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

A question was raised on whether construction work under Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Urban (PMAY–U) was being done in an environmentally friendly manner and how this was being monitored. In response, the Minister said that the Technology Sub-Mission under PMAY–U aims to facilitate the adoption of modern, innovative and green technologies and building materials. Hindustan Prefab Ltd. (HPL) has been undertaking several construction projects using prefabricated technologies all over the country. A prefabricated housing technology park has been established in the premises of HPL for demonstrating various prefabricated technologies for adoption in housing. Building Materials and Technology Promotion Council (BMTPC), an autonomous organization under

the aegis of Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) is mandated to identify, evaluate and promote emerging construction systems suited to different geo climatic conditions of the country, which are safe, sustainable and environment-friendly and ensure faster delivery of quality houses. So far, BMTPC has evaluated and certified 36 housing technologies/systems under the Performance Appraisal and Certification Scheme. The Central Public Works Department (CPWD) has also published the schedule of rates for new technologies with an objective to give impetus to the use of new technologies. CPWD has so far issued a Schedule of Rates on 29 new and emerging technologies/materials.

The MoHUA is further implementing Global Housing Technology Challenge-India to select the innovative, disaster resilient, sustainable and cost effective technologies for affordable housing in India through a global challenge process. The objective of this challenge is to bring a paradigm shift in the building construction sector through the use of innovative and sustainable technologies.

The MoHUA also issues documents/guidelines regarding the use of new and sustainable technologies. Under PMAY-U, there is a provision for third-party quality monitoring to ensure quality of construction of houses in addition to the State/UT government's own monitoring system. There is also provision for sample monitoring by the MoHUA.

Further, BMTPC undertakes regular training and capacity building programmes for engineers, architects and other construction professionals on alternative/emerging technologies at the State/urban local body (ULB) level. It also organises seminars, workshops and exhibitions to promote emerging technologies in different parts of the country amongst various stakeholders. The evaluation and certification scheme is also carried out by BMTPC under the Technology Sub-Mission. So far, more than 15 lakh houses are constructed/under construction under PMAY-U and other housing schemes in various States/UTs with new and sustainable technologies (Unstarred Question No. 1530, Rajya Sabha, 4 March 2020).

EARTHQUAKE RESISTANT CONSTRUCTION

The Scheme Guidelines provide that the houses under the Mission should be designed and constructed to meet the requirements of structural safety against earthquake, flood, cyclone, landslides, etc. conforming to the National Building Code and other relevant Bureau of Indian Standards codes. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) has issued 'Model Building Bye-Laws-2016' which lays focus on the structural safety of buildings, to protect them against fire, earthquake, noise, structural failures and other hazards. Building bye-laws are legal tools used to regulate coverage, height, building bulk and architectural design

and construction aspects of buildings so as to achieve orderly development of an area.

Further, the National Disaster Management Authority has issued 'National Disaster Management Guidelines on Ensuring Disaster Resilient Construction of Buildings and Infrastructure Financed Through Banks and Other Lending Institutions' in September 2010. This is for ensuring disaster resilience by the techno-financial regime of banks and other lending institutions (Unstarred Question No. 2011, Rajya Sabha, 11 March 2020).

GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL CELL

The Minister was asked whether the grievance redressal cell was receiving an increasing number of complaints, and if 62 per cent of them were about non-receipt of subsidies. The Minister shared the number of public grievances received through the grievances redressal cell of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) during the last three years. In 2017, 2018 and 2019 under PMAY-U 1,842, 2,895 and 3,214 calls were made

respectively, which includes queries related to eligibility criteria under the scheme, application status, information related to the management information system (MIS), status of instalment/subsidy release, miscellaneous calls, along with complaints. He said that the percentage of complaints pertaining to non-receipt of subsidies are much below 62 per cent (Unstarred Question No. 2411, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020).

CONCLUSION

It is evident that the Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Urban (PMAY–U) emerged from the fact that in a country like India, with rapid urbanisation and increasing working population, affordable and accessible housing is a key component and basis for sustainable development. Even after 5 years of its launch, with its steady completion rate and underutilisation of funds, it has not been able to make its reach to the urban poor. Many researchers have claimed that it does not have the vision and provisions as per people's needs and aspirations and has demotivated people by pushing them towards the margins.

While the commitment to provide 'housing for all' is a commendable step, PMAY fails to adopt a human rights approach and relies on the private sector to deliver

(Housing and Land Rights Network, 2018). Moreover, evictions and demolitions of unauthorised colonies have added distress and threat to the lives of marginalised populations. There is a need to understand that the vision of 'housing for all' can be achieved only through the human rights approach where there are efforts made in favour of the urban poor, the homeless, displaced, informal sector workers and marginalised communities. Priority must be given to fundamental components—housing ownership, tenure security, in-situ upgradation, access to basic services, ensuring protection against evictions/displacements, and introduction of new housing typologies like rental housing.

CHAPTER 2

ATAL MISSION FOR REJUVENATION AND URBAN TRANSFORMATION

INTRODUCTION

Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT) was launched on 25 June 2015 for 5 years till May 2020. The Scheme aims to develop basic urban infrastructure in 500 Mission cities or towns by providing full coverage in water supply and management, sewage facilities, green public spaces, urban transport and amenities which will improve quality of life for all, especially the children, the poor and the disadvantaged. Though the ministry provided data regarding financial progress of the scheme, nothing was offered regarding the actual work undertaken.

AMRUT comprises of seven major components:

1. Capacity building
2. Reform implementation
3. Water supply
4. Sewerage and septage management.
5. Storm water drainage
6. Urban transport
7. Development of green spaces and parks

KEY SCHEMES UNDER AMRUT

The key schemes under Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT) focus on the following:

- **Water Supply** system focuses on addition of existing water supply, water treatment plants and universal metering. It also includes the rejuvenation of water bodies, specifically for drinking water supply and recharging of groundwater, and special water supply arrangement for areas facing difficulty in access to water like hills and coastal cities, including those having water quality problems, e.g. presence of arsenic and fluoride
- **Sewerage** focuses on a decentralised network of underground sewerage systems, including augmentation of existing sewerage systems and sewage treatment plants, rehabilitation of old sewerage systems, recycling of water for beneficial purposes and reusing wastewater.
- **Storm Water Drainage** focuses on the construction and improvement of storm water drains in order to reduce and eliminate flooding.
- **Urban Transport** focuses on footpaths/walkways, sidewalks, foot-over bridges and facilities for non-motorised transport, e.g., bicycles, walking, skates, and also includes wheelchair travel.

FUNDING PATTERNS AND FINANCIAL PROGRESS

The selection, appraisal, approval and implementation of individual projects under Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT) is the responsibility of the State/UT. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) approves the State Annual Action Plans (SAAPs) submitted by the States/UTs and releases Central Assistance as per Mission guidelines.

SAAPs of all the States/UTs amounting to INR 77,640 crores, including committed Central Assistance of INR 35,990 crore, have been approved for the entire Mission period under AMRUT, of which projects costing INR 39,011 crores have been approved in the water supply sector and projects costing INR 32,456 crores have been approved in the sewerage and septage management

sector (Unstarred Question No. 4196, Lok Sabha, 19 March 2020).

So far, contracts have been awarded for 5,384 projects costing INR 73,641 crores under the Mission, of which 2,529 projects (47 per cent) costing INR 9,025 crores have been completed and 2,855 projects costing INR 64,616 crores are under implementation. Further, 476 projects costing INR 10,460 crores are at various stages

of tendering.

The most number of projects have been completed in Tamil Nadu (414) worth INR 1,168 crores. The most expensive projects have been completed in Gujarat, with 179 projects worth INR 1,268 crores (Unstarred Question No. 4363, Lok Sabha, 19 March 2020). Assam, Bihar, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Meghalaya have no completed projects.

SL. NO.	STATE/UT	WORK COMPLETED		WORK UNDER IMPLEMENTATION		WORK AT VARIOUS STAGES OF TENDERING	
		NO.	AMOUNT IN INR CRORE	NO.	AMOUNT IN INR CRORE	NO.	AMOUNT IN INR CRORE
1.	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	60	5	19	6	-	-
2.	ANDHRA PRADESH	75	517	150	2,732	1	81
3.	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	-	-	11	123	-	-
4.	ASSAM	-	-	14	623	3	59
5.	BIHAR	-	-	59	2,200	11	367
6.	CHANDIGARH (UT)	9	36	3	21	-	-
7.	CHHATTISGARH	135	275	156	2,020	-	-
8.	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	-	-	2	41	-	-
9.	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	1	7	2	19	-	-
10.	DELHI	6	24	18	538	3	163
11.	GOA	7	15	5	43	7	48
12.	GUJARAT	179	1,268	224	3,620	36	340
13.	HARYANA	40	481	96	2,052	1	1
14.	HIMACHAL PRADESH	29	81	42	217	2	7
15.	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	44	141	44	349	4	38
16.	JHARKHAND	26	57	33	1,558	-	-
17.	KARNATAKA	198	947	198	4,148	4	24
18.	KERALA	408	220	564	1,497	60	447
19.	LAKSHADWEEP (UT)	5	1	3	1	-	-
20.	MADHYA PRADESH	69	446	130	6,029	-	-
21.	MAHARASHTRA	89	391	104	7,169	3	265
22.	MANIPUR	1	1	5	211	-	-
23.	MEGHALAYA	-	-	4	5	8	76
24.	MIZORAM	6	55	10	86	-	-
25.	NAGALAND	2	1	8	57	15	60
26.	ODISHA	133	748	58	956	-	-
27.	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	12	6	9	38	3	16
28.	PUNJAB	5	156	61	900	131	2,712
29.	RAJASTHAN	44	180	104	2,930	2	109
30.	SIKKIM	30	8	9	16	14	5
31.	TAMIL NADU	414	1,168	27	10,310	3	2,041

32.	TELANGANA	25	660	40	1,002	1	2
33.	TRIPURA	1	1	8	158	1	2
34.	UTTAR PRADESH	111	685	405	9,250	129	3,087
35.	UTTARAKHAND	40	62	103	515	6	36
36.	WEST BENGAL	325	382	127	3,178	28	474
TOTAL		2,529	9,025	2,855	64,616	476	10,460

Table 2.1 | : Work completed and work in-progress under AMRUT, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 4363, Lok Sabha, 19 March 2020

Note 1: Data as on 12 March 2020. Note 2: Amounts rounded off to the nearest integer.

The State-wise allocation of Central Assistance is given in Table 2.2. Uttar Pradesh is allocated the highest amount, followed by Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra,

Madhya Pradesh and Karnataka. These five states account for 50 per cent of the total funds allocated under the Mission.

SL. NO.	STATE/UT	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE FOR ENTIRE MISSION UNDER AMRUT (IN INR CRORE)
1.	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	10.82
2.	ANDHRA PRADESH	1,056.62
3.	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	126.22
4.	ASSAM	591.42
5.	BIHAR	1,164.80
6.	CHANDIGARH (UT)	54.09
7.	CHHATTISGARH	1,009.74
8.	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	10.82
9.	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	18.03
10.	DELHI	802.31
11.	GOA	104.58
12.	GUJARAT	2,069.96
13.	HARYANA	764.51
14.	HIMACHAL PRADESH	274.07
15.	JAMMU & KASHMIR (INCLUDING UT OF LADAKH)	533.72
16.	JHARKHAND	566.17
17.	KARNATAKA	2,318.79
18.	KERALA	1,161.20
19.	LAKSHADWEEP (UT)	3.61
20.	MADHYA PRADESH	2,592.86
21.	MAHARASHTRA	3,534.08
22.	MANIPUR	162.28
23.	MEGHALAYA	72.12
24.	MIZORAM	126.22
25.	NAGALAND	108.19
26.	ODISHA	796.97
27.	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	64.91
28.	PUNJAB	1,204.47
29.	RAJASTHAN	1,541.95
30.	SIKKIM	36.06
31.	TAMIL NADU	4,756.58
32.	TELANGANA	832.60

33.	TRIPURA	133.43
34.	UTTAR PRADESH	4,922.46
35.	UTTARAKHAND	533.72
36.	WEST BENGAL	1,929.32
TOTAL		35,989.70

Table 2.2 | Central assistance allocated for AMRUT during 2015–20, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 4196, Lok Sabha, 19 March 2020

DRINKING WATER AND SANITATION FACILITIES

Members of Parliament (MPs) Shri Ramdas C.Tadas and Shri Sangam Lal Gupta asked the Minister whether one-fourth urban population was still devoid of clean drinking water and sanitation facilities, and details of efforts made in the last three years regarding this matter (Unstarred Question No. 4196, Lok Sabha, 19 March 2020).

The Minister of State, Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA), Shri Hardeep Singh Puri in reply states that as per the 'Handbook of Urban Statistics of 2019' published by MoHUA, 91.4 per cent households in urban India have access to source of drinking water,

81.4 per cent have access to latrines and 81.8 per cent have access to drainage facilities. He went on to say that drinking water and sanitation are State subjects, but the Government supplements their efforts through programmes like Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT) and Swachh Bharat Mission–Urban (SBM–U). He provided general information about these two schemes, and the funds allocated State-wise under each of them, but did not directly give specific details about the progress or funding for drinking water and sanitation projects.

WATERLOGGING AND FLOODING IN CITIES

Questions were asked by Member of Parliament (MP) Shri Pankaj Chaudhary about whether the government has paid any heed to the problems of waterlogging and flooding in cities during heavy rainfall and the details of the number of people affected and their financial losses last monsoon due to the same in the urban areas. The Minister of MoHUA, Shri Hardeep Singh Puri, confidently said that they are paying heed to the problem of waterlogging and flooding that happens in the cities during the monsoon season. However, he said that no such records are maintained by the Ministry of the number of people affected and those who lost their lives due to flooding. This makes it difficult to believe that adequate support is being provided, if the magnitude of the problem itself is not being recorded.

Shri Pankaj Chaudhary also asked whether the unplanned urbanisation or inadequate sewerage system has been the major causes behind waterlogging and floods in the urban areas and whether the Government will consider making a better sewerage system during the rainy

season in the identified cities lacking proper planning. The Minister dodged the question by saying that urban planning is a State subject and the construction and maintenance of the sewerage and storm water drainage systems fall under the purview of the urban local body/urban development authority under the State Governments.

He said that MoHUA has issued Urban and Regional Development Plans Formulation and Implementation Guidelines in 2014 which integrate the guidelines on mitigation, prevention and preparedness for urban flooding issued by the National Disaster Management Authority. Also, the Ministry has issued Standard Operating Procedures for Urban Flooding in 2017, which lays down, in a comprehensive manner the specific actions required to be undertaken by the city administration, various departments under the district administration and the State Government. Further, the Ministry has published a Manual on Storm Water Drainage Systems, 2019 to provide guidance towards all

aspects of sustainable design, planning and management of storm water drainage systems and emergency plan for flood response in urban areas. To conclude, he once again gave information on the AMRUT scheme and its focus on

sewerage and septage management (Unstarred Question No. 875, Lok Sabha, 6 February 2020). It seems like the Centre takes only an advisory role on this issue, with the implementation responsibility being left to the States.

CONCLUSION

Equitable provision of basic services such as water, sanitation, drainage, greenery, and transport are key functions for the economic and social development of urban areas. With a small handful of questions being raised on the scheme's progress and reporting, it seems that this scheme has largely been left unscrutinised by the media and even by the Members of Parliament (MPs). With the Scheme's slow implementation and completion rate, there is a need to highlight the factors behind the downfall of this Mission, which can be done

through states' timely audit mechanism. The provision of ensuring universal and just access to basic services to all must stand firm without leaving any household, colony or settlement behind. The Mission must expand and reach unauthorised and informal colonies with a purpose of addressing a wide range of vulnerable and marginalised populations. Moreover, platforms for public engagement must be created and maintained to consult with people, to spread information, and to keep the mission transparent.

CHAPTER 3

SWACHH BHARAT MISSION-URBAN

INTRODUCTION

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 is being implemented by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) in urban areas and by the Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation in rural areas.

In October 2019, SBM–U celebrated a major milestone with all 36 States/UT's declaring themselves Open Defecation Free (ODF) through the construction of over 10 crore toilets (MoDWS, 2020). However, several reports including one by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India have criticised and dismissed this claim (Kanwar, 2019).

SBM–U has been allocated funds to the tune of INR 14,622.73 crores for the entire Mission period (2014–2020) (Unstarred Question No. 2004, Rajya Sabha, 11 March 2020). The objectives of the SBM–U as stated by the MoHUA (2017) are:

1. Elimination of open defecation
2. Eradication of manual scavenging
3. Modern and scientific municipal solid waste (MSW) management
4. To effect behavioral change regarding healthy sanitation practices
5. Generate awareness about sanitation and its linkage with public health
6. Capacity augmentation for urban local bodies (ULBs) to create an enabling environment for private sector participation in capex (capital expenditure) and opex (operation and maintenance).

The Minister of State, MoHUA, Sri Hardeep Singh Puri, in a question regarding the scheme's objectives stated that the two prime objectives of SBM–U are to achieve 100 per cent ODF status and 100 per cent scientific processing of MSW generated in the country. To achieve the objectives, the process of assessing the progress of the scheme includes (Unstarred Question No. 2799, Rajya Sabha, 18 March 2020):

- For individual toilets, geo-tagging at various stages of construction is done.
- For community/public toilets (CT/PTs), urinals and solid waste management projects, Management Information System (MIS) is used.
- Swachh Survekshan, the annual cleanliness survey that ranks cities on various cleanliness parameters is another tool. 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 are also being used.

Key scheme highlights are as follows (Unstarred Question No. 920, Lok Sabha, 6 February 2020):

- All 35 States/UT's, except 56 urban local bodies (ULBs) of West Bengal have been declared ODF.
- The door-to-door collection of MSW is being practised in 96 per cent and source segregation in 74 per cent of 84,475 wards in the country.

- Out of 1,48,945 tonnes per day (TPD) waste generated per day, 60 per cent (i.e., 89,367 TPD) is being scientifically processed.
- 1,304 cities have been certified ODF+ (to ensure

that all CT/PTs are clean and usable), and 481 cities are certified ODF++ (which stipulates various requirements regarding safe containment, transportation and scientific disposal of the septage and sludge) (Unstarred Question No. 4157, Lok Sabha, 19 March 2020).

COMPONENT-WISE ANALYSIS

1. INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLD LATRINES

Swachh Bharat Mission–Urban (SBM–U) boasts of overachieving its target of building individual household latrines (IHHLs) across the country, though deeper analysis has revealed that it has been possible due to a revision of set targets and reducing them by almost 50 per cent. While SBM–U originally targeted the construction of 1.04 crore IHHLs (Deshpande, 2018), the current target as shared by the Minister stands at 58 lakh (Unstarred Question No. 267, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020). Regarding the current status, almost 64 lakh IHHLs have been constructed, placing the achievement rate at about 105 per cent. However, it is disheartening that achievement is not reflective of actual implementation but a resultant of data adjustments made to portray significant success.

State-wise analysis revealed that the top 3 states in terms of over-achievement were the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Meghalaya and Arunachal Pradesh, with an achievement rate of 336 per cent, 318.3 per cent and 269.9 per cent, respectively. However, astonishingly the target set for Andaman and Nicobar Islands was in fact 'zero', for Meghalaya 480 and for Arunachal Pradesh 3,235, all substantially low numbers (Unstarred Question No. 267, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020).

The maximum number of IHHLs have been built in the six states of Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu and Bihar, accounting for 58.9 per cent of all toilets built in urban areas across the country (Lok Sabha, Unstarred Question No. 267, 12 March 2020).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLD LATRINES	
		TARGET	COMPLETED
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	192,508	243,764
2	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	0	336
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	3,235	8,732
4	ASSAM	67,118	73,511
5	BIHAR	406,645	393,613
6	CHANDIGARH (UT)	6,117	6,117
7	CHHATTISGARH	323,445	325,050
8	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	695	1,197
9	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	1,179	1,181
10	NCT OF DELHI	702	725
11	GOA	3,378	3,556
12	GUJARAT	516,937	560,046
13	HARYANA	65,948	64,943
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	6,011	6,687
15	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	51,316	50,435
16	JHARKHAND	214,847	217,801
17	KARNATAKA	312,322	340,941
18	KERALA	28,951	37,207

19	MADHYA PRADESH	543,207	568,097
20	MAHARASHTRA	700,500	700,446
21	MANIPUR	37,274	34,735
22	MEGHALAYA	480	1,528
23	MIZORAM	2,436	2,972
24	NAGALAND	8,451	16,015
25	ODISHA	140,649	132,946
26	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	7,794	5,037
27	PUNJAB	98,187	103,015
28	RAJASTHAN	346,265	366,818
29	SIKKIM	1,018	1,066
30	TAMIL NADU	507,216	507,895
31	TELANGANA	143,837	150,777
32	TRIPURA	19,792	19,623
33	UTTAR PRADESH	888,120	889,906
34	UTTARAKHAND	16,199	19,900
35	WEST BENGAL	167,628	282,542
	TOTAL	5,830,407	6,139,160

Table 3.1 | IHHLs constructed/under construction as on January 2020, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 267, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020

2. COMMUNITY TOILETS/PUBLIC TOILETS

At a national level, the SBM-U has overshoot its target of constructing 5.08 lakh toilets by building 5.8 lakh community toilets/public toilets (CTs/PTs) as per the data shared by the Minister of State, Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA). However, aggregate data has unfortunately masked the large variance in performance that is visible when state wise analysis is done. For example, while in Maharashtra over 1.6 lakh CTs/PTs have been built, the number stands at a mere 46 CTs/PTs constructed in Arunachal Pradesh (0.76 per cent of the total toilets). Maharashtra itself accounts for almost 29 per cent of the total CTs/PTs constructed across the country (Unstarred Question No. 267, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020).

The other visible concern while analysing state wise data for CTs/PTs is the setting of the targets itself. As in the case of individual household latrine (IHHL) targets, CT/PT targets have also been reduced over the years (Deshpande, 2018) and a large variance in the targets of

States/UTs of similar geographic sizes was also observed. For example, the target for the NCT of Delhi was set as 11,000+ CTs/PTs, whereas for Himachal Pradesh a significantly larger state it was set at only 876 CTs/PTs.

The top five states where the maximum number of CTs/PTs have been constructed are Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Karnataka and Delhi, accounting for 66.7 per cent of the total toilets constructed. In terms of target achievement and over achievement, the top 5 ranking States/UT's were Daman and Diu, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Maharashtra, Chandigarh and Delhi. However it is important to highlight that though Daman and Diu and Andaman and Nicobar islands boast of an over achievement rate of 663.6 per cent and 478.57 per cent respectively, the target set for these two UTs were a mere 77 and 126 CTs/PTs, respectively.

The five least performing States/UTs with less than 50 per cent of target achievement rates were Madhya Pradesh, Meghalaya, Telangana, West Bengal and Arunachal Pradesh (Unstarred Question No. 267, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC TOILETS	
		TARGET	COMPLETED
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	21,464	17,757
2	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	126	603
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	387	46
4	ASSAM	3,554	3,286
5	BIHAR	26,438	17,178
6	CHANDIGARH (UT)	976	2,512
7	CHHATTISGARH	17,796	18,832
8	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	77	511
9	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	142	104
10	NCT OF DELHI	11,138	28,244
11	GOA	507	581
12	GUJARAT	31,010	24,149
13	HARYANA	10,394	10,926
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	876	1,567
15	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	3,779	3,523
16	JHARKHAND	12,366	7,551
17	KARNATAKA	34,839	36,550
18	KERALA	4,800	2,802
19	MADHYA PRADESH	40,230	18,633
20	MAHARASHTRA	59,706	1,66,465
21	MANIPUR	620	485
22	MEGHALAYA	362	152
23	MIZORAM	491	461
24	NAGALAND	479	235
25	ODISHA	17,800	9,634
26	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	1,205	778
27	PUNJAB	10,924	11,009
28	RAJASTHAN	26,364	23,147
29	SIKKIM	142	163
30	TAMIL NADU	59,922	92,744
31	TELANGANA	15,543	6,000
32	TRIPURA	587	883
33	UTTAR PRADESH	63,451	64,890
34	UTTARAKHAND	2,611	4,642
35	WEST BENGAL	26,483	5,530
	TOTAL	5,08,589	5,82,573

**Table 3.2 | Community/Public Toilets (CT/PTs) constructed/under construction
as on January 2020, State/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 267, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020

3. SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (SWM)

Solid Waste Management (SWM) refers to a systematic process that comprises a number of steps ranging from segregation, collection, storage, transportation, treatment and others to final safe disposal of solid waste.

It has been a prime objective of the SBM-U and the target was to achieve 100 per cent scientific disposal of solid waste by 2 October 2019. 16 months past

the target date, the rate of scientific disposal stands at about 60 per cent (Unstarred Question No. 920, Lok Sabha, 6 February 2020). The primary steps to ensure scientific disposal i.e., door-to-door collection and waste segregation, have also failed to achieve their intended targets contributing to the overall slacking implementation.

QUESTIONS DODGED

1. INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLD LATRINES

Along with the slow rate of implementation being a concern, there is also the lack of clarity regarding how this target is being achieved with the ministry refusing to provide answers to pertinent and targeted questions on the same. The Minister of State, Sri Hardeep Singh Puri, specifically deflected several questions regarding the physical infrastructure required, being built or in place to ensure scientific disposal of waste. When asked regarding the details of the projects being implemented for collection and management of solid waste, the Minister passed the responsibility on to the urban local bodies (ULBs) who he stated undertook solid waste management (SWM) themselves, contractually, or through self-help groups (SHGs) (Unstarred Question No. 1998, Rajya Sabha, 11 March 2020). In another question that asked for the details of the infrastructure being developed to treat solid waste, the Minister outlined the technologies being used to treat dry, wet and hazardous waste, completely ignoring the question altogether (Unstarred Question No. 2796, Rajya Sabha, 18 March 2020). Lastly, in a direct question on how many waste recycling plants have been installed during the Mission period, the Minister replied that waste recycling plants are installed by private operators and not funded under the Mission (Unstarred Question No. 418, Rajya Sabha, 5 February 2020). **With no clarity on how scientific waste disposal**

is being managed or data on infrastructure available/ planned to do it, the objective and target of SWM both appear to be vaguely outlined and lacking in authenticity. Regarding door-to-door waste collection, all States/UTs except four reported over 85 per cent waste collection. 17 States/UTs reported all wards with 100 per cent door-to-door waste collection. The slow performers were Jammu and Kashmir, Assam, Nagaland and Meghalaya, with Meghalaya reporting only 24 per cent of the wards with 100 per cent door-to-door waste collection (Unstarred Question No. 2398, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020).

Even though the door-to-door collection percentage was high across states, the process of waste segregation requires attention and was not seen to be uniform. A larger difference was observed across states regarding wards with 100 per cent waste segregation. 18 States/UTs reported less than 85 per cent of the wards with 100 per cent waste segregation and seven States/UTs—Bihar, Meghalaya, West Bengal, Nagaland, Delhi, Jammu and Kashmir, Arunachal Pradesh—reported less than one-third of their wards with 100 per cent waste segregation. Only five States/UTs—Kerala, Himachal Pradesh, Dadar and Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu and Chhattisgarh—reported having achieved the target of 100 per cent waste segregation in all their wards (Unstarred Question No. 2398, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	TOTAL WARDS	WARD WITH 100% DOOR-TO-DOOR COLLECTION	% WARDS WITH 100% DOOR-TO-DOOR COLLECTION	WARD WITH 100% SOURCE SEGREGATION	% WARDS WITH 100% SOURCE SEGREGATION
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	3,409	3,409	100%	3,300	97%
2	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	24	24	100%	23	96%
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	75	75	100%	11	15%
4	ASSAM	943	698	74%	368	53%
5	BIHAR	3,377	3,276	97%	1107	34%
6	CHANDIGARH (UT)	26	26	100%	24	92%
7	CHHATTISGARH	3,217	3,217	100%	3,217	100%
8	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	28	28	100%	28	100%
9	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	15	15	100%	15	100%
10	DELHI	294	294	100%	59	20%
11	GOA	217	217	100%	173	80%
12	GUJARAT	1,427	1427	100%	1,187	83%
13	HARYANA	1,496	1,401	94%	935	67%
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	497	490	99%	490	100%
15	JAMMU AND KASHMIR (UT)	1,081	809	75%	137	17%
16	JHARKHAND	932	897	96%	752	84%
17	KARNATAKA	6,464	6,464	100%	3,694	57%
18	KERALA	3,536	3,022	85%	3536	117%
19	MADHYA PRADESH	7,115	7,115	100%	7005	98%
20	MAHARASHTRA	7,322	6,590	90%	6,346	96%
21	MANIPUR	306	270	88%	196	73%
22	MEGHALAYA	114	27	24%	27	24%
23	MIZORAM	264	264	100%	230	87%
24	NAGALAND	234	148	63%	30	20%
25	ODISHA	2,024	2,009	99%	1,402	70%
26	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	122	122	100%	116	95%
27	PUNJAB	3,123	3,064	98%	2,664	87%
28	RAJASTHAN	5,389	5,389	100%	4,419	82%
29	SIKKIM	53	53	100%	50	94%
30	TAMIL NADU	12,814	12,429	97%	10,891	88%
31	TELANGANA	2,112	2,020	96%	1,008	50%
32	TRIPURA	310	277	89%	243	88%
33	UTTAR PRADESH	12,007	11,872	99%	8,294	70%
34	UTTARAKHAND	1,170	1,170	100%	669	57%
35	WEST BENGAL	2,938	2,527	86%	558	22%
	TOTAL	84,475	81,135	96.05%	63,204	74.8%

Table 3.3 | Number and percentage of wards with 100% door to door collection 100% source segregation, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2398, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020

While on average 60 per cent of the solid waste produced is reportedly being processed daily, only Dadar and Nagar Haveli reported processing 100 per cent of the waste and in three states—West Bengal, Meghalaya and Arunachal Pradesh—the processing percentage was seen to be in single digits with Arunachal Pradesh processing 0 percent

of the solid waste daily. This highlights the vast disparity that exists across states in terms of solid waste processing (Unstarred Question No. 2796, Rajya Sabha, 18 March 2020). Overall, the implementation of SWM was seen to be slow in comparison to other objectives of SBM–U, with large variations in performance seen across states.

S.NO.	STATE/UT	TOTAL WASTE GENERATION (METRIC TONNE PER DAY)	TOTAL WASTE PROCESSED (METRIC TONNE PER DAY)	TOTAL WASTE PROCESSING (%)
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	6,141	3,850	63%
2	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	90	86	95%
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	181	0	0%
4	ASSAM	1,432	759	53%
5	BIHAR	2,272	1,159	51%
6	CHANDIGARH (UT)	479	455	95%
7	CHHATTISGARH	1,650	1,485	90%
8	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	32	24	75%
9	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	55	55	100%
10	DELHI	10,500	5,775	55%
11	GOA	250	175	70%
12	GUJARAT	10,274	8,938	87%
13	HARYANA	4,783	2,296	48%
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	377	294	78%
15	JAMMU AND KASHMIR (INCLUDING LEH & LADAKH) (UTS)	1,489	238	16%
16	JHARKHAND	2,135	1,281	60%
17	KARNATAKA	10,000	5,400	54%
18	KERALA	2,696	1,914	71%
19	MADHYA PRADESH	6,424	5,589	87%
20	MAHARASHTRA	22,080	12,806	58%
21	MANIPUR	174	101	58%
22	MEGHALAYA	268	10	4%
23	MIZORAM	236	83	35%
24	NAGALAND	461	277	60%
25	ODISHA	2,721	1,306	48%
26	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	415	55	13%
27	PUNJAB	4,100	2,501	61%
28	RAJASTHAN	6,500	4,680	72%
29	SIKKIM	89	62	70%
30	TAMIL NADU	15,437	10,497	68%
31	TELANGANA	8,634	6,735	78%
32	TRIPURA	450	239	53%
33	UTTAR PRADESH	15,500	8,990	58%
34	UTTARAKHAND	1,589	731	46%
35	WEST BENGAL	7,700	700	9%
TOTAL/AVERAGE		1,47,613	89,545	60%

Table 3.4 | Waste generation and processing under SBM–U, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2796, Rajya Sabha, 18 March 2020

FINANCIAL PROGRESS

The data provided by the Minister regarding the financial aspects of Swachh Bharat Mission–Urban (SBM–U) showed glaring inconsistencies, raising serious questions regarding budget allocations for the scheme. As stated by the Minister, the budget allocated for SBM–U is over INR 14,622.73 crores (Unstarred Question No. 2004, Rajya Sabha, 11 March 2020). However, the first discrepancy occurs when in the State wise budget allocation table, this total is written as 14,013.46 crores (Unstarred Question No. 920, Lok Sabha, 6 February 2020) and more shockingly on adding the individual state budgets, it

adds up only to 13,605.46 crores (Ibid. and Unstarred Question No. 267, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020). **Close to INR 1,000 crores that have been budgeted for the scheme, have not been accounted for/allocated in the State/UT distribution.** Another surprising aspect of the budget allocation is that close to half the budget (INR 7,365.82 crores) has been allocated to solid waste management (SWM), even though the Minister denied any infrastructure expenditure for SWM, stating it to be the responsibility of private companies (Unstarred Question No. 267, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020).

SL. NO.	STATE/UT	TOTAL MISSION ALLOCATION	AMOUNT RELEASED (IN INR CRORE)		
			2017-18	2018-19	2019-20 (AS ON 31 JAN 2020)
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	3.52	0.00	0.33	0.95
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	571.33	139.70	52.87	7.57
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	36.28	3.67	6.46	0.00
4	ASSAM	244.30	46.55	55.90	83.70
5	BIHAR	556.68	52.45	123.21	39.87
6	CHANDIGARH (UT)	28.02	0.00	2.08	18.79
7	CHHATTISGARH	357.85	104.59	101.83	0.00
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	4.13	0.39	0.72	0.00
9	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	2.58	0.00	0.61	0.05
10	DELHI	349.75	0.00	53.13	0.00
11	GOA	17.09	3.56	0.00	3.27
12	GUJARAT	834.15	102.42	279.46	0.00
13	HARYANA	287.08	42.40	5.65	57.66
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	43.95	0.00	6.20	7.63
15	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	200.63	7.11	65.86	19.09
16	JHARKHAND	258.71	47.68	22.56	1.77
17	KARNATAKA	820.96	78.76	312.73	0.00
18	KERALA	219.99	0.00	52.60	0.96
19	MADHYA PRADESH	920.04	293.87	0.00	26.72
20	MAHARASHTRA	1677.80	272.22	268.68	205.62
21	MANIPUR	83.10	3.03	23.24	3.76
22	MEGHALAYA	24.12	3.25	0.00	3.36
23	MIZORAM	49.02	8.91	0.00	12.11
24	NAGALAND	53.49	0.00	17.72	9.89
25	ODISHA	372.02	0.00	40.77	100.45
26	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	28.94	0.00	0.00	0.58
27	PUNJAB	364.02	126.33	0.00	22.27
28	RAJASTHAN	705.46	184.83	17.10	0.00
29	SIKKIM	11.52	1.08	0.00	0.93

30	TAMIL NADU	1200.50	66.05	374.49	236.19
31	TELANGANA	413.74	26.80	19.62	0.00
32	TRIPURA	100.37	0.00	11.46	7.76
33	UTTAR PRADESH	1740.98	592.14	359.18	73.58
34	UTTARAKHAND	112.00	11.73	20.96	15.28
35	WEST BENGAL	911.34	145.15	111.82	0.00
TOTAL		14013.46	2364.68	2407.23	959.82

Table 3.5 | Allocation and utilisation of funds under SBM-U, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 920, Lok Sabha, 6 February 2020

CONCLUSION

To achieve the sanitation goals in an equitable and comprehensive way, the Swachh Bharat Mission–Urban (SBM–U) needs to move beyond its heavy image-building strategies like manipulation of data, exaggeration of progress and inaccurate ground reporting. This Mission requires close examination of the challenges and requirements of users on ground. There is a need to have access to and generate accurate data but also verification of data and information is

essential in strategising the Mission. Most importantly, the focus should be balanced on both the quantity and quality of the Mission as building toilets is not enough. Ensuring sanitation encompasses the key features like accessibility, safety, feasibility, and usability too and for that, the Mission needs to expand its horizon and ensure best practices to facilitate 'the right to adequate health, hygiene and sanitation'.

CHAPTER 4 SMART CITIES MISSION

INTRODUCTION

On 25 June 2015, the Government of India launched the Smart Cities Mission (SCM) for the development of 100 cities as Smart Cities. The cities were selected through a 'City Challenge Process', based on co-operative and competitive federalism (Unstarred Question No. 3201, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020; Unstarred Question No. 877, Lok Sabha, 6 February 2020). The process was conducted in four rounds from January 2016 to June 2018. The Smart Cities are expected to be completed within five years from the date of their selection. A total of 5,151 projects worth INR 2,05,018 crores have been proposed by the 100 Smart Cities as part of their Smart Cities Proposals (SCPs).

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 application of 'Smart Solutions'. Various transformational projects such as Smart Integrated Command and

Control Centres, Smart Roads, Smart Solar and Smart Water projects, etc. have been implemented in this direction (Unstarred Question No. 3167, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020). The Mission also aims to ensure that all citizens, including women and children, benefit from the urban transformation taking place in the Smart Cities. Implementation of the mission at the Smart City level will be done by a Special Purpose Vehicle ('SPV') created for the purpose (Unstarred Question No. 2362, Lok Sabha, 5th March 2020). The SPV will be a Limited Company incorporated under the Companies Act 2013, in which the State/Union Territory and the Urban Local Body ('ULB') will be the promoters having 50:50 equity shareholding.

This chapter analyses the questions raised and answered in the Parliament, and how effectively they shed light on the qualitative success of these initiatives, beyond just the quantitative, physical and financial progress.

NATURE OF THE QUESTIONS

In both sessions of the Parliament combined, 28 questions were raised about the Smart Cities Mission (SCM) in the Lok Sabha, and 20 in the Rajya Sabha. Several questions were repetitive, with 8 questions about the general features of the SCM, 7 questions about the selection criteria for cities and 21 State-specific questions about the cities selected and progress of projects in the State. One question was about whether the Mission had been launched. This reflects a lack of research and thoughtfulness in preparing questions,

especially five years after the launch of the Mission. The responses to these questions included information that is easily available on the Mission's public website, and the opportunity to get more detailed information on the scheme was squandered. Only one question was about the Ease of Living Index, which qualitatively assesses the program, two questions were about gender and other socio-economic equality in the programme implementation, and two questions were about data and security.

FUNDING PATTERN

A total of 5,151 projects worth INR 2,05,018 crores were proposed by the Smart Cities as part of their Smart Cities Proposals (SCPs) (Unstarred Question No. 3127, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020). As per the Smart

Cities Mission (SCM) Statement and Guidelines, the Central Government proposed to give financial support to the extent of INR 48,000 crores over five years, i.e., an average of INR 500 crores per city over the Mission

period. An equal amount, on a matching basis, would be provided by the State urban local bodies (ULBs).

Apart from these funds, various cities have proposed to use funding from public-private partnerships, loans, resources and convergence with other government programmes/missions as part of the SCPs (Unstarred Question No. 2791, Rajya Sabha, 18 March 2020).

The Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) is also facilitating the Memorandum of Understanding/Agreements between Foreign Agencies and States/UTs for more financial assistance. For example, the City Investments to Innovate, Integrate and Sustain programme was launched in July 2018 with Agence Francaise de Development, European Union and the National Institute of Urban Affairs.

FINANCIAL PROGRESS

On 28 February 2020, the Government of India released INR 18,810.10 crores to the States/UTs (Unstarred Question No. 3127, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020). The funds allocated and released has increased each year since 2015. So far, out of 5151 projects, more than 4,500 projects worth INR 1,63,844 crores have been tendered of which more than 3,600 projects worth INR 1,22,123 crores have been grounded and 1,587 projects worth INR 25,926 crores have been completed.

Therefore, only 31 per cent of the projects proposed, worth 12.6 per cent of the cost of the total proposed projects (INR 2,05,018 crore) have been completed in the last five years. 27 of the 36 States/UTs have released more than 75 per cent of the funds given to

them by the Government of India to the special purpose vehicles (SPVs). 6 of them have released 100 per cent of funds to the SPVs. However, Meghalaya and Telangana have released only 9–10 per cent of the funds received to the SPVs. Despite the overall high rate of fund release, in 9 states, the SPVs have utilized less than 25 per cent of the funds received. SPVs in Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Andaman and Nicobar Islands and Daman and Diu have received 100 per cent of the funds from the State, but have used less than 10 per cent of them, with Dadra and Nagar Haveli at 0.85 per cent utilization rate. Hence, even though overall 81 per cent of funds have been released to SPVs and 70 per cent of that has been utilised, there is variation between States in distribution and use.

FINANCIAL YEAR	FUNDS ALLOCATED (IN INR CRORE)	FUNDS RELEASED (IN INR CRORE)
2015-16	1,496.2	1,469.2
2016-17	4,598.5	4,492.5
2017-18	4509.5	4,499.5
2018-19	6,000.0	5856.8
2019-20	6,450.0	2496.0(*)
TOTAL	23,054.2	18,810.1

Table 4.1 | Funds allocated and released yearly by the GoI under SCM to States/UTs
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1531, Rajya Sabha, 4 March 2020

(*) Till 24 February 2020

SL. NO.	STATE/UT	GOI FUNDS RELEASED TO STATES/UTs UNDER SCM (IN INR CRORE)	GOI FUNDS RELEASED BY STATES/UTs TO SPVs (IN INR CRORE)	UTILISATION OF FUNDS BY SPVs (IN INR CRORE)
1	ANDAMAN NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	196	196	11.44
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	1,383.2	1,076	1,237.58
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	118	112	92.50
4	ASSAM	196	191	32.88
5	BIHAR	510	503	109.80
6	CHANDIGARH (UT)	196	196	34.94
7	CHHATTISGARH	376	303	155.73
8	DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	104	104	0.88
9	DAMAN AND DIU (UT)	110	110	1.71
10	DELHI	196	194	121.41
11	GOA	196	112.2	105.70
12	GUJARAT	1,576	1,141.75	1,102.02
13	HARYANA	256	246	190.41
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	254	250	62.53
15	JAMMU AND KASHMIR (UT)	118	111.2	36.08
16	JHARKHAND	294	294	224.87
17	KARNATAKA	1,378	1,325	665.49
18	KERALA	391.51	248	65.61
19	LAKSHADWEEP (UT)	60	52	1.53
20	MADHYA PRADESH	1,955	1,385.6	1,303.57
21	MAHARASHTRA	1,670	1,551.92	974.15
22	MANIPUR	196	117	39.73
23	MEGHALAYA	55	5	1.87
24	MIZORAM	60	55	4.10
25	NAGALAND	196	111	82.69
26	ODISHA	497.93	490	324.04
27	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	103	98	3.22
28	PUNJAB	351.1	304	140.92
29	RAJASTHAN	882	782	536.57
30	SIKKIM	390	390	276.70
31	TAMIL NADU	2,263.62	1,628.81	1,560.45
32	TELANGANA	392	42.08	57.60
33	TRIPURA	201.1	140	90.72
34	UTTAR PRADESH	1,422	1,328	914.77
35	UTTARAKHAND	200.64	165	130.00
36	WEST BENGAL	66	58	54.20
TOTAL		18,810.10	15,416.56	10748.41

Table 4.2 | Funds released by Gol under SCM, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question 1531, Rajya Sabha, 4 March 2020 and SCM MIS as on 24 February, 2020

Of the 20 cities chosen in the first round (highlighted in Table 4.3), only 11 of them have received more than 50 per cent of the INR 500 crore promised from the Center per city, and only 11 of them have utilized more than 70 per cent of the funds released, since 2016. Kochi and Guwahati have utilised less than a third of the funds released to them, even though the 5 years period of their selection is almost over.

When asked about adjustments to the programme due to the underutilisation of funds and bureaucratic and/or administrative delays, the Ministers have responded saying that the Mission progress is satisfactory, and all the cities are expected to complete their projects within 5 years of the date of selection.

SL. NO	STATE/UT	NAME OF CITY	AMOUNTS IN INR CRORE						UTILISATION IN INR CRORE
			2015 -16	2016 -17	2017 -18	2018 -19	2019 -20	TOTAL CENTRAL RELEASE	UTILISATION OF GOI FUNDS
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	VISAKHAPATNAM	188	8	0	98	5.2	299.2	278.5
		TIRUPATI	2	92	102	0	0	196	194.09
		KAKINADA	190	6	0	98	98	392	291.49
		AMARAVATI	0	0	18	372	106	496	473.5
2	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	PORT BLAIR	0	194	2	0	0	196	11.44
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	PASIGHAT	2	0	18	40	0	60	41.41
		ITANAGAR	0	0	0	58	0	58	51.09
4	ASSAM	GUWAHATI	2	189	5	0	0	196	32.88
5	BIHAR	MUZAFFARPUR	2	0	17	41	0	60	3.44
		BHAGALPUR	2	63	131	0	0	196	14.74
		BIHARSHARIF	2	0	0	58	0	60	6.44
		PATNA	0	0	18	176	0	194	85.18
6	CHANDIGARH (UT)	CHANDIGARH	2	71	123	0	0	196	34.94
7	CHATTISGARH	RAIPUR	2	94.5	99.5	0	0	196	102
		BILASPUR	2	0	18	38	0	58	17.22
		ATAL NAGAR	0	0	18	104	0	122	36.51
8	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	DIU	0	0	0	110	0	110	1.71
9	DADAR & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	SILVASSA	0	2	0	102	0	104	0.88
10	DELHI	NDMC	2	194	0	0	0	196	121.41
11	GOA	PANAJI	2	0	110.2	83.8	0	196	105.7
12	GUJARAT	GANDHINAGAR	2	0	18	90	86	196	109.26
		AHMEDABAD	2	194	0	98	0	294	287.07
		SURAT	2	194	0	98	204	498	389.02
		VADODARA	2	0	109	85	0	196	157.02
		RAJKOT	2	0	19	175	0	196	108.59
		DAHOD	2	0	17	167	10	196	51.06
13	HARYANA	KARNAL	2	0	17	41	0	60	18.5
		FARIDABAD	2	92	102	0	0	196	171.91
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	DHARAMSHALA	2	188	6	0	0	196	60.32
		SHIMLA	0	0	18	40	0	58	2.21
15	JHARKHAND	RANCHI	2	92	102	0	98	294	224.87

16	JAMMU KASHMIR (UT)	SRINAGAR	0	1	18	40	0	59	19.08
		JAMMU	0	1	18	40	0	59	17
17	KARNATAKA	MANGALURU	2	0	109	6	79	196	51.18
		BELAGAVI	2	194	0	0	0	196	139.38
		SHIVAMOGGA	2	0	109	85	0	196	86.25
		HUBBALLI-DHARWAD	2	0	109	85	8	204	75.11
		TUMAKURU	2	0	109	85	0	196	158.32
		DAVANAGERE	2	194	0	0	0	196	146.05
		BENGALURU	0	0	0	58	136	194	9.2
18	KERALA	KOCHI	2	194	0	0	1.51	197.51	51.95
		THIRUVANANTHAPURAM	0	0	18	176	0	194	13.66
19	LAKSHADWEEP (UT)	KAVARATTI	2	0	0	58	0	60	1.53
20	MADHYA PRADESH	BHOPAL	188	8	0	98	196	490	392
		INDORE	188	8	0	0	196	392	293.02
		JABALPUR	2	194	0	0	98	294	289
		GWALIOR	2	92	102	0	0	196	73.95
		SAGAR	2	0	18	65	0	85	31.73
		SATNA	2	0	18	176	0	196	27.93
		UJJAIN	2	92	102	0	106	302	195.94
21	MAHARASHTRA	PIMPRI-CHINCHWAD	2	0	18	176	0	196	119.29
		NASHIK	2	92	102	0	0	196	58.16
		THANE	2	62	132	0	0	196	99.84
		GREATER MUMBAI#	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
		AMRAVATI#	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
		SOLAPUR	2	194	0	0	0	196	109.06
		NAGPUR	2	92	102	0	0	196	196
		KALYAN-DOMBIVALI	2	92	102	0	0	196	20.07
		AURANGABAD	2	92	102	0	0	196	171.73
		PUNE	2	194	0	0	98	294	196
22	MANIPUR	IMPHAL	2	0	109	6	79	196	39.73
23	MEGHALAYA	SHILLONG	2	0	0	53	0	55	1.87
24	MIZORAM	AIZAWL	2	0	0	58	0	60	4.1
25	NAGALAND	KOHIMA	2	0	109	6	79	196	82.69
26	ODISHA	BHUBANESWAR	190	6	0	0	105.93	301.93	294
		ROURKELA	2	0	188	6	0	196	30.04
27	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	PUDUCHERRY	2	0	98	3	0	103	3.22
28	PUNJAB	LUDHIANA	2	194	0	0	0	196	99.23
		JALANDHAR	2	0	27	31	0	60	17.28
		AMRITSAR	2	0	27	31	8	68	24.41
29	RAJASTHAN	SULTANPUR LODHI#					27.1	27.1	0
		JAIPUR	188	8	0	0	0	196	136.51
		UDAIPUR	161.2	34.8	0	0	98	294	196
		KOTA	2	91	103	0	0	196	80.98
		AJMER	2	92	102	0	0	196	123.08
30	SIKKIM	NAMCHI	2	0	109	85	0	196	196
		TIRUCHIRAPPALLI	2	0	18	176	0	196	67.25

31	TAMIL NADU	TIRUNELVELI	2	0	18	176	0	196	101.63
		DINDIGUL#	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
		THANJAVUR	2	0	109	85	0	196	115.52
		TIRUPPUR	2	0	18	176	0	196	193.9
		SALEM	2	0	109	85	0	196	107.89
		VELLORE	2	0	109	85	0	196	178.69
		COIMBATORE	2	188	6	0	0	196	196
		MADURAI	2	0	109	85	0	196	179.99
		ERODE	2	0	0	194	0	196	172.71
		THOOTHUKUDI	2	0	18	176	0	196	50.75
		CHENNAI	2	188	6	0	105.62	301.62	194.12
32	TELANGANA	KARIMNAGAR	2	0	18	40	136	196	29.81
		GREATER WARANGAL	2	92	0	6	96	196	27.79
33	TRIPURA	AGARTALA	2	63	131	0	5.1	201.1	90.72
34	UTTAR PRADESH	MORADABAD	2	0	0	58	0	60	6.2
		ALIGARH	2	0	19	89	86	196	75.64
		BAREILLY	2	0	0	58	0	60	4.1
		JHANSI	2	0	36	22	0	60	10.18
		KANPUR	2	0	109	85	0	196	182.18
		PRAYAGRAJ	2	0	19	175	0	196	180.06
		LUCKNOW	2	66.2	127.8	0	0	196	135.93
		VARANASI	2	0	109	85	0	196	140.36
		GHAZIABAD	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
		AGRA	2	0	109	85	0	196	173.04
		RAMPUR#	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
		MEERUT/RAEBARELI#	0	0	2	0	0	2	2
35	UTTARAKHAND	DEHRADUN	2	0	18	40	140.64	200.64	130
36	WEST BENGAL	NEW TOWN KOLKATA	2	0	0	58	0	60	48.2
		BIDHANNAGAR#	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
		DURGAPUR#	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
		HALDIA#	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
		TOTAL	1469.2	4492.5	4499.5	5856.8	2492.1	18810.1	10748.41

Table 4.3 | Funds released and expenditure incurred under SCM, State/city-wise
Source: Unstarred Question 2791, Rajya Sabha, 18 March 2020
stands for 'city not selected as smart city'

APPARATUS TO REVIEW THE SCHEME

The review of progress is carried out regularly at different levels. At the Smart Cities level, it is done by the special purpose vehicle (SPV) created for the purpose. At the state level, the Mission is implemented and coordinated by the State Level High Powered Steering Committees chaired by the respective Chief Secretaries of the States/UTs. At the National Level, the Apex Committee, headed by the Secretary, Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) is responsible. The nominee Director of MoHUA on the Board of SPVs also monitors the progress in respective interactions with the states/Smart Cities through video conferences, review meetings, field visits, regional workshops, etc. at various levels to assess the performance of the cities and to help them improve the same. The Smart Cities also regularly report on

the implementation status of projects under the SCM through the Online Management Information System (MIS).

A few tools are available to review the qualitative impact of the scheme. The Ministry was asked whether the government was planning to release a report card of 100 selected small cities in three categories. The question was dodged and the reply given stated that the Government is not planning to release any report card of 100 selected Smart Cities (Unstarred Question No. 2319, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020). However, the Ministry stated that it is planning to release the Ease of Living Index 2019–2020 to assess the ease of living of citizens across three pillars of Quality of Life, Economic Ability and Sustainability.

EASE OF LIVING INDEX

Dr. Shashi Tharoor raised a question on the list of parameters and indicators and their weightage to rank cities under the Ease of Living Index assessment. The Minister gave the requested details and said that the city rankings have not yet been decided. He did not respond to the question on data insufficiency of the indicators. A Citizen Perception Survey under the Ease of Living Assessment exercise was also conducted from 16

January 2020–20 March 2020. Under this survey, more than 31 lakh citizens had given their feedback online and around 96,000 responses were received from citizens through a face-to-face survey (Unstarred Question No. 1967, Lok Sabha, 22 September 2020). However, this is a small number compared to the overall population of the Smart Cities, and relying on online feedback automatically excludes the large percentage of the population that is not digitally literate.

PILLARS	CATEGORY	INDICATOR NO.	INDICATOR
GENERAL		0	TOTAL POPULATION OF CITY AS PER CENSUS 2011
			TOTAL AREA OF CITY AS OF 31 MARCH 2019
			TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS IN THE CITY AS PER CENSUS 2011
QUALITY OF LIFE	EDUCATION	1	HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE ON EDUCATION
		2	LITERACY RATE
		3	PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO AT THE PRIMARY LEVEL
		4	PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO AT THE UPPER PRIMARY LEVEL
		5	DROPOUT RATE AT SECONDARY LEVEL
		6	PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS WITH ACCESS TO DIGITAL EDUCATION
		7	PERCENTAGE OF PROFESSIONALLY TRAINED TEACHERS
		8	NATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT SURVEY SCORE
	HEALTH	9	HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE ON HEALTH
		10	AVAILABILITY OF HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS
		11	ACCREDITED PUBLIC HEALTH FACILITIES
		12	AVAILABILITY OF HOSPITAL BEDS
		13	PREVALENCE OF DISEASES
	HOUSING AND SHELTER	14	HOUSEHOLDS WITH ELECTRICAL CONNECTIONS

QUALITY OF LIFE		15	BENEFICIARIES UNDER PRADHAN MANTRI AWAS YOJANA (PMAY)
		16	SLUM POPULATION
	WASH AND SWM	17	DEVIATION OF TOTAL WATER SUPPLIED FROM SERVICE-LEVEL BENCHMARK
		18	HOUSEHOLDS WITH PIPED WATER SUPPLY
		19	SWACHH SURVEKSHAN SCORE
		20	AMOUNT OF WASTEWATER TREATED
		21	HOUSEHOLDS CONNECTED TO SEWERAGE NETWORK
		22	COVERAGE OF STORMWATER DRAINAGE NETWORK
	MOBILITY	23	AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT
		24	TRANSPORT RELATED FATALITIES
		25	ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE
	SAFETY AND SECURITY	26	PREVALENCE OF VIOLENT CRIME
		27	EXTENT OF CRIME RECORDED AGAINST WOMEN
		28	EXTENT OF CRIME RECORDED AGAINST CHILDREN
		29	EXTENT OF CRIME RECORDED AGAINST ELDERLY
	RECREATION	30	SHARE OF TOTAL AREA OF CITIES THAT IS OPEN SPACE FOR PUBLIC USE
		31	AVAILABILITY OF : A. MUSIC, DANCE AND DRAMA CENTRE/THEATRES B. COMMUNITY HALLS C. RESTAURANTS D. CINEMA HALLS (NUMBER OF SCREENS)
ECONOMIC ABILITY	LEVEL OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	32	TRADED CLUSTERS
		33	CLUSTER STRENGTH
	ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES	34	CREDIT AVAILABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY
		35	NUMBER OF INCUBATION CENTRES/SKILL DEVELOPMENT CENTRES
SUSTAINABILITY	ENVIRONMENT	37	WATER QUALITY
		38	TOTAL TREE COVER
		39	HOUSEHOLDS USING CLEAN FUEL FOR COOKING
		40	RAINWATER HARVESTING STRUCTURES
		41	AIR QUALITY INDEX: A. SO2 B. NO2 C. PM10 D. PM2.5
	GREEN BUILDING	42	DOES THE CITY INCENTIVISE GREEN BUILDINGS?
		43	GREEN BUILDINGS
	ENERGY CONSUMPTION	44	ENERGY REQUIREMENT VS ENERGY CONSUMPTION
		45	ENERGY CONSUMED FROM RENEWABLE SOURCES
		46	NUMBER OF SUSTAINED ELECTRICAL INTERRUPTIONS
	CITY RESILIENCE	47	DOES THE CITY HAVE A DISASTER MANAGEMENT PLAN IN PLACE?
		48	ARE EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS (EWS) IN PLACE FOR HAZARDS?
		49	NUMBER OF DEATHS AND DIRECTLY AFFECTED PERSONS ATTRIBUTED TO DISASTERS

PILLARS	PILLAR WEIGHT (%)	CATEGORY	CATEGORY WEIGHT (%)
QUALITY OF LIFE	35	EDUCATION	5
		HEALTH	5
		HOUSING AND SHELTER	5
		WATER SANITATION AND HYGIENE AND SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT	5
		MOBILITY	5
		SAFETY AND SECURITY	5
		RECREATION	5
ECONOMIC ABILITY	15	LEVEL OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	7.5
		ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES	7.5
SUSTAINABILITY	20	ENVIRONMENT	5
		GREEN BUILDING	5
		ENERGY CONSUMPTION	5
		CITY RESILIENCE	5
CITIZEN	30	A SURVEY WAS UNDERTAKEN FOR	30
PERCEPTION		ASSESSING CITIZEN PERCEPTION	
SURVEY		UNDER EASE OF LIVING 2019 FRAMEWORK	
	100		100

Table 4.4 | Ease of Living Index, 2019—parameters, indicators and weightage
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1967, Lok Sabha, 22 September 2020

INCLUSIVITY

When questioned regarding the details of the steps that will be undertaken as part of Smart Cities Mission (SCM) to ensure that Indian cities are more gender friendly and non-discriminatory, the question was completely sidestepped. The answer vaguely stated that inclusiveness would be built into SCM to ensure that all citizens, including women and children, benefit from urban transformation and the different projects being implemented by Smart Cities will provide more liveable

and safer conditions to all sections of society, including the vulnerable and homeless, elderly, women, children and people with disabilities (Unstarred Question No. 3175 and 3167, Lok Sabha, 12 March 2020). No response was given to the question on specific sub-committees or projects developed to address gender equality and non-discrimination. Instead, the general information on special purpose vehicles (SPVs) was restated.

DATA AND SECURITY

In response to a question on data portals in the Smart Cities, the Minister said that the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) has launched an Open Data

Portal for Smart Cities and City Data Officers have been appointed in all the Smart Cities. A research project has also been undertaken in collaboration with the Indian

Institute of Science (IISc), Bengaluru, for development of a reference architecture of Urban Data Exchange. The salient features of the Urban Data Exchange are given below:

1. An open source digital exchange for data sharing among various stakeholders.
2. Facilitating access to data in different systems available with different owners, in a secure manner.
3. Access of live and archived data from Internet of Things (IoT) devices, Information Technology (IT) systems, alerts, messages and events, etc.

MoHUA has not taken any decision on selling data to private firms under this exchange. (Unstarred Question No. 2789, Lok Sabha, 18 March 2020).

Another question was asked about the security of Smart Cities and steps taken to protect them from terrorism,

organised crime and cyber attacks. The Minister responded that security features have been incorporated in the initiatives of the Smart Cities Mission (SCM) and considering the ever-expanding risk landscape, a Cyber Security Model framework has been released to all the Smart Cities to ensure security compliance and data protection. The Integrated Command and Control Centres (ICCCs) have already been set up in 45 Smart Cities with centralised monitoring and decision-making capabilities in the area of safety and security. A significant focus of ICCC is on improving public safety through better surveillance, inter-departmental coordination and deployment of Smart Information Technology components/sensors. With the help of ICCCs, Smart Cities are preparing themselves to create better plans against unforeseen security threats (Unstarred Question No. 1514, Lok Sabha, 4 March 2020). However, the question of whether this surveillance culture will benefit all citizens still remains.

IMPACT OF COVID-19

The transport, housing, health and other infrastructure of cities has been put to test under the pandemic. There were two questions on the impact of COVID-19 on ongoing projects under the Smart Cities Mission (SCM) and any changes to the Mission to prepare it for such circumstances in the future. The response mentioned that some projects were temporarily halted in varying proportions across the country, but most have now commenced the work. However, some projects could

be delayed by a few months (Unstarred Question No. 1984, Lok Sabha, 4 March 2020). In terms of future preparation, an advisory was issued by SCM on 18 June 2020, to allow special purpose vehicles (SPVs) flexibility in prioritisation of projects and contained a list of innovations/interventions that could be taken by them in such situations (Unstarred Question No. 1935, Lok Sabha, 4 March 2020).

CONCLUSION

Just like Swachh Bharat Mission (SBM), budgetary expenditure and utilisation under the Smart Cities Mission (SCM) has been low with unauthentic Government data and information. Under the Mission, there has been meagre public consultation and representation, even after claiming that Citizens' aspirations were captured by the selected cities. Moreover, the special purpose vehicles (SPVs) fail to do justice as per the 74th Constitutional Amendment Act as it is the independent and central body responsible for Scheme implementation and monitoring. It is

critical that massive development projects like SCM understand and fulfill the central role of representation and intersectionality. These responsibilities are not limited to paperwork and speeches but are applicable to implementation as well. To make sure that tomorrow's cities provide opportunities and better living conditions for all, it is essential to maintain accessible and transparent platforms to engage with the public. The more insights and accurate data are drawn from people, the greater the chances we have for envisioning inclusive and sustainable cities.

CHAPTER 5

DEENDAYAL ANTYODAYA YOJANA–NATIONAL URBAN LIVELIHOODS MISSION

INTRODUCTION

The National Urban Livelihoods Mission (NULM), later renamed as Deendayal Antyodaya Yojana–National Urban Livelihoods Mission (DAY–NULM) was launched in 2013 with the aim to reduce poverty and vulnerability of the urban poor by enabling them to access gainful self employment and skill wage employment. In urban areas, it is currently being implemented by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation (MoHUPA). Presently the scheme covers 4,041 statutory cities and towns out of the total of 7,935 towns that constitute the urban frame of the country (Census, 2011).

The Mission aims at sustainably improving the livelihoods of the urban poor by strengthening grassroots institutions and structures such as access to credit, social security and skill development. It also aims at providing the urban homeless with shelters equipped with essential services and creating special sections for vulnerable groups such as children, persons with disability, the elderly, etc. For

urban street vendors, the Mission focuses on facilitating access to suitable spaces, institutional credit, skill upgradation, etc. to increase access to emerging market opportunities.

The seven major components of DAY–NULM are:

1. Employment through Skills Training and Placement—EST&P
2. Capacity Building and Training—CBT
3. Self-Employment Programme—SEP
4. Scheme of Shelter for Urban Homeless—SUH
5. Support to Urban Street Vendors—SUSV
6. Innovative and Special Project—ISP

KEY SCHEME HIGHLIGHTS

- The Employment through Skills Training and Placement (EST&P) component focuses on providing assistance for the development and upgrading of the skills of the urban poor by providing training and enhancing their capacity for self-employment and salaried employment. It intends to fill the gap between the demand and availability of local skills by providing skill training programmes as required by the market. So far, 10,58,599 candidates have been skill trained, out of which 5,92,528 candidates are placed for self or wage employment, i.e., about 56 per cent placement.
- The Self-Employment Programme (SEP) focuses on financial assistance to individuals and groups of the urban poor for setting up gainful self-employment ventures and micro-enterprises, suited to their skills, training, aptitude, and local conditions. So far, 4,39,780 self-help groups (SHGs) have been formed, out of which 3,34,971 SHGs have been given revolving funds. Further, 4,93,734 beneficiaries have been assisted for setting up of individual/group micro enterprises, and 6,00,712 loans have been given to SHGs under the SHG Bank-Linkage programme.
- The main objective of the Scheme of Shelter for Urban Homeless (SUH) is to provide shelter and all other essential services to the urban homeless. So far 1,367 SUH are made functional.
- The Support to Urban Street Vendors (SUSV) component of Deendayal Antyodaya Yojana–National

Urban Livelihoods Mission (DAY-NULM) aims at identification of street vendors, skilling, access to credit, vendor market development, pro-vending urban planning along with enhancing social security

options. So far, 2,449 cities have completed street vendors surveys, wherein 15,35,240 street vendors have been identified and 9,25,765 street vendors have been issued identity cards.

COMPONENT-WISE ANALYSIS

1. EST&P AND SEP

Under the Employment through Skills Training and Placement (EST&P) component of the mission, the target for skilling candidates in 2018–19 was 3,98,400 candidates out of which 2,94,457 received skill training, i.e., 73.9 per cent of the target was met. Of those trained, about 62.3 per cent (1,83,519) were placed that year. In 2019–20, the total number of skilled candidates placed dropped to 52,480 persons (Unstarred Question No. 4227, Lok Sabha, 19 March 2020 and Unstarred Question No. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020).

Apart from the number of candidates who were skill trained, all other parameters of the components showed substantial overachievement of the set targets between 2017–19. However, the targets set in all these components themselves witnessed a decline over the

years, without adjusting for the previous year's output. This could have contributed to significantly large achievement figures, skewing the actual increase, which was seen to be only marginally higher and in some cases even lower compared to the previous year (Unstarred Question No. 4227, Lok Sabha, 19 March 2020).

The top five states with the largest number of skilled candidates placed (71.2 per cent) between 2016–20 were Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Gujarat. However, a steep decline in placements was seen in Andhra Pradesh in 2019–20, with only 6 candidates placed that year. The placement trend in Uttar Pradesh has also been declining sharply post 2016–17 (Unstarred Question No. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	CUMULATIVE
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	35,882	11,496	54,610	6	1,01,994
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	0	328	622	1	951
3	ASSAM	293	740	461	949	2,443
4	BIHAR	176	2,142	884	885	4,087
5	CHHATTISGARH	5,858	7,248	5,242	1,100	19,448
6	GOA	66	314	1,257	86	1,723
7	GUJARAT	3,920	8,218	13,233	3,096	28,467
8	HARYANA	0	2,093	3,105	336	5,534
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	86	168	417	121	792
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	0	85	114	84	283
11	JHARKHAND	2,700	15,304	6,953	1,108	26,065
12	KARNATAKA	637	0	0	0	637
13	KERALA	443	3,254	4,832	1,827	10,356
14	MADHYA PRADESH	38,060	7,882	33,905	3,425	83,272
15	MAHARASHTRA	11,768	15,445	32,095	29,938	89,246
16	MANIPUR	0	0	109	99	208
17	MEGHALAYA	317	157	249	16	739
18	MIZORAM	147	171	1,420	589	2,327
19	NAGALAND	341	0	1	0	342
20	ODISHA	2,467	463	0	0	2,930

21	PUNJAB	0	2,213	1,371	1,792	5,376
22	RAJASTHAN	0	920	2,747	1,311	4,978
23	SIKKIM	0	0	248	0	248
24	TAMIL NADU	0	3,771	3,034	298	7,103
25	TELANGANA	1,861	7,734	5,120	1,108	15,823
26	TRIPURA	0	5	228	6	239
27	UTTAR PRADESH	42,174	6,739	745	475	50,133
28	UTTARAKHAND	1,731	3,757	1,076	77	6,641
29	WEST BENGAL	2,691	6,327	8,954	3,639	21,611
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
31	CHANDIGARH (UT)	283	875	466	108	1,732
32	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
33	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
34	DELHI	0	0	21	0	21
35	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL	1,51,901	1,07,849	1,83,519	52,480	4,95,749

Table 5.1 | Skill trained candidates placed, 2016–20
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020

The total number of self-help groups (SHGs) formed in 2018–19 was 91,452 which overshoot the target of 29,985 set for that year (Unstarred Question No. 4227, Lok Sabha, 19 March 2020). In 2019–20, another 73,794 SHGs were formed. The top five states with the largest number of SHGs formed between 2016–19 were—Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal, Andhra

Pradesh and Orissa. They accounted for about 51.6 per cent of the total SHGs formed across states. In all states/UTs, except seven—Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Puducherry, Chandigarh, Delhi and Andman and Nicobar Islands—the number of SHGs formed in 2019–20 were lesser than in the previous year (Unstarred Question No. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	CUMULATIVE
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	4,256	3,774	6,988	13,528	28,546
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	32	32	64	26	154
3	ASSAM	2,491	1,913	2,199	1,807	8,410
4	BIHAR	2,161	1,707	5,176	3,955	12,999
5	CHHATTISGARH	5,117	5,164	3,684	3,376	17,341
6	GOA	40	317	74	14	445
7	GUJARAT	3,526	3,703	5,148	5,199	17,576
8	HARYANA	266	1,554	1,768	570	4,158
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	462	462	476	340	1,740
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	310	346	168	28	852
11	JHARKHAND	1,744	3,126	2,810	1,878	9,558
12	KARNATAKA	2,560	2,252	1,860	882	7,554
13	KERALA	2,757	2,728	3,868	1,406	10,759
14	MADHYA PRADESH	3,579	8,082	5,700	2,409	19,770
15	MAHARASHTRA	7,686	12,074	17,736	12,081	49,577
16	MANIPUR	109	876	416	260	1,661
17	MEGHALAYA	49	55	30	12	146

18	MIZORAM	160	192	79	69	500
19	NAGALAND	56	37	26	11	130
20	ODISHA	12,067	9,222	3,053	1,415	25,757
21	PUNJAB	1,979	1,647	1,209	795	5,630
22	RAJASTHAN	2,784	6,273	4,871	1,360	15,288
23	SIKKIM	4	22	14	8	48
24	TAMIL NADU	10,529	11,865	10,830	11,360	44,584
25	TELANGANA	3,985	3,516	2,993	2,098	12,592
26	TRIPURA	55	227	364	284	930
27	UTTAR PRADESH	6,003	7,203	4,100	3,815	21,121
28	UTTARAKHAND	269	282	197	247	995
29	WEST BENGAL	9,751	14,244	5,468	4,599	34,062
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	0	25	2	19	46
31	CHANDIGARH (UT)	41	21	24	53	139
32	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
33	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
34	DELHI	0	25	12	18	55
35	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	165	100	45	52	362
	TOTAL	84,993	1,03,066	91,452	73,974	3,53,485

Table 5.2 | Self-help groups formed, 2016–20
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020

Among the 73,974 SHGs formed in 2019–20, 58,529 (79.1 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.

A total of 1,70,936 SHGs were given loans under the

SHG–bank linkage programme in 2019–20. In Goa, Sikkim, Delhi, Andaman and 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. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020).

S. NO.	STATES/UT	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	CUMULATIVE
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	11,000	3,726	2,783	6,214	23,723
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	0	11	91	23	125
3	ASSAM	1,668	2,603	2,002	2,612	8,885
4	BIHAR	2,247	1,196	2,655	2,650	8,748
5	CHHATTISGARH	4,834	4,850	3,363	2,286	15,333
6	GOA	75	101	198	100	474
7	GUJARAT	3,716	2,993	5,227	3,935	15,871
8	HARYANA	30	532	854	584	2,000
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	283	625	237	38	1,183
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	597	106	73	129	905
11	JHARKHAND	681	1,860	2,445	1,805	6,791
12	KARNATAKA	299	1,285	432	741	2,757

13	KERALA	19,372	527	6,409	142	26,450
14	MADHYA PRADESH	2,721	5,174	5,105	1,623	14,623
15	MAHARASHTRA	4,004	8,501	15,673	12,349	40,527
16	MANIPUR	149	285	14	53	501
17	MEGHALAYA	0	9	27	36	72
18	MIZORAM	225	200	42	97	564
19	NAGALAND	0	0	0	8	8
20	ODISHA	1,659	5,191	2,301	1,224	10,375
21	PUNJAB	335	551	219	307	1,412
22	RAJASTHAN	2,907	5,225	4,485	826	13,443
23	SIKKIM	0	8	18	11	37
24	TAMIL NADU	1,214	11,723	8,929	10,343	32,209
25	TELANGANA	2,088	1,455	590	79	4,212
26	TRIPURA	180	191	272	327	970
27	UTTAR PRADESH	3,991	4,953	3,319	4,589	16,852
28	UTTARAKHAND	176	104	103	179	562
29	WEST BENGAL	7,317	7,807	9,919	5,169	30,212
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	0	0	11	3	14
31	CHANDIGARH (UT)	50	46	14	19	129
32	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
33	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
34	DELHI	0	0	0	0	0
35	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	0	108	66	28	202
	TOTAL	71,818	71,946	77,876	58,529	2,80,169

Table 5.3 | Self-help groups given a revolving fund, 2016–20, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020

S. NO.	STATE/UT	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	CUMULATIVE
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	5,252	56,257	53,509	1,19,811	2,34,829
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	0	2	2	1	5
3	ASSAM	63	293	482	337	1,175
4	BIHAR	238	109	220	589	1,156
5	CHHATTISGARH	1,440	1,926	1,835	1,570	6,771
6	GOA	0	0	0	0	0
7	GUJARAT	49	1,367	1,911	2,181	5,508
8	HARYANA	113	8	96	47	264
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	46	135	140	86	407
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	72	15	1	1	89
11	JHARKHAND	51	142	275	318	786
12	KARNATAKA	1,234	197	201	128	1,760
13	KERALA	2,618	4,849	7,445	3,617	18,529
14	MADHYA PRADESH	1,610	3,434	2,969	1,475	9,488
15	MAHARASHTRA	1,195	3,175	8,371	7,915	20,656
16	MANIPUR	70	0	17	1	88
17	MEGHALAYA	0	0	1	0	1
18	MIZORAM	21	45	32	25	123
19	NAGALAND	21	0	0	0	21
20	ODISHA	406	1,952	2,435	1,964	6,757
21	PUNJAB	1	3	1	0	5
22	RAJASTHAN	198	278	794	322	1,592
23	SIKKIM	0	0	0	0	0
24	TAMIL NADU	62,095	8,041	9,829	8,381	88,346
25	TELANGANA	29,836	14,788	22,293	13,759	80,676
26	TRIPURA	0	7	18	12	37
27	UTTAR PRADESH	106	1,274	1,220	1,574	4,174
28	UTTARAKHAND	2	7	10	31	50
29	WEST BENGAL	1,747	4,833	7,127	6,778	20,485
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
31	CHANDIGARH (UT)	4	0	0	0	4
32	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
33	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
34	DELHI	0	0	0	0	0
35	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	0	4	45	13	62
	TOTAL	1,08,488	1,03,141	1,21,279	1,70,936	5,03,844

Table 5.4 | Loans given to SHGs under the SHG-Bank Linkage programme, 2016-2020, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020

A total of 4,52,929 beneficiaries have been assisted in setting up individual/group micro enterprises between 2016-20. However, no micro enterprises have been set

up in Delhi, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Daman and Diu, Dadar and Nagar Haveli and Manipur since 2016 (Unstarred Question No. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	CUMULATIVE
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	13,660	21,800	21,260	11,175	67,895
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	0	47	17	5	69
3	ASSAM	58	724	571	242	1,595
4	BIHAR	1,358	1,808	2,070	1,080	6,316
5	CHHATTISGARH	3,711	6,683	6,072	4,092	20,558
6	GOA	10	32	25	15	82
7	GUJARAT	2,704	2,295	3,366	3,164	11,529
8	HARYANA	180	866	913	303	2,262
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	363	654	532	242	1,791
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	794	1,494	1,464	117	3,869
11	JHARKHAND	636	1,534	1,130	1,043	4,343
12	KARNATAKA	1,973	1,053	1,606	640	5,272
13	KERALA	238	928	2,010	1,034	4,210
14	MADHYA PRADESH	13,008	19,228	15,026	3,242	50,504
15	MAHARASHTRA	7,319	7,700	9,624	4,345	28,988
16	MANIPUR	0	0	0	0	0
17	MEGHALAYA	42	13	15	17	87
18	MIZORAM	527	472	194	230	1,423
19	NAGALAND	24	5	51	83	163
20	ODISHA	4,823	5,788	4,810	3,037	18,458
21	PUNJAB	1,717	1,045	1,788	864	5,414
22	RAJASTHAN	3,229	9,979	5,223	679	19,110
23	SIKKIM	2	13	18	0	33
24	TAMIL NADU	21,893	41,658	46,475	32,208	1,42,234
25	TELANGANA	2,290	2,289	1,946	1,447	7,972
26	TRIPURA	53	38	77	24	192
27	UTTAR PRADESH	10,255	13,202	9,927	7,899	41,283
28	UTTARAKHAND	925	812	914	561	3,212
29	WEST BENGAL	1,193	1,089	1,026	676	3,984
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
31	CHANDIGARH (UT)	0	0	3	3	6
32	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
33	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	0	0	0	0	0
34	DELHI	0	0	0	0	0
35	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	56	4	14	1	75
	TOTAL	93,041	1,43,253	1,38,167	78,468	4,52,929

Table 5.5 | Beneficiaries assisted for setting up individual/group micro enterprises, 2016-2020, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 3592, Rajya Sabha, 24 July 2019

All the parameters under the Employment through Skills Training and Placement (EST&P) and Self-Employment Programme (SEP) component of DAY-NULM showed a decline in numbers in 2019-20 except the number of loans given to SHGs under the bank linkage programme. The

number of skilled candidates placed dropped to less than one-third of the previous year. Refer to Table 5.6 for details of the scheme's targets and achievements during 2017-18 and 2018-19.

PARAMETER	2017-18			2018-19		
	TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT	PERCENTAGE	TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT	PERCENTAGE
CANDIDATES TRAINED	2,99,906	1,82,574	60.88	3,98,400	2,94,457	73.91
SELF-HELP GROUPS (SHGS) FORMED	45,636	1,03,066	225.84	29,985	91,452	304.99
SHGS GIVEN REVOLVING FUND	27,490	71,946	261.72	20,989	77,876	371.03
LOANS GIVEN TO SHGS UNDER BANK LINKAGE PROGRAMME	38,491	1,03,141	267.96	24,987	1,21,279	485.37
BENEFICIARIES ASSISTED FOR SETTING UP INDIVIDUAL/ GROUP MICRO-ENTERPRISES	38,486	1,43,253	372.22	24,987	1,38,167	552.96

Table 5.6 | Physical targets and achievements under various components of DAY-NULM during 2017-18 and 2018-19

Source: Unstarred Question No. 4227, Lok Sabha, 19 March 2020

2. SHELTERS FOR URBAN HOMELESS (SUH)

The operational guidelines of the Scheme of Shelter for Urban Homeless (SUH) mandates conducting a systemic third-party survey by the local/municipal bodies to assess accurately the need for shelters at suitable locations. Currently, 22 States/UTs have conducted a third-party survey through which 2,07,847 urban homeless persons have been identified in total (Unstarred Question No. 739, Lok Sabha, 17 September 2020). The states of Rajasthan, Gujarat and Uttar Pradesh have the most number of homeless people, accounting for almost 50 per cent of the total urban homeless amongst the states

surveyed. However, states such as Maharashtra and Delhi with large urban centres are yet to conduct the survey. The Census 2011 pegged the urban homeless population in the country to be 9,38,348 persons.

Currently, only 1,367 shelters are functional, housing a maximum of 50-100 persons per shelter (Unstarred Question No. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020). Therefore, considering the dated Census data or current data of homeless persons from 22 states a clear gap exists between the number of homeless people and the functional shelters, unable to provide shelter to even half the homeless population.

QUESTIONS DODGED

Majority of the questions on the number of homeless shelters provided by the Centre were evaded as well as the financial allocations for the Scheme of Shelter for Urban Homeless (SUH) component.

The Centre has been able to easily relinquish its responsibility of providing shelter to the most destitute

by claiming that 'Land' and 'Colonisation' are State subjects requiring States/UTs to frame policies and schemes for building permanent structures (Unstarred Question No. 2053, Lok Sabha, 22 September 2020). The minister was also able to evade the question asked regarding the quantum of funds utilised specifically for the SUH component, by stating the funds are released in a consolidated manner to the States/UTs, out of

which the appropriate amount is apportioned for the various components as per their requirement (Unstarred Question No. 739, Lok Sabha, 17 September 2020).

Even though robust monitoring and evaluation guidelines for the SUH component of DAY-NULM have been detailed in the operational guidelines, the Centre has

renounced its own accountability by limiting itself to being the funds provider only. Clearly, the lack of political will coupled with slow implementation from the Centre and the States has resulted in the neglect of this population, who continue to struggle even with the existence of such ambitious schemes designed for their upliftment.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	URBAN HOMELESS PERSONS IDENTIFIED	NUMBER OF FUNCTIONAL SHELTERS
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	11,173	79
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	-	0
3	ASSAM	-	1
4	BIHAR	10,253	61
5	CHHATTISGARH	10,216	22
6	GOA	173	0
7	GUJARAT	35,293	48
8	HARYANA	19,015	16
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	879	6
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	-	1
11	JHARKHAND	1,735	92
12	KARNATAKA	-	43
13	KERALA	3,195	17
14	MADHYA PRADESH	-	132
15	MAHARASHTRA	-	76
16	MANIPUR	4	0
17	MEGHALAYA	48	1
18	MIZORAM	3,888	65
19	NAGALAND	50	2
20	ODISHA	13,651	31
21	PUNJAB	-	22
22	RAJASTHAN	39,512	164
23	SIKKIM	13	1
24	TAMIL NADU	14,040	144
25	TELANGANA	2,952	28
26	TRIPURA	-	1
27	UTTAR PRADESH	28,409	88
28	UTTARAKHAND	-	9
29	WEST BENGAL	10,565	22
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	-	0
31	CHANDIGARH (UT)	2,064	1
32	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	-	0
33	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	-	0
34	DELHI	-	193
35	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	719	1
	TOTAL	2,07,847	1,367

Table 5.7 | Number of functional shelters under Shelters for Urban Homeless (SUH) and homeless population, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020 & Unstarred Question No. 739, Lok Sabha, 17 September 2020

3. SUPPORT TO URBAN STREET VENDORS

In India, there are approximately 1 crore street vendors constituting about 2.5 per cent of the total urban population (Naik, 2013). Informal street vending not only provides gainful employment to one of the most marginalised sections of the urban poor but also contributes to the urban economy by providing cost-effective goods and services to middle-class households at affordable rates. Additionally, street vendors provide a platform for marketing goods manufactured by small-scale industries, home-based businesses and small agriculturists allowing them to sell their products to the masses through minimal investment in infrastructure or advertising (Saha, 2011). Lastly, the popularity of street vendors can also be attributed to their dispersed locations across urban neighbourhoods, providing goods and services to consumers within easy reach.

The Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014 mandates conducting surveys of street vendors by Town Vending Committees (TVCs) every five years and providing a Certificate for Vending to all those identified. Further the Support to Urban Street Vendors (SUSV) component of the DAY-NULM supports urban local bodies (ULBs) to conduct the street vendor identification survey and issue

the certificates.

Currently, 18,25,776 street vendors have been identified across States/UTs through surveys and 4,94,920 provided certificates of vending, i.e., a mere 27 per cent of the total identified vendors (Unstarred Question No. 1201, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020). However, vast discrepancies were observed in the data regarding street vendors who were issued vending certificates during the Budget and Monsoon sessions 2020 of the Parliament. In February 2020, the number of street vendors issued vending certificates was reported to be 9,25,765 yet this number was almost halved in September 2020 to 4,94,920, a physical impossibility (Unstarred Question No. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020 & Unstarred Question No. 1201, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020). Moreover, in Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Odisha the number of street vendors issued vending certificates exceeded the number of street vendors identified, again highlighting major fault lines in the data presented and requiring enquiry if certificates were actually issued without proper identification (Unstarred Question No. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	SUPPORT TO URBAN STREET VENDORS		
		CITIES COMPLETED STREET VENDORS' SURVEY	STREET VENDORS IDENTIFIED IN SURVEYED CITIES	STREET VENDORS ISSUED ID CARDS
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	110	92,604	91,974
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	31	1,740	2,537
3	ASSAM	24	5,635	653
4	BIHAR	58	65,507	22,655
5	CHHATTISGARH	57	28,688	26,935
6	GOA	13	0	744
7	GUJARAT	167	1,76,757	1,90,349
8	HARYANA	80	1,02,780	1,051
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	54	5,005	2,945
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	6	7,942	6,434
11	JHARKHAND	44	37,130	24,158
12	KARNATAKA	265	1,10,616	1,01,317
13	KERALA	93	19,445	14,748
14	MADHYA PRADESH	80	88,791	97,262
15	MAHARASHTRA	23	73,627	10
16	MANIPUR	2	0	0
17	MEGHALAYA	3	843	160
18	MIZORAM	6	4,605	2,144
19	NAGALAND	3	1,011	0
20	ODISHA	112	61,511	9,099
21	PUNJAB	165	90,949	34,186
22	RAJASTHAN	189	80,483	64,422
23	SIKKIM	7	0	0
24	TAMIL NADU	664	1,03,102	1,02,737
25	TELANGANA	74	71,519	71,099
26	TRIPURA	20	8,666	0
27	UTTAR PRADESH	48	2,44,769	50,925
28	UTTARAKHAND	45	25,115	4,003
29	WEST BENGAL	0	0	0
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	0	0	0
31	CHANDIGARH (UT)	1	21,622	0
32	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	0	0	0
33	DAMAN & DIU (UT)	0	0	0
34	DELHI	0	0	0

35	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	5	4,778	3,218
	TOTAL	2,449	15,35,240	9,25,765

Table 5.8 | Beneficiaries under Support to Street Vendors, DAY–NULM, from 2014–15 till 28 February 2020 (Cumulative)

Source: Unstarred Question No. 2519, Lok Sabha, 5 March 2020

The COVID–19 pandemic and the subsequent lockdowns have adversely impacted the livelihoods of street vendors across the country. Keeping in mind the urgent need to provide working capital to street vendors to resume their business the government announced the Pradhan Mantri Street Vendors AatmaNirbhar Nidhi (PMSVANidhi) Scheme under its AatmaNirbhar Bharat Abhiyaan. The scheme aims to provide, i. A working capital loan of upto INR 10,000 to street vendors ii. Incentivise regular payment in the form of interest subsidy at 7 per cent per annum on regular repayment of loan iii. Promote digital transactions by providing cashback upto INR 100 per month on undertaking digital transactions iv. Timely or early repayment of loans allowing vendors to be eligible for the next cycle of the loan with an enhanced limit. However, the loan processing scheme that commenced on 2 July 2020 is only eligible for vendors who have been vending on or before 20 March 2020.

Regarding the number of loan applications received, sanctioned and disbursed under PMSVANidhi, the Minister of State of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA), Sri Hardeep Singh Puri, presented data that differed in the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha. In the Lok Sabha, he answered that **11,96,419 applications were received; 4,18,427 sanctioned and INR 103.823 crores of the INR 416.044 crores sanctioned was**

disbursed (i.e. 24.9 per cent)(Unstarred Question No. 857, Lok Sabha, 17 September 2020 & Unstarred Question No. 775, Lok Sabha, 17 September 2020).

However in the Rajya Sabha the numbers presented were 11,59,763 applications received; 4,06,835 sanctioned and INR 1,02,616 crores of loans disbursed (i.e. 25 per cent) (Unstarred Question no. 406, Rajya Sabha, 16 September 2020).

While the difference in figures requires enquiry, both data sets highlight the slow pace of the loan processing scheme with **only about 35 per cent of the applicants who have been sanctioned the loans and out of those approved only 25 per cent who have received the loan amount. The top five states that received the highest number of loan applications were Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Telangana, Gujarat and Maharashtra. While the performance of Madhya Pradesh was seen to be the most efficient across all States/UTs with almost 53 per cent of the applicants being sanctioned loans, the other four states saw the ratio of applications to loans sanctioned in single digits. Looking cumulatively, only about 9 per cent of the street vendors who have applied for loans across States/UTs have been disbursed the sanctioned amount** (Unstarred Question No. 406, Rajya Sabha, 5 March 2020).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	APPLICATIONS RECEIVED	LOANS SANCTIONED	LOANS DISBURSED
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	121	83	15
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	63,076	17,327	1,728
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	705	311	95
4	ASSAM	2,822	208	12
5	BIHAR	22,166	4,515	199
6	CHANDIGARH	504	264	102
7	CHATTISGARH	7,546	1,955	660
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU (UT)	763	259	53

9	DELHI	7,920	990	74
10	GOA	316	152	10
11	GUJARAT	90,718	38,410	1,668
12	HARYANA	16,057	4,559	337
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	1,014	528	120
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	536	28	2
15	JHARKHAND	15,833	7,062	1,104
16	KARNATAKA	37,216	9,788	1,151
17	KERALA	7,648	3,593	1,170
18	LADAKH (UT)	3	0	0
19	MADHYA PRADESH	2,68,942	1,60,490	85,004
20	MAHARASHTRA	83,301	15,305	1,345
21	MANIPUR	2,596	501	85
22	MEGHALAYA	25	1	0
23	MIZORAM	348	172	22
24	NAGALAND	39	4	0
25	ODISHA	21,085	4,750	622
26	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	937	78	6
27	PUNJAB	5,034	1,310	45
28	RAJASTHAN	28,334	6,773	499
29	SIKKIM	4	0	0
30	TAMIL NADU	36,069	11,272	1,488
31	TELANGANA	2,16,070	73,249	4,575
32	TRIPURA	1,195	120	16
33	UTTARAKHAND	2,887	844	104
34	UTTAR PRADESH	2,16,532	41,757	2,048
35	WEST BENGAL	1,401	177	3
TOTAL		11,59,763	4,06,835	1,02,616

Table 5.9 | Applications received and loan sanctioned under PM SVANidhi (as on 14 September 2020), State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question no. 406, Rajya Sabha, 5 March 2020

QUESTIONS DODGED

Questions regarding the actual number of street vendors in the country, registered or unregistered, the plans to identify them or how the government intends to allocate spaces for vending were largely ignored.

Member of Parliament (MP) Shri Devji M. Patel questioned the ministry regarding data on unregistered vendors and the reasons for their large numbers. However the Minister of State responded that the MoHUA does not maintain data regarding unregistered street vendors, thereby relinquishing the need to address their large numbers automatically. With the estimated number of

street vendors being about 10 crores in India, and the slow pace of implementation of the Street Vendors Act with the number of registered vendors stated to be only about 5 lakh, there is a glaring gap in the urgency of providing social protection to this large population or even taking the first step towards accurately identifying them (Unstarred Question No. 1962, Rajya Sabha, 22 September 2020).

When asked by MP Dr. Amar Patnaik, whether the government has taken any steps to identify street vendors and provide spaces for vending, the Minister of State quoted the Street Vendors Act 2014, which

requires States/UTs to frame rules, schemes and bye-laws to ensure that subsequent surveys of street vendors are carried out at least once in five years. He also stated that support is provided to urban local bodies (ULBs) under DAY-NULM to conduct surveys, yet no mention of recent efforts was made or any comment provided regarding the allotment of spaces for vending. Even

though only 22 states have conducted the street vendor survey, between 2014–15 and 2020, the Minister avoided answering whether any action steps were being taken to rectify the situation, follow up with the states or even conduct fresh surveys as is mandated in the 2014 Act after the lapsed five year period (Unstarred Question No. 1201, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020).

CONCLUSION

The celebrated success of the DAY-NULM scheme in reducing urban poverty requires further deliberation and critical enquiry. With large gaps existing in the available data as well as unavailability of data in identifying vulnerable populations, its claim as a success stands questionable and far stretched.

The accuracy of the implementation status of the scheme formulates a secondary concern, when the fundamental step of identifying homeless populations or

number of street vendors has not been addressed so far thereby making it impossible to accurately assess the exact need or extent of support required. Furthermore, the number of persons being skilled, placed or being provided financial assistance is witnessing a decline over the years, again emerging as a cause of concern. Certain states with almost negligible implementation of the scheme need to be urgently questioned along with others who are dragging their feet in order to ensure the success of the scheme at a functional level.

CHAPTER 6 LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Ministry of Labour and Employment (MoLE) 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 Central Government Industrial Tribunals cum Labour Courts and National Industrial Tribunals
- Workers' education
- Labour and employment statistics

KEY SCHEMES	LABOUR WELFARE ACTS	LABOUR REFORMS
PRADHAN MANTRI ROZGAR PROTSAHAN YOJANA (PMRPY)	THE UNORGANISED WORKERS SOCIAL SECURITY ACT 2008	THE CODE ON WAGES, 2019
PRADHAN MANTRI SHRAM YOGI MAANDHAN YOJANA (PMSYM)	THE BONDED LABOUR SYSTEM (ABOLITION) ACT, 1976	THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, HEALTH AND WORKING CONDITIONS CODE, 2019
NATIONAL PENSION SCHEME FOR TRADERS, SHOPKEEPERS AND SELF-EMPLOYED PERSONS	THE INTER-STATE MIGRANT WORKMEN (REGULATION OF EMPLOYMENT AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) ACT, 1979	THE CODE ON SOCIAL SECURITY, 2019
PRADHAN MANTRI JEEVAN JYOTI BIMA YOJANA (PMJJBY) AND PRADHAN MANTRI SURAKSHA BIMA YOJANA (PMSBY) CONVERGED WITH AAM ADAMI BIMA YOJANA ATAL BEEMIT VYAKTI KALYAN YOJANA	THE CONTRACT LABOUR (REGULATION & ABOLITION) ACT, 1970	THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS (IR) CODE
LABOUR TRIBUNALS, COURTS OF ENQUIRY AND CONCILIATION BOARDS	THE BEEDI WORKERS WELFARE FUND ACT, 1976	
REHABILITATION OF BONDED LABOURER	THE MINIMUM WAGE ACT, 1948	

Table 6.1 | Key schemes and reforms of Ministry of Labour and Employment
Source: Ministry of Labour and Employment, n.d.

The informal sector, despite being a huge contributor to India's gross domestic product (GDP), is often neglected when it comes to supportive policies especially in times of crises (SEWA, 2020). With COVID-19 and full lockdown measures, the reality of the labour schemes and programmes was uncovered. Due to tremendous neglect

in legal recognition, protection, security and welfare for the unorganised workers, they were made destitute, unemployed, and vulnerable. Most of the measures taken by the government, such as targeted cash transfers and tax benefits, also excluded the vast army of informal economy workers (Khan and Mansoor, 2020).

THE UNORGANISED SECTOR

The Ministry communicated that there is no separate published data for the unorganised sector as a whole but it is planning to develop a National Database for Unorganised Workers seeded with Aadhaar. On the status of implementation of Unorganised Workers' Social Security Act, 2008, the Ministry shared that the pace of fund utilisation for Pradhan Mantri Jeevan Jyoti Bima Yojana (PMJJBY)/ Pradhan Mantri Suraksha Bima Yojana (PMSBY) has been increased during the period of 3 years. For Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Maan-dhan (PM-SYM), the total expenditure/fund allocated to LIC (as per 2019-20) was INR 352.67 crores which fell significantly short of both its budget estimate (INR 500 crores) and revised estimate (INR 408 crores).

The Indian labour market is characterised by the predominance of informal employment with more than 90 per cent of India's informal workforce working as self-employed and casual workers (Srija and Shirke, 2014). Most workers in the informal economy lack legal recognition and protection with nearly no written job contracts; long working hours, low pay, and difficult working conditions with negative consequences on their health and wellbeing, and; rampant child and forced labour, where women are generally made to work in vulnerable, low-paid, or undervalued jobs (National Sample Survey Office, n.d.).

UNORGANISED WORKERS' SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, 2008

The Unorganised Workers' Social Security Act was enacted as per the National Social Security Board for recommending the formulation of 'social security schemes viz. life and disability cover, health and maternity benefits, old age protection and any other benefit' as may be determined by the Government for unorganised workers. The Unorganised Workers' Social Security Act, 2008 stipulates formulation of suitable welfare schemes

The ministry communicated that there is no separate published data for the unorganised sector as a whole. This was a reply to the Parliamentary question on whether 90 per cent of the country's workforce is employed in the informal sector with no minimum wages or any kind of social security (Unstarred Question No. 1550, Rajya Sabha, 4 March 2020). According to the survey conducted by the National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) during 2011-2012 the total employment in the unorganised sector in the country was 39 crores (Unstarred Question No. 3536, Lok Sabha, 16 March 2020).

For the first time, the Ministry of Labour and Employment informed that it envisages the development of a National Database for Unorganised Workers seeded with Aadhaar for all unorganised workers. The project will enroll unorganised workers, including migrant workers, to help them get employment and other assistance (Unstarred Question No. 412, Rajya Sabha, 16 September 2020). This decision can offer support to unorganised workers, enabling their access to basic labour rights like minimum wage and social security and welfare. Although the Supreme Court has not yet ruled on the legitimacy of making Aadhaar mandatory for entitlements, the entire Unorganised Workers Identification Number (UWIN) platform is built around Aadhaar (Jebaraj, 2018).

for unorganised workers on matters relating to: (i) life and disability cover under Pradhan Mantri Jeevan Jyoti Bima Yojana (PMJJBY) and Pradhan Mantri Suraksha Bima Yojana (PMSBY), (ii) health and maternity benefits, (iii) old age protection under PM-SYM and (iv) any other benefit as may be determined by the Central Government (Unstarred Question No. 431, Rajya Sabha, 5 February 2020).

Life and disability cover is provided by the Central

Government through PMJJBY and PMSBY to the unorganised workers, depending upon their eligibility. The health and maternity benefits are addressed through the Ayushman Bharat scheme. For old age protection in the form of monthly pension, the Ministry of Labour and Employment launched Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Maandhan (PM-SYM) Yojana in 2019, which is a voluntary and contributory pension scheme providing monthly minimum assured pension of INR 3,000 on attaining the age of 60 years (Unstarred Question No. 1540, Rajya Sabha, 4 March 2020).

On the status of implementation of the Unorganised Workers' Social Security Act, 2008, the Ministry shared that the pace of fund utilisation for PMJJBY/PMSBY has been increased during the period of 3 years. While the second year expenditure increased with approximately

INR 50 crores, in the next year it increased substantially with INR 150 crores (approximately). For PM-SYM, the total expenditure/fund allocated to LIC (as per 2019–20) was INR 352.67 crores, which fell significantly short of both the budget estimate (INR 500 crores) and revised estimate (INR 408 crores). It should be noted that the estimate for 2019–20 was set much higher than the estimates from 2018–19.

Funds under PMJJBY/PMSBY and PM-SYM are not allocated to the State/UT governments for implementation. However, the expenditure incurred on the Social Security Scheme of PMJJBY/PMSBY from the Social Security Fund maintained by LIC, during the last three years towards providing insurance cover is as given in Table 6.2.

YEAR	EXPENDITURE (IN INR CRORE)
2016–17	385.34
2017–18	435.16
2018–19	587.52

Table 6.2 | Expenditure incurred on the Social Security Scheme of PMJJBY/ PMSBY from the Social Security Fund maintained by LIC, 2016–2019
Source: Unstarred Question No. 431, Rajya Sabha, 5 March 2020

The budget and expenditure details for the PM-SYM scheme is detailed in Table 6.3

2018–19		2019–20		
BUDGET ESTIMATE/ REVISED ESTIMATE	EXPENDITURE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	REVISED ESTIMATE	TOTAL EXPENDITURE/ FUND ALLOCATED TO LIC (AS ON 31.12.2019)
0/50	49.49	500	408	352.67

Table 6.3 | Budget and expenditure details for PM-SYM
Source: Unstarred Question No. 431 Rajya Sabha, 5 February 2020

The total number of enrollments under PM-SYM in the country is estimated at around 35 lakh with over 6 lakh of beneficiaries from Haryana, and over 5 lakh from

Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh each. These 3 states alone account for 50 per cent of all the enrollments in the country.

STATE/UT	ENROLLMENTS TILL 17 JANUARY 2020
HARYANA	6,18,857
CHHATTISGARH	1,76,683
GUJARAT	3,64,519
HIMACHAL PRADESH	37,917
TRIPURA	19,646
JAMMU AND KASHMIR (INCLUDING LADAKH) (UTS)	65,181
MAHARASHTRA	5,77,473
ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	1,638
JHARKHAND	1,26,542
ODISHA	1,52,709
UTTARAKHAND	31,432
DAMAN AND DIU (UT)	741
UTTAR PRADESH	5,68,871
CHANDIGARH (UT)	2,746
DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI (UT)	705
ANDHRA PRADESH	82,956
BIHAR	1,73,756
MADHYA PRADESH	1,16,505
RAJASTHAN	97,498
NAGALAND	2,607
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	2,234
KARNATAKA	76,149
PUNJAB	31,157
MANIPUR	3,500
PONDICHERRY (UT)	1,154
TAMIL NADU	54,431
TELANGANA	29,942
WEST BENGAL	59,626
MEGHALAYA	2,024
MIZORAM	552
GOA	648
ASSAM	15,619
NCT OF DELHI	
	7,287
LAKSHADWEEP (UT)	21
KERALA	9,283
SIKKIM	102
TOTAL	35,12,711

Table 6.4 | Enrollments under PM-SYM till January 2020, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 431, Rajya Sabha, 5 February 2020

DOMESTIC WORKERS

The Ministry kept silent on the repetitive but inevitable questions on the introduction of legislation as well as on the official definition for domestic workers. The Ministry made a statement by saying, 'To recognize and protect the rights of domestic workers, the Government has introduced a Bill, "The Code on Social Security" in the Lok Sabha, in which domestic workers have been defined as wage workers'.

A pressing question asked by Member of Parliament (MP) Shri Shrinivas Patil was if data on registered/unregistered women domestic workers including minors was maintained. The Ministry informed the parliament that no such data is available at the Central level. The National Sample Survey from 2011–2012 estimates that 39 lakh people are employed as domestic workers by private households, of which 13 lakh are male and 26 lakh are female domestic workers. To the question on sexual abuse and exploitation, the Ministry responded that whenever any such incident is brought to the knowledge of the Government, action is taken as per prevalent rules in this regard. Apart from this, the question on implementation of the International Labour Conference standards was

ignored by the Ministry (Unstarred Question No. 4734, Lok Sabha, 23 March 2020).

When the question on domestic workers' recognition as labourers' and 'introduction of legislation for recognising and protecting their rights' was asked in the Parliament, the Ministry made said, 'To recognize and protect the rights of domestic workers, the Government has introduced a Bill, "The Code on Social Security" in the Lok Sabha, in which domestic workers have been defined as wage workers' (Unstarred Question No. 2029, Rajya Sabha, 11 March 2020).

In the absence of a national policy, domestic workers are freely exploited: since the sector is largely unorganised, these workers are at the mercy of their employers and suffer under abject poverty, with little to no education and a competing demand for jobs which results in depressed wages (EPW, 2018). It is evident that just placing them under the umbrella codes and schemes is not enough to legally protect them. Hence, there is a need for a detailed and specific legislative framework that ensures the protection of domestic workers' rights.

CONSTRUCTION WORKERS

Out of 4 crore (approximately) registered construction workers, less than half of the registered workers were given cash assistance of INR 5,000 crores from the Building and Other Construction Worker's (BOCW), cess fund and only 30 lakh Building and Other Construction (BOC) workers were provided with food packages, which accounts for only 7.5 per cent of total registered construction workers.

The Building and Other Construction Workers (RECS) Act, 1996 mandates States/UTs to register every building and other construction worker under Section 12 of the Act as beneficiary of the fund of the respective State/UT welfare board. On the basis of the data provided by the States/UTs, the cumulative number of construction workers in the year 2018 and 2019 is depicted in Table 6.5.

YEAR	NO. OF CONSTRUCTION WORKERS
2018	3,23,90,187
2019	3,92,17,369

Table 6.5 | Cumulative construction workers in 2018 and 2019
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2028, Rajya Sabha, 11 March 2020

It should be noted that this Government data is representing the construction workers who are 'registered' with different BOCW boards across different states in the country. According to a study, there are more than 6 crore construction workers working in India (Ananda, 2020).

As part of COVID-19 relief, 1.83 crore construction workers have been provided approximately INR 5,000 crore directly in their bank accounts from the BOCW Cess Fund being maintained by various States (Unstarred Question No. 1270, Lok Sabha, 19 September 2020). In another answer, the Ministry stated that 2.03 crore BOC workers have been given cash assistance of INR 5,000 crores (approximately) from the cess fund and 30

lakh BOC workers have been given food packages relief also from the cess fund (Unstarred Question No. 69, Lok Sabha, 14 September 2020). With the discrepancy in numbers given by the Ministry for the same question, it must be noted that only 46.6 per cent (according to first data)/ 51.7 per cent (according to second data) of registered construction workers were financially benefited.

While the Ministry gave the required data on construction workers, no question was raised on the state-wise comparative data on the cess collection and payment in the Parliament. Questions could have been raised in the Parliament on financial and physical progress of the BoCW welfare boards across states.

MIGRATION

In response to the multiple questions on the database, the Ministry of Labour and Employment admits that it has not maintained any register for migrant workers. However, according to the Ministry, 1.06 crore migrants made their way back to their home states from various corners of the country.

Data: In response to the multiple questions on the database, the Ministry of Labour and Employment admitted that it has not maintained any register for migrant workers (Unstarred Question No. 4621, Lok Sabha, 23 March 2020). To support and justify the answer, the Ministry further added that every citizen has a right to migrate to any part of the country. The Constitution of India guarantees the right to every citizen to move to and reside in any State/UT in search of occupation/job. For the Ministry, it is not feasible to record the number as migration is a continuous process and the migrant workers keep on moving from one place to another place in search of work (Unstarred Question No. 4621, Lok Sabha, 23 March 2020). Many activists have raised their concern over a lack of a database of migrant workers, which is supposed to be maintained by the states under the Inter-State Migrant Workmen Act, 1979 (Nath, 2020).

The Ministry, however, reported in multiple answers that 1.06 crore migrants made their way back to their home states from various corners of the country. (Unstarred

Question No.1213 and Unstarred Question No. 1233, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020). It provided a state-wise table on the number of migrant workers who moved back to their hometowns. This is the only data that the Ministry could provide on migrant workers and their distress. However, there are NGO reports that claim that 'the actual figures were much larger' (Paliath, 2021).

The Ministry also admits that the Central Government has not conducted any study in regard to living standard, health and safety of migrant workers (Unstarred Question No. 4621, Lok Sabha, 23 March 2020). This study could have been useful in assessing the situation and also in protecting the life and health of migrant workers during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Ministry also informed the Parliament that there is no data available or maintained on the number of migrant workers who lost their lives during their return to their hometown, so the 'question does not arise' of compensation/ economic assistance to the victim's family. The Labour Ministry said 'no such data is maintained' to a question seeking a response on whether the government has done any assessment of the job losses among migrant workers due to the COVID-19 crisis (Unstarred Question No. 174, Lok Sabha, 14 September 2020).

The Ministry also admits that there is no data available on the number of such labourers who died/sustained

injuries during migration to their native place due to the lockdown (Unstarred Question No. 60, Lok Sabha,

14 September 2020).

STATE/UT-WISE MIGRATION

STATE/UT	MIGRANT WORKERS WHO HAVE RETURNED TO THEIR HOME STATE/UT
ANDHRA PRADESH	32,571
ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	-
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	2,871
ASSAM	4,26,441
BIHAR	15,00,612
CHANDIGARH (UT)	-
CHHATTISGARH	-
DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU (UTS)	43,747
DELHI	-
GOA	-
GUJARAT	-
HARYANA	1,289
HIMACHAL PRADESH	-
JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	48,780
JHARKHAND	5,30,047
KARNATAKA	-
KERALA	3,11,124
LADAKH (UT)	50
LAKSHADWEEP (UT)	456
MADHYA PRADESH	7,53,581
MAHARASHTRA	1,82,990
MANIPUR	12,338
MEGHALAYA	4,266
MIZORAM	-
NAGALAND	11,750
ODISHA	-
PONDICHERRY (UT)	1,694
PUNJAB	5,15,642
RAJASTHAN	13,08,130
SIKKIM	-
TAMIL NADU	72,145
TELANGANA	37,050
TRIPURA	34,247
UTTAR PRADESH	32,49,638
UTTARAKHAND	-
WEST BENGAL	13,84,693
TOTAL	1,04,66,152

Table 6.6 | Migrant workers who have returned to their home state, State/UT-wise
Source: Unstarred Question No. 431, Rajya Sabha, 05 February 2020

COVID-19 RELIEF MEASURES

1. The Government of India has taken the following measures under Pradhan Mantri Garib Kalyan Anna Yojana (PMGKAY):
 - Insurance cover of INR 50 lakh for health workers fighting COVID-19 in government hospitals and healthcare centres.
 - 5 kg wheat or rice and 1 kg of preferred pulses for free every month for three months; the Pradhan Mantri Garib Kalyan Anna Yojana (PMGKAY) scheme has been extended till the end of November 2020.
 - An ex-gratia of INR 500 per month for three months for women Jan Dhan account holders.
 - Increase in The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 (MNREGA) wage to INR 202 a day from INR 182 to benefit 13.62 crore families.
 - An ex-gratia of INR 1,000 to 3 crore poor senior citizens, poor widows and poor disabled persons.
 - INR 2,000 paid to farmers in the first week of April under PM Kisan Yojana to benefit 8.7 crore farmers.
2. The Government of India has also launched Garib Kalyan Rojgar Abhiyaan (GKRA) on 20 June 2020, which focuses on providing livelihood opportunities to returning migrants and similarly affected rural citizens, providing infrastructure and creating livelihood assets. The Abhiyaan involves intensified and focused implementation of 25 target driven works to provide employment and create infrastructure in the rural areas of 116 districts of 6 States with a fund of INR 50,000 crore.
3. The Government issued an advisory on 24 March 2020 under section-60 of the Building and Other Construction Workers Act, 1996 to all the States/UTs to provide financial assistance to Building and Other Construction Workers from the cess funds collected by the States/UTs. In response the State Welfare Boards have cumulatively disbursed around INR 5000 crore to approximately 1.83 crore BOCW Workers during lockdown and thereafter.
4. The Government of India has also launched PM Street Vendor's AtmaNirbhar Nidhi (SVANidhi) Scheme for the benefit of about 50 lakh street vendors to provide them collateral free working capital loan upto INR 10,000 to resume their lost livelihood.
5. In order to safeguard the interest of the migrant workers the Central Government has enacted the Inter-State Migrant Workmen (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Services) Act, 1979 which, inter alia, provides for payment of minimum wages, journey allowance, displacement allowance, residential accommodation, medical facilities and protective clothing, etc. Further, the Government is implementing a contributory pension scheme, namely, Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Man Dhan Yojana (PM-SYM) to provide old age pension to unorganised workers, including inter-state migrant workers depending upon their eligibility (Unstarred Question No. 4621, Lok Sabha, 23 March 2020)
6. Apart from this, the Ministry of Women and Child Development has launched various schemes for migrant workers who have returned to their native places. One of the schemes is anganwadi services, which has been extended to children of migrant workers.
7. To provide employment to the migrant workers, the Ministry of Transport and Highways has identified the ongoing works/new works for road construction. The Ministry of Steel assisted migrant workers and their families with food packets and face masks, milk powder, etc.
8. The Inter-state Migrant Workmen (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1979, has provisions to protect the interests of the migrant workers against the coercive exploitation by private parties and contractors. It entitles the migrant

workers to receive displacement allowances, journey allowances and other facilities.

9. The Ministry of Labour and Employment issued an advisory to the States/UTs and the Employers' Associations on 20 March 2020, asking them to extend their cooperation by not terminating their employees, particularly casual/contractual workers from jobs or reducing their wages.
10. The Ministry of Home Affairs in its order dated 29 March 2020 instructed that the landlords of the migrant workers shall not demand payment of rent for a period of one month and not ask to vacate their premises.
11. In the same order, the Government instructed

IMPLEMENTATION OF COVID-19 RELIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 20 control rooms were set up by the Ministry of Labour and Employment across the country to receive and address the grievances of workers regarding wages, etc. during the national lockdown.
- Approximately 80 crore beneficiaries were provided additional 5 kg wheat or rice and 1 kg of preferred pulses, free of cost every month till November 2020 under provisions of National Food Security Act.
- Around 1.83 crore Building and Other Construction

QUESTIONS DODGED

The Ministry completely dodged the question when asked about the number of daily wage labourers who have lost their jobs during the COVID-19 lockdown. The Ministry also failed to provide any answer on data or information of deaths of labourers during the lockdown period (Unstarred Question No. 413, Rajya Sabha, 16 September 2020). There is also 'no data available' on how many employees were retrenched due to COVID-19 (Unstarred Question No. 2823, Rajya Sabha, 16 September 2020). The answer to the above question could have been important in analysing the impact of COVID-19, along with getting an estimation of informal sector workers who are at risk of abject poverty in India. The sudden decision of the Government

the industry, shops and commercial establishments to make payment of wages to workers, at their workplace, on the due date, without any deduction, for the period their establishments remain under closure during the lockdown.

12. The Ministry of Labour and Employment also issued comprehensive Advisory Guidelines on 27 July 2020 to all the States/UTs for COVID safety and welfare of the migrant workers returning to their workplaces in the destination states.

(Unstarred Question No. 424 and Unstarred Question No. 415, Rajya Sabha, 16 September 2020, Unstarred Question No. 1211 and Unstarred Question No. 1213, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020)

(BOC) workers were given cash assistance of INR 5,000 crore (approximately) from the cess fund. 30 lakh BOC workers were given food package relief also from the cess fund.

- The Garib Kalyan Rajgar Abhiyaan involves intensified and focused implementation of 25 target driven works to provide employment and create infrastructure in the rural areas of 116 districts of 6 States with a resource envelope of INR 50,000 crore

(Unstarred Question No. 415, Rajya Sabha, 16 September 2020, and Unstarred Question No. 1211, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020)

of India to impose a nationwide lockdown on 24 March 2020, with just a four-hour notice followed by a near complete shutdown of all economic activities imparted a devastating impact on the labour market and as a result the unemployment rate increased manifold (Chakraborty, 2020).

During the lockdown, there were widespread media reports and coverage on unfortunate deaths of migrant workers, increasing unemployment and harassment. On these burning issues, many questions were raised in the Parliament but went unnoticed and unanswered in the end. The Ministry could not respond when asked about the number of migrant labourers who were infected with COVID-19 virus after the March lockdown was

announced (Unstarred Question No.1215, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020). The answer to this fundamental question could have been helpful in understanding the Government's attempts to measure the effect on the spread of the pandemic and to assess the health vulnerabilities as well.

It's a well established fact that the vast majority of the urban population works in the informal sector, which was badly affected by the pandemic as many such employed people in cities have lost their jobs, with meagre savings to fall upon. The Ministry ignored the question on numbers on lockdown-related job losses among migrant workers. It also remained silent on the question of whether the Government had any plans for such migrant workers before announcing the lockdown (Unstarred Question No.1216, Rajya Sabha,

21 September 2020). Amidst some important questions, another question that the Ministry missed was the acceptance that the Government could not give enough time to the migrant workers before announcing the lockdown as the lockdown was sudden and unexpected for many (Unstarred Question No.1214, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020). While the Government was able to safeguard the interests of migrant labourers from exploitative employers by launching some schemes, it dodged the question on the number of migrant labourers thrown out of their places of residences by their employers/landlords (Unstarred Question No.1216, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020). It was also unable to give consideration to the question regarding the number of cases of migrant labourers' suicides (Unstarred Question No. 1152, Lok Sabha, 19 September 2020).

COVID-19 RELIEF MEASURES

There is a significant rise in the unemployment data in these six years and for this, the Government could not provide any reason or explanation. No scheme or relief measures have been introduced by the Ministry

for those who are unemployed and those who have lost their jobs due to the pandemic and lockdowns. The unemployment data from the period of the COVID-19 pandemic is also absent from the Ministry's register.

LABOUR FORCE INDICATORS	2013-14 (LABOUR BUREAU)	2015-16 (LABOUR BUREAU)	2017-18 (PLFS BY NSO)	2018-19 (PLFS)
UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	3.4%	3.7%	6.0%	5.8%

Table 6.7 | Unemployment from Annual Periodic Labour Force Survey, 2013-19
Unstarred Question No.1241, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020 and Unstarred Question No.2027, Rajya Sabha, 11 March 2020

Many questions have been raised on the Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy's unemployment data of 9.15 per cent (reported in July 2020) and 9.83 per cent (reported in August 2020). Since it was not Government data, the response offered was that only official data are used and data captured by non-government agencies are not referred (Unstarred Question No.1209, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020).

Responding to a question on whether the Government

has conducted a survey on the number of people who have dropped out of the workforce of the country between March and August 2020, the Ministry of Labour and Employment told the Parliament that 'no such data is available'. It also admits that there is no Government estimation of the unemployment rate in the country between the said months due to the COVID-19 pandemic (Unstarred Question No. 29, Lok Sabha, 14 September 2020).

QUESTIONS DODGED

The No data was provided by the Ministry on workers who have lost their jobs due to COVID-19 in the organised and unorganised sector. Such questions were asked in the light of COVID-19 specifically, but the answer provided by the Ministry totally overlooked this critical mention and situation, giving answers repeatedly on the latest Government data on unemployment, i.e. the Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS) data of 2018-19 (Unstarred

Question No. 434, Rajya Sabha, 16 September, 2020).

The very important follow-up question on why there is an increase in the unemployment rate was also completely dodged by the Ministry. Along with the accurate data, it is useful to understand the reasons for the failures and inability of an economy to generate employment. It is always useful to have information on the country's labour and employment market situation.

LABOUR CODES

The new codes and regulations passed by the Government have brought significant changes to the law of labour and employment in India. Questions were raised in the Parliament on just the definition and characteristics of these codes when it was essential to get some answers on the rationality, approach and intention of these codes. It was also important to know on what grounds and with what purpose the Ministry suspended the previous labour laws.

The Ministry has taken steps for drafting four Labour Codes, i.e., the Code on Wages; the Industrial Relations Code, the Occupational Safety, Health & Working Conditions Code and the Code on Social Security by simplifying, amalgamating and rationalising the relevant provisions of the existing Central Labour Laws (Unstarred Question No. 431, Rajya Sabha, 16 September 2020). The four Labour Codes also envisage further strengthening of protection available to workers, including migrant workers, in terms of statutory minimum wage, industrial dispute mechanism, social security protection and healthcare of workers. Also, the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code provides for maintenance of database or record for inter-state migrant workers, besides extending portability of benefits and other protections (Unstarred Question No. 1325, Lok Sabha, 19 September 2020).

The process of legislative reforms on Labour includes consultation with stakeholders including Central Trade Unions, Employers' Associations and State Governments in the form of tripartite consultation. Such tripartite consultations were also carried out on all the four Labour Codes (Unstarred Question No. 2815, Rajya Sabha, 18 March 2020). According to the Working People's Charter,

there has been no consultation with the representatives of workers nor state governments while drafting the new Codes, making the process exclusive and undemocratic (WPC, 2020). They further added that while the Union government claims to have responded to demands by workers' unions, almost no suggestions have been meaningfully incorporated into the current versions of these Code Bills.

On the question of extension of working hours by some states, the Ministry answered that the subject of 'labour' is in the concurrent list of the Constitution of India where both the Central and State Governments are competent to enact legislation subject to certain matters being reserved for the Centre. Under the Factories Act, State Governments are empowered to issue notification to extend the working hours without any reference to the Central Government. Some of the State Governments have notified an increase in working hours to address the issues of limited availability of workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. As far as the issue of ordinances are concerned, the State Governments are required to refer the proposal to the Central Government for effecting changes in the existing Central Labour Laws enacted by the Parliament. The Ministry of Labour and Employment has received proposals through the Union Ministry of Home Affairs, from the various State Governments including Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Punjab, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh to effect changes in one or all of these Central Acts viz., the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Factories Act, 1948 or the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970 (Unstarred Question No. 441, Rajya Sabha, 16 September 2020).

EXPLAINING THE NEW LABOUR CODES

Code on Wages, 2019

The Code on Wages, 2019 has been notified on 8 August 2019. This code has subsumed:

1. The Minimum Wages Act, 1948,
2. The Payment of Wages Act, 1936,
3. The Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 and
4. The Equal Remuneration Act, 1976.

The Code on Wages, 2019 has universalised the provision of Minimum Wage and timely payment of wages to all employees irrespective of the class of work and wage ceiling. The Draft rules made under the Code on Wages, 2019 have been notified on 07 July 2020 for seeking suggestions of all stakeholders (Unstarred Question No. 428, Rajya Sabha, 16 September 2020).

The minimum wages are different for Central and State Governments as both the Central and State Governments are the appropriate Government to fix, revise and enforce minimum wages in scheduled employment in their respective jurisdictions under the Act (Unstarred Question No. 1548, Rajya Sabha, 4 March 2020).

Social Security Code 2019

In line with the recommendations of the Second National Commission on Labour, a Code on Social Security has been prepared by amalgamating, simplifying and rationalising the relevant provisions of the following nine Central Labour Acts:

- i. The Employees' Compensation Act, 1923
 - ii. The Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948
 - iii. The Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952.
 - iv. The Employment Exchanges (Compulsory Notification of Vacancies) Act, 1959
 - v. The Maternity Benefit Act, 1961
 - vi. The Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972
 - vii. The Cine Workers Welfare Fund Act, 1981
 - viii. The Building and Other Construction Workers Welfare Cess Act, 1996 and
 - ix. The Unorganised Workers' Social Security Act, 2008
- (Unstarred Question No.1223, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020)

The Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2019

The Central Government has enacted the Factories Act, 1948, for ensuring the occupational safety, health and welfare of the workers employed in the factories registered under the Factories Act, 1948. There are elaborate provisions pertaining to health, safety, welfare, hazardous processes, working hours, penalties and procedures etc. under the Act and the Rules framed thereunder are adequate to ensure safety and health of the workers working in the registered factories. The Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2019 was introduced in Lok Sabha on 23 July 2019 and subsequently referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Labour for examination (Unstarred Question No. 4695, Lok Sabha, 23 March 2020).

Industrial Relations Code, 2020

This code consolidates and amends the laws relating to Trade Unions, conditions of employment in industrial establishment or undertaking, investigation and settlement of industrial disputes and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto. It governs important aspects of the employer-employee relationship such as working conditions, collective bargaining, re-skilling etc.

Laws subsumed:

1. The Trade Unions Act, 1926
2. The Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946
3. The Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

(Source: Lakshmikumaran & Sridharan Attorneys)

The new codes and regulations passed by the Government have brought significant changes to the law of labour and employment in India. Questions were raised in the Parliament on the definition and characteristics of these codes when it was essential to get some answers

MONITORING

Shram Suvidha Portal, launched by the Government on 16 October 2014, brings transparency and accountability in enforcement of Labour Laws. Further, 'Santusht' - Implementation Monitoring Cell has been constituted in the Office of Minister of State (Independent Charge) for

on the rationality, approach and intention of these codes. It was also important to know on what grounds and with what purpose, the Ministry suspended the previous labour laws.

Labour and Employment in January 2020. The objective of 'Santusht' is to promote transparency, accountability, effective delivery of public services and implementation of policies and schemes of the Ministry of Labour and Employment at the grassroots level through constant monitoring.

CONCLUSION

The COVID-19 pandemic highlights the need for both immediate relief to protect informal workers and a long-term economic and social plan that integrates livelihood recovery with stronger and more equal labour and social protections for informal workers (WIEGO, 2020) Since the Ministry does not maintain significant data or information on labour working in the unorganised sector, it becomes difficult to monitor the concerns and issues across the country as whole. It is crucial to have

accurate quantitative and qualitative data in the public domain in order to draft new laws or measures. Moreover, to introduce any new bill, code, scheme and even relief measures, people's participation, representation and voice is critical. The due acknowledgement of vulnerable sections of society must be prioritised as they require support. Their timely registration and access to livelihood and income security, social security and protection and healthcare benefits is critical.

REFERENCES

- Ananda, J. (2020, 27 March). 1.5 crore unregistered construction workers in the lurch sans relief. *The New Indian Express*. Retrieved from <https://www.newindianexpress.com/business/2020/mar/27/15-crore-unregistered-construction-workers-in-the-lurch-sans-relief-2122056.html>
- Census of India. (2011). Retrieved from <http://censusindia.gov.in/>
- Chakraborty, S. (2020, 29 August). COVID-19 and Women Informal Sector Workers in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*. Retrieved from <https://www.epw.in/journal/2020/35/commentary/covid-19-and-women-informal-sector-workers-india.html>
- Deshpande, D. (2018, 6 October). Swachh Bharat: A Tale Of Disappearing Toilets, Vanishing Data. *IndiaSpend*. Retrieved from <https://www.indiaspend.com/swachh-bharat-a-tale-of-disappearing-toilets-vanishing-data/>
- Economic and Political Weekly*. (2018, 2 November). Where are the Laws to Protect the Rights of Domestic Workers in India? Retrieved from <https://www.epw.in/engage/article/domestic-workers-rights>
- Housing and Land Rights Network. (2018). The Human Rights to Adequate Housing and Land in India: Report to the United Nations Human Rights Council for India's Third Universal Periodic Review [With Relevant Recommendations]. Retrieved from https://www.hlrn.org.in/documents/Housing_Land_Rights_India_UPR3_2018.pdf
- Jebaraj, P. (2018, June 19). Database on unorganised workers gets underway. *The Hindu*. Retrieved from <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/database-on-unorganised-workers-gets-underway/article24203636.ece>
- Kanwar, S. (2019, 17 May). Four Years on, How Swachh Is Bharat? *The Wire*. Retrieved from <https://thewire.in/urban/swachh-bharat-mission-urban-sanitation>
- Khan, F., and Mansoor, K. (2020, May 11). COVID-19 impact: Informal economy workers excluded from most govt measures, be it cash transfers or tax benefits. *First Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.firstpost.com/business/covid-19-impact-informal-economy-workers-excluded-from-most-govt-measures-be-it-cash-transfers-or-tax-benefits-8354051.html>
- Lakshmikumaran & Sridharan Attorneys (2020). Industrial Relations Code, 2020: An Overview. Retrieved from <https://www.lakshmisri.com/insights/articles/industrial-relations-code-2020-an-overview/#>
- Lok Sabha (2019). *Parliament of India: Starred and Unstarred Questions, Lok Sabha*. Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs. Published by the Government of India. Retrieved from <http://loksabhaph.nic.in/Questions/qsearch15.aspx>
- MoDWS SBM(U). (n.d.). Retrieved 2020, from <https://jalshakti-ddws.gov.in/>
- MoHUA AMRUT. (n. d.). Retrieved 2020, from <http://amrut.gov.in/>
- MoHUA DAY-NULM. (n. d.). Retrieved 2020, from <https://nulm.gov.in/>
- MoHUA PMAY(U). (n. d.). Retrieved 2020, from <https://pmaymis.gov.in/>
- Naik, A. (2013) Contextualising Urban Livelihoods: Street Vending in India. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2238589>
- Nath, D. (2020, 14 September). Govt. has no data of migrant workers' death, loss of job. *The Hindu*. Retrieved from <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/govt-has-no-data-of-migrant-workers-death-loss-of-job/article32600637.ece>
- National Sample Survey Office. (n.d.). Retrieved 2020, from <http://mospi.nic.in/NSSOa>

Paliath, S. (2021, 26 March). A year after Covid-19 lockdown, India still doesn't have reliable data or policy on migrant workers. *The Scroll*. Retrieved from

<https://scroll.in/article/990527/a-year-after-covid-19-lockdown-india-still-doesnt-have-reliable-data-or-policy-on-migrant-workers>

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

Saha, D. (2011). Decent work for the street vendors in Mumbai, India—a distant vision. The Research Gate. Retrieved from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247872180_Decent_Work_for_the_Street_Vendors_in_Mumbai_India-A_Distant_Vision

SEWA. (2020). Impact of Coronavirus on the Informal Economy. Retrieved from

<https://www.wiego.org/sites/default/files/resources/file/SEWA-Delhi-Covid-19-Impact.pdf>

Srija, A., and Shirke, S. (2014) An Analysis of the Informal Labour Market in India. Confederation of Indian Industry. Retrieved from

<https://www.ies.gov.in/pdfs/CII%20EM-october-2014.pdf>

WPC. (2020, 23 September) Why the new labour codes leave India's workers even more precariously poised than before. *The Scroll*. Retrieved from

<https://scroll.in/article/973877/why-the-new-labour-codes-leave-workers-even-more-precariously-poised-than-before>

WIEGO. (2020). Informal Workers in the COVID-19 Crisis. Retrieved from

https://www.wiego.org/sites/default/files/resources/file/Informal%20Workers%20in%20the%20COVID-19%20Crisis_WIEGO_July_2020.pdf

Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action (YUVA). (2019). *Parliamentary Watch Report: An Analysis of Questions Asked on Urban Issues in the Indian Parliament in 2018*. City Say. Retrieved from

<https://yuvaindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/PWR-2018.pdf>

Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action (YUVA) (2020). *Parliamentary Watch Report: An Analysis of Questions Asked on Urban Issues in the Indian Parliament in 2019*. City Say. Retrieved from

https://yuvaindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Yuva_PW_Report-2019.pdf

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.
