

# PARLIAMENTARY WATCH REPORT

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



**Suggested citation:**

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

**Published by**

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

# PARLIAMENTARY WATCH REPORT

---

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



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

**Contributor:**

Aarohi Damle

**Research & documentation support:**

Barasha Kakati and Devi Lavanya

**Reviewer:**

Marina Joseph

**Copy Editor:**

Doel Jaikishen

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

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



@officialyuva



@officialyuva



yuvaindia84



@yuvaonline



officialyuva



/company/officialyuva

**Published by:**

YUVA (Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action)

YUVA Centre, Sector 7, Plot 23, Kharghar,

Navi Mumbai – 410210 (INDIA)

March 2023

**Designed by:**

Manoj Hodawadekar

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Abbreviations</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>iv</i>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1   PRADHAN MANTRI AWAS YOJANA-URBAN (PMAY-U)</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2   ATAL MISSION FOR REJUVENATION AND URBAN TRANSFORMATION</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3   SWACHH BHARAT MISSION-URBAN</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4   SMART CITIES MISSION</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>CHAPTER 5   DEENDAYAL ANTYODAYA YOJANA-NATIONAL URBAN LIVELIHOODS MISSION</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>CHAPTER 6   LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT</b>	<b>80</b>
<i>References</i>	<i>99</i>

# ABBREVIATIONS

<b>AB-PMJAY</b>	Ayushman Bharat-Pradhan Mantri Jan Arogya Yojana	<b>ESIC</b>	Employees' State Insurance Corporation
<b>AHP</b>	Affordable Housing in Partnership	<b>EST&amp;P</b>	Employment Through Skills Training and Placement
<b>AMRUT</b>	Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation	<b>EWS</b>	Economically Weaker Section
<b>ARHC</b>	Affordable Rental Housing Complex	<b>GDP</b>	Gross Domestic Product
<b>BJP</b>	Bharatiya Janata Party	<b>Gol</b>	Government of India
<b>BLC</b>	Beneficiary Led Construction	<b>IEC</b>	Information, Education and Communication
<b>BOCW</b>	Building and Other Construction Workers	<b>IHHL</b>	Individual Household Latrine
<b>CA</b>	Central Assistance	<b>INR</b>	Indian Rupee
<b>CBT</b>	Capacity Building and Training	<b>ISP</b>	Innovative and Special Project
<b>CLSS</b>	Credit Linked Subsidy Scheme	<b>ISSR</b>	In-situ Slum Redevelopment
<b>CNA</b>	Central Nodal Agency	<b>JnNURM</b>	Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission
<b>CoV</b>	Certificate of Vending	<b>LHP</b>	Light House Project
<b>CSC</b>	Common Service Centre	<b>LIC</b>	Life Insurance Corporation of India
<b>CSCAF</b>	Climate Smart Cities Assessment Framework	<b>LIG</b>	Low Income Group
<b>CT</b>	Community Toilet	<b>MIG</b>	Middle Income Group
<b>DAY-NULM</b>	Deendayal Antyodaya Yojana-National Urban Livelihoods Mission	<b>MLD</b>	Million Litres Per Day
<b>DW</b>	Domestic Worker	<b>MoHUA</b>	Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs
<b>D2D</b>	Door-to-Door	<b>MoLE</b>	Ministry of Labour and Employment
		<b>MoSPI</b>	Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation

<b>MP</b>	Member of Parliament	<b>SCM</b>	Smart Cities Mission
<b>MSW</b>	Municipal Solid Waste	<b>SCP</b>	Smart Cities Proposals
<b>MT</b>	Metric Tonnes	<b>SEP</b>	Self Employment Programme
<b>NCS</b>	National Career Service	<b>SHG</b>	Self Help Group
<b>NCT</b>	National Capital Territory	<b>SPV</b>	Special Purpose Vehicle
<b>NDA</b>	National Democratic Alliance	<b>SSWAP</b>	Special State Water Action Plan
<b>NPS</b>	National Pension Scheme	<b>ST</b>	Scheduled Tribe
<b>NULM</b>	National Urban Livelihoods Mission	<b>STP</b>	Sewage Treatment Plant
<b>OBC</b>	Other Backward Class	<b>SUH</b>	Shelter for Urban Homeless
<b>ODF</b>	Open Defecation Free	<b>SUSV</b>	Support to Urban Street Vendor
<b>OSHW</b>	Occupational Safety, Health and Working Condition	<b>SVA</b>	Street Vendors (Protection Of Livelihood And Regulation Of Street Vending) Act, 2014
<b>PLFS</b>	Periodic Labour Force Survey	<b>SVANidhi</b>	Street Vendor's AtmaNirbhar Nidhi
<b>PMAY-U</b>	Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana-Urban	<b>SWAP</b>	State Water Action Plan
<b>PMJJBY</b>	Pradhan Mantri Jeevan Jyoti Bima Yojana	<b>SWM</b>	Solid Waste Management
<b>PMKVY</b>	Pradhan Mantri Kaushal Vikas Yojana	<b>TVC</b>	Town Vending Committee
<b>PMSBY</b>	Pradhan Mantri Suraksha Bima Yojana	<b>UAN</b>	Universal Account Number
<b>PMSYM</b>	Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Maandhan Yojana	<b>UC</b>	Utilisation Certificate
<b>PT</b>	Public Toilets	<b>ULB</b>	Urban Local Body
<b>RAY</b>	Rajiv Awas Yojana	<b>UR</b>	Unemployment Rate
<b>RTE</b>	Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education (RTE) Act, 2009	<b>UT</b>	Union Territory
<b>SAAP</b>	State Annual Action Plan	<b>WPR</b>	Worker Population Ratio
<b>SBM-U</b>	Swachh Bharat Mission-Urban		
<b>SC</b>	Scheduled Caste		

# LIST OF TABLES

Table	Details	Page	Table	Details	Page
<b>1.1</b>	PMAY COMPONENTS AND CORRESPONDING CENTRAL ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS	7	<b>2.3</b>	AMRUT AND AMRUT 2.0 FUNDS RELEASED DURING THE LAST THREE YEARS AND THE CURRENT YEAR, STATE/UT-WISE	26
<b>1.2</b>	HOUSES COMPLETED, AND CENTRAL ASSISTANCE RELEASED BETWEEN FY 2019-20 AND 2021-22 UNDER PMAY	10	<b>2.4</b>	UTILISATION CERTIFICATES PENDING /UNSPENT BALANCE UNDER AMRUT 2.0, STATE/UT-WISE	28
<b>1.3</b>	HOUSES SANCTIONED, GROUNDED FOR CONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETED UNDER ISSR COMPONENT OF PMAY-U, STATE/UT- WISE	13	<b>2.5</b>	SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS UNDER AMRUT, STATE/UT-WISE	29
<b>1.4</b>	FINANCIAL AND PHYSICAL PROGRESS OF CLSS COMPONENT OF PMAY-U, STATE/UT-WISE	15	<b>2.6</b>	TAP CONNECTION TARGETS SET AND TAP CONNECTIONS PROVIDED UNDER AMRUT AND IN CONVERGENCE WITH OTHER SCHEMES, STATE/UT-WISE	30
<b>1.5</b>	HOUSES SANCTIONED, GROUNDED FOR CONSTRUCTION, AND COMPLETED UNDER BLC COMPONENT OF PMAY-U, STATE /UT-WISE	16	<b>2.7</b>	LIST OF PROPOSED/UPCOMING WATER BODIES REJUVENATION PROJECTS UNDER AMRUT 2.0, STATE/UT-WISE	31
<b>1.6</b>	HOUSES SANCTIONED, GROUNDED FOR CONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETED UNDER AHP COMPONENT OF PMAY-U, STATE /UT-WISE	17	<b>3.1</b>	CENTRAL FUNDS ALLOCATED, RELEASED AND FUND BALANCE REMAINING UNDER SBM-U 2.0	34
<b>1.7</b>	GOVERNMENT FUNDED JNNURM HOUSES TO BE CONVERTED INTO ARHCS UNDER MODEL-I	19	<b>3.2</b>	OPEN DEFECATION FREE (ODF) CERTIFICATION OF ULBS IN 2022	35
<b>1.8</b>	NUMBER OF ARHC UNITS SANCTIONED FOR CONSTRUCTION UNDER MODEL-2	19	<b>3.3</b>	NUMBER OF OPEN DEFECATION FREE ULBS, STATE/UT-WISE	37
<b>2.1</b>	CENTRAL ALLOCATION OF FUNDS UNDER AMRUT AND AMRUT 2.0, STATE/UT-WISE	24	<b>3.4</b>	INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLD LATRINE TARGETS SET AND TOILETS COMPLETED SINCE 2014, STATE/UT-WISE	38
<b>2.2</b>	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE FOR AMRUT 2.0 RELEASED DURING FY 2021-22 AND 2022-23, STATE/UT-WISE	25	<b>3.5</b>	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA FOR SANITATION FACILITIES UNDER SBM-U AND SBM-U 2.0	40



Table	Details	Page
<b>3.6</b>	INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLD LATRINES AND COMMUNITY/PUBLIC TOILET TARGETS SET AND UNITS COMPLETED SINCE 2014, STATE/UT-WISE	41
<b>3.7</b>	FUNDS RELEASED UNDER SBM – U AND SBM-U 2.0, STATE/UT-WISE	43
<b>3.8</b>	PROGRESS IN ACHIEVEMENT IN MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE (MSW) MANAGEMENT, STATE/UT-WISE	45
<b>3.9</b>	MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI'S PROGRESS AND PLANS FOR LEGACY WASTE MANAGEMENT	46
<b>4.1</b>	LIST OF 100 SMART CITIES SELECTED IN VARIOUS ROUNDS OF THE SCM CHALLENGE	49
<b>4.2</b>	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE RELEASED AND UTILISED UNDER SCM, STATE /UT-WISE	51
<b>4.3</b>	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE RELEASED AND UTILISED FROM 2015-16 TO 2021-22, STATE/UT-WISE AND CITY-WISE	52
<b>4.4</b>	DETAILS OF SLUM RE-DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS UNDER SCM	55
<b>4.5</b>	DETAILS OF THE SIX LIGHT HOUSE PROJECTS STARTED ON 1ST JANUARY 2021	59
<b>4.6</b>	PERFORMANCE OF SMART CITIES ON CLIMATE SMART CITIES ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK 2.0	60
<b>4.7</b>	OVERALL RATINGS OF CITIES UNDER CLIMATE SMART CITIES ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK 2.0	61
<b>5.1</b>	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES TRAINED AND PLACED UNDER DAY-NULM SINCE 2013	64
<b>5.2</b>	DETAILS ON THE SELF-EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME COMPONENT OF DAY-NULM FROM 1 APRIL 2014 TILL 28. FEBRUARY 2022, STATE/UT-WISE	66

Table	Details	Page
<b>5.3</b>	URBAN HOMELESS POPULATION IDENTIFIED THROUGH SYSTEMATIC THIRD-PARTY SURVEY AS ON 25 MARCH 2022, STATE/UT-WISE	68
<b>5.4</b>	NUMBER OF FUNCTIONAL SHELTERS FOR THE URBAN HOMELESS UNDER DAY-NULM AS ON 30 NOVEMBER 2022, STATE/UT-WISE	69
<b>5.5</b>	DETAILS ON NUMBERS OF STREET VENDORS IDENTIFIED AND CERTIFICATES OF VENDING ISSUED SINCE 1 APRIL 2014, STATE/UT-WISE	72
<b>5.6</b>	DETAILS ON THE STATUS OF LOANS ISSUED UNDER THE PM SVANIDHI SCHEME SINCE 2020 AS ON 5 DECEMBER 2022, STATE/UT-WISE	74
<b>5.7</b>	DETAILS OF THE LOANS DISBURSED UNDER THE THREE SVANIDHI TRANCHES	75
<b>5.8</b>	DETAILS OF LOANS REPAID UNDER TRANCHE ONE AND TRANCHE TWO OF SVANIDHI SCHEME, STATE/UT-WISE	76
<b>5.9</b>	DETAILS OF SVANIDHI BENEFICIARIES AND FAMILY MEMBERS SURVEYED AND SCHEME SANCTIONS FACILITATED AS ON 12 JULY 2022, STATE/UT-WISE	77
<b>6.1</b>	RURAL AND URBAN UNEMPLOYMENT RATE FOR THE LAST THREE YEARS AS PER THE PERIODIC LABOUR FORCE SURVEY	81
<b>6.2</b>	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE AMONG EDUCATED WORKING POPULATION (15 YEARS AND ABOVE) AS PER THE PLFS 2019-20, STATE/UT-WISE	82
<b>6.3</b>	NUMBER OF WORKERS REGISTERED ON THE E-SHRAM PORTAL AS ON 7 DECEMBER 2022, STATE/UT-WISE	86
<b>6.4</b>	STATES/UTS THAT HAVE PRE-PUBLISHED THE DRAFT RULES ON THE FOUR LABOUR CODES	87

<b>Table</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>6.5</b>	LIST OF MONITORING CENTRES FOR INTER-STATE MIGRANTS AS OF 2022	90
<b>6.6</b>	NUMBER OF REGISTERED BUILDING AND OTHER CONSTRUCTION WORKERS AND CESS FUND DETAILS, STATE/UT-WISE	92
<b>6.7</b>	DOMESTIC WORKERS TRAINED UNDER PRADHAN MANTRI KAUSHAL VIKAS YOJANA 2.0 AND 3.0, STATE/UT-WISE	94
<b>6.8</b>	DETAILS OF FUNDS ALLOCATED, AND EXPENDITURE INCURRED UNDER PM-SYM IN THE LAST THREE YEARS	98

# INTRODUCTION

---

The World Cities Report, 2022 estimates that India's urban population will stand at 675 million by 2035, second only to China's one billion urban residents (UN Habitat, 2022). The needs of a rapidly urbanising Indian population will have to be met with cost-effective, robust, and sustainable infrastructure to improve standard of living, and the liveability of the city. A World Bank Report estimates that India will require capital investment of USD 840 billion over the next 15 years, with over half the investments to be made in basic municipal services (excluding housing) and the rest in mass transit infrastructure (Athar et al., 2021). To say the least, India's current capital investment in urban infrastructure does not match the World Bank estimates.

Since 2014, the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) led National Democratic Alliance (NDA) has been (re)elected and applauded on its mandate of 'sabka sath, sabka vikas' which has largely foregrounded the sustainable and resilient development of urban India. Amidst valid criticisms, the NDA government has brought in private players to assist in its long-term development agenda. Suffice to say that the government's investment in the future cannot come at the cost of people's needs in the present.

Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action's (YUVA's) *Parliamentary Watch Report 2022* (like its earlier reports) focuses on the government's flagship schemes, analyses the financial and programmatic progress by culling out data from the publicly available parliamentary questions made to the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) and Ministry of Labour and Employment (MoLE). Against the backdrop of elite aspirations and growth predictions of the future, the parliamentary questions raised in the three Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha sessions in 2022 serve as a critical source of information to hold the government accountable for its pro-people policies and actions in the present.

The flagship schemes and missions implemented by the NDA aim to tackle the prevalence and incidence of multidimensional urban poverty and inequality. Over the years, the NDA government has simultaneously launched, relaunched, and bolstered its flagships schemes aimed at transforming urban India. The Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Urban (PMAY–U), Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT), Swachh Bharat Mission–Urban (SBM–U), Smart Cities Mission (SCM), and Deendayal Antyodaya Yojana–National Urban Livelihoods Mission (DAY–NULM), were all initially launched by the MoHUA in 2014–2015, and addressed issues of housing, basic services, livelihoods along with overall infrastructure upgradation of cities.

In the aftermath of the migrant worker crisis that resulted during the pandemic, the MoLE launched the e-Shram portal and its database, and introduced other social security benefits to the urban informally employed.

The parliamentary questions as a legislative tool are useful in highlighting the gaps in schemes and, enabling the Members of Parliament (MPs) and the administration to take the required action to steer the implementation of the programs. This report aims to assess the performance of flagship schemes solely based on the answers provided by Ministries themselves. However, the foremost problem faced during analysis stemmed from an unresearched approach to parliamentary proceedings by the MPs. The asking and framing of weak questions is as much to blame for the repetitive and/or vague responses and easily dodged questions. Any discrepancies, dodged questions and/or surface-level responses that were noticed have been highlighted in the relevant chapters.

In 2022, a total of 25 Bills were passed by both Houses of Parliament in the three sessions, despite the several protests and walkouts. The overall sentiment and important theme of this year's discussions were largely centred around India's foreign policy and defence policy,

owing to the Ukraine war and frequent India–China border clashes. The opposition, on its part, criticised the anti-poor and anti-people state budget 2022, and were refused parliamentary discussions on price rise and inflation by the Union government (“Home and Away”, 2022). All in all, the functioning, actions, and debates of the India Parliament are returning to a pre-pandemic normal, as the government debates and decides policies on a host of matters apart from labour, incomes and livelihoods. Although the need for strong and inclusive

policies across all sectors cannot be denied, it is important to note that the urban poor are still reeling from the impacts and consequences of the pandemic. Supply chains remain disrupted, education, health and nutrition remain affected, incomes have decreased, unemployment remains rampant, and the most socio-economically marginalised sections remain the most affected. The questions on urban livelihoods raised in Parliament and studied for this report seek to keep the spotlight on the urban poor, and the actions taken to support them.

## KEY HIGHLIGHTS

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

1. A total of 122.69 lakh houses have been sanctioned under PMAY–U. 106 lakh houses had been grounded and 65.5 lakh houses completed and delivered to the beneficiaries.
2. 4,33,334 in-situ slum redevelopment (ISSR) houses have been sanctioned, of which 2,40,744 houses (55.56 per cent) have been grounded, and only 1,49,116 houses have been completed (34.41 per cent). The greatest number of ISSR houses have been sanctioned in Maharashtra (2,24,618).
3. 73,44,944 houses have been sanctioned under the beneficiary-led construction (BLC) component, of which 61,52,163 houses (83.76 per cent) have been grounded, and 29,05,565 have been completed (39.55 per cent). The greatest number of BLC homes have been sanctioned in Andhra Pradesh (17,39,094).
4. 20,94,030 affordable housing in partnership (AHP) houses have been sanctioned under PMAY of which 13,51,799 have been grounded (64.55 per cent) and 6,77,022 have been completed (32.33 per cent). The highest number of houses have been sanctioned in Maharashtra (4,86,167).
5. The benefits of the credit linked subsidy scheme (CLSS) have reached 19,13,779 beneficiary households in the middle-income group (MIG), economically weaker sections (EWS) and low-income groups (LIGs). A total of INR 44,625 crores has been

released as central subsidy. Maharashtra (4,67,481), Gujarat (4,57,931) and Uttar Pradesh (1,30,107) make up 55.15 per cent of the total CLSS beneficiary households.

6. Under affordable rental housing complexes (ARHCs), 83,534 vacant houses were constructed under Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JnNURM), 5,478 have been converted into ARHCs and 7,483 are under the process of getting converted. The proposals for construction of 80,273 new ARHC units have been sanctioned.
7. 17.77 lakh houses under BLC/AHP/ISSR have been sanctioned for slum dwellers. PMAY houses have been sanctioned to 96,46,036 women beneficiaries across the country. PMAY has 20,07,765 scheduled caste (SC) beneficiaries, 5,73,024 scheduled tribe (ST) beneficiaries and 40,60,588 other backward class (OBC) beneficiaries. 2,285 houses for transgender persons have been provided under PMAY.

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

1. AMRUT 2.0 aims to make urban India ‘water secure’ by promoting a circular economy of water. The second phase of this Mission is unique as it seeks community involvement for monitoring projects by engaging with self-help groups (SHGs), students, and via citizen feedback, and promotes urban-rural convergence to improve the reuse of treated water and co-operative

use of water and sewage treatment facilities. The Mission also promotes non-motorised urban transport for the benefit of pedestrians.

2. Under the first phase of AMRUT, a central allocation of INR 35,990 crore was made for five years. The Central allocation under AMRUT 2.0 is INR 66,750 crore, i.e., almost double the amount set aside in the first phase.
3. In the first phase, central assistance was distributed among states/union territories (UTs) using an equitable formula in which equal (50:50) weightage was given to the urban population (Census 2011) of each State/UT and the number of statutory towns in the State/UT. Under AMRUT 2.0, projects have been distributed among the States/UTs using the equitable formula wherein weightage to urban population (Census 2011) and area of each State/ UT have been given in the ratio of 90:10.
4. In FY 2021–22, INR 983.98 crore central funds were released of which INR 979.84 crore was reported as unutilised within the year. INR 1,506.73 crore was released in FY 2022–23. 28 states received no central assistance towards AMRUT 2.0 projects, while only the two states of Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu received 61.02 per cent of total funds released to states and UTs in FY 2022–23.
5. The Ministry has not declared any AMRUT city to have achieved hundred per cent water supply coverage. 126 lakh new water tap connections have been provided against the target of 139 lakh water taps.
6. Under AMRUT, INR 32,456 crore (42 per cent of phase one central assistance [CA]) was allocated to projects under the sewerage and septage management sector. During AMRUT 2.0, INR 66,750 crore (87 per cent of phase two CA) has been allocated to projects under sewerage and septage management sector.
7. 95 lakh new sewer connections have been achieved against the target of 149 lakh. 128 sewage treatment plants (STPs) against the sanctioned 282 STPs have been completed.
8. Under AMRUT, 31 water body rejuvenation projects worth INR 114.28 crore were initiated and 20 projects were completed and 11 are on-going. Under AMRUT 2.0, 690 water body rejuvenations projects have been launched worth INR 1,628.78 crore.
9. Under the public transport component of AMRUT, 347 projects worth INR 1,025 crore have been grounded, of which 263 projects worth INR 544 crore have been completed. Through these projects, 372 km of pedestrian walkways have been developed.

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

1. The second phase of SBM–U was launched with the aspiration of making India's cities 'garbage free.' In a departure from the first phase, SBM 2.0 includes grey and black water management for all cities not covered by AMRUT as well as focused interventions for remediation of legacy waste and dumpsites.
2. SBM–U 2.0 has a total outlay of INR 1,41,600 crore, which includes central share of INR 36,465 crore, which is nearly 2.5 times the allocation of INR 14,623 crore under phase one. However, analysis reveals that only INR 32,826 crore has been allocated to the states.
3. Except Purulia in West Bengal, of all 4,372 urban local bodies (ULBs) in the country, 4,371 have been declared 100 per cent open defecation free (ODF). 4,316 ULBS are certified ODF, while 3,339 ULBs are certified ODF+ and 961 ULBs are certified ODF++ through a third-party verification process.
4. 62,64,914 individual household latrines (IHHLs) were built against the target of 58,99,637, and 6,23,682 community and public toilets (CTs/PTs) were built against the target of 5,07,588. Very few questions in Parliament quizzed the government on the repeatedly fluctuating targets on building toilets since the initial conception of the Mission. It begs the question: What incentives will the state/UT governments have to increase sanitation access if the Mission targets are already shown to be met?

5. Under solid municipal waste management, across India 87,982 wards out of 90,617 wards practice 100 per cent door-to-door collection of waste. 79,932 wards practice 100 per cent source segregation of waste. The government claims an average of 73 per cent of total solid municipal waste processing power in the country. However, YUVA's analysis of the data, for this report, shows the country only processes an average of 63 per cent of the waste generated.
6. To achieve the target of 'Lakshya Zero Dumpsite' an advisory has been issued and disseminated to all stakeholders and capacity building for states on planning waste remediation has been initiated. A third-party compiles the best practices adopted across cities on remediation procedures and monitoring mechanisms; this compilation is set to act as a ready reckoner to other ULBs.
5. Slum development projects under SCM are very broad in scope. Slum development projects have been initiated in 22 smart cities worth INR 2,241.24 crore. 25 projects worth INR 939.98 crore have been completed, while 16 projects worth INR 1,303.26 crores are ongoing.
6. The push for green building and construction has picked up pace in 2022. Six Light House Projects (LHPs) using six distinct and innovative constructing technologies have been initiated at Chennai, Rajkot, Indore, Lucknow, Ranchi and Agartala, comprising a total of 6,368 houses, with total project cost of INR 790 crore.
7. Under the Climate Smart Cities Assessment Framework (CSCAF), 126 cities participated in the exercise. 31 cities have achieved an overall rating of 1-star; 64 cities have achieved 2-star; 22 cities 3-star and 9 cities have achieved 4-star rating.

## SMART CITIES MISSION (SCM)

1. 100 smart cities were selected between 2016 and 2018 in 4 rounds of competition. All SCM projects were to be completed within five years of the selection of the city. However, given COVID-19 induced delays, the period of implementation for all SCM projects, across 100 cities, has been extended to June 2023.
2. As per SCM guidelines, the central government was set to provide financial support of INR 48,000 crore to 100 smart cities with an almost equal amount contributed by state governments. As on 2 December 2022, the Government of India has released INR 34,399 crore for 100 Smart Cities, out of which INR 30,400 crores (88 per cent) has been utilised.
3. Work orders have been issued for 7,738 projects worth around INR 1,81,112 crore, of which 4,987 projects worth INR 92,439 crore have been completed, while 2,751 projects worth INR 88,673 crore are in progress.
4. 11 cities have received central assistance of INR 490 crore or higher under SCM. 37 of 100 cities have received and utilised less than 40 per cent (> INR 200 crore) of the promised CA of INR 500 crore budget by 2022.

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

1. 13 lakh urban poor have been imparted skill training to enhance their employability, of which more than 6.78 lakh trained have been placed under self and/or wage employment.
2. The Ministry reported that 7.8 lakh self-help groups (SHGs) have been formed. More than 5.36 lakh SHGs have been assisted with a revolving fund and 7.17 lakh loans have been disbursed under SHG bank linkage programme for taking up activities for improving incomes under DAY-NULM. However, statistical discrepancies plague the data on loan disbursements wherein 62.91 per cent of the loans were given out in Andhra Pradesh and Telangana only.
3. A total of 7,10,816 beneficiaries have been assisted in setting up individual/group micro-enterprises since 2013. Tamil Nadu has set up 2,36,303, which alone is 33.24 per cent of the total enterprises.
4. For the urban homeless population, 2,414 shelters have been sanctioned, of which 1,678 shelters with a capacity of 96,386 persons were completed by March

2022. The number of functional shelters increased to 1,788 by 30 November 2022.

5. For street vendors' protection, town vending committees (TVCs) are yet to be constituted in 4,452 cities/ULBs. As on 30 November 2022, 4,339 TVCs have been constituted.
6. 49,48,657 street vendors were identified through the survey conducted across cities in India. Only 28,17,897 have been issued a Certificate of Vending (CoV) i.e., only 56.94 per cent of identified street vendors have proof of work.
7. A total of 58,34,635 applications have been received under the Pradhan Mantri Street Vendor's AtmaNirbhar Nidhi (PM SVANidhi) scheme of which 43,41,902 loan applications have been sanctioned. 38 lakh loans amounting to INR 4,405 crore have been disbursed under PM SVANidhi Scheme through various lending institutions.
5. As of 2022, 31 states/UTs have pre-published the draft rules under Code on Wages, 2019, 26 states/UTs have pre-published the draft rules under the Industrial Relations Code, 2020, 25 states/UTs have pre-published the draft rules under the Code on Social Security, 2020 and 24 states/UTs have pre-published the draft rules under the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020.
6. At the end of 2021, more than four crore construction workers (4,56,67,175) have been registered across India and a cumulative amount of INR 78,521.24 crore has been collected as cess funds to ensure the social security and other welfare measures for construction workers and their families.
7. The All India Survey on Domestic Workers commenced in January, 2022. The survey covers 1.5 lakh households across 12,766 (6,190 rural + 6,576 urban) blocks. No additional information on the physical progress of the survey was disclosed in Parliament.

## LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

1. As per the Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS), in 2020–21, the unemployment rate (UR) among urban males was 6.7 and among urban females was 8.6. This is the lowest the unemployment rate has been since 2018. The UR in urban India is almost twice that of rural India.
2. The Worker Population Ratio (WPR) has risen from 47.3 per cent in 2018–2019 to 52.6 per cent in 2020–21. A change in the WPR is taken as a stand-in measure to showcase increase in employment.
3. Overall, unemployment is decidedly higher among diploma holders (14.2 per cent) and graduates (17.2 per cent) as per PLFS 2019–2020.
4. 28,45,65,622 informal workers have been registered on the e-Shram portal. Aadhaar linkage continues to plague e-Shram registration and benefit disbursement. 7.6 crore workers out of 28.4 crore workers (i.e. 26.70 per cent) registered on e-Shram did not have their bank account linked with Aadhaar.
8. Under the welfare and social security schemes for informal workers, 14.02 crore beneficiaries enrolled under Pradhan Mantri Jeevan Jyoti Bima Yojana and 30.57 crore beneficiaries enrolled under Pradhan Mantri Suraksha Bima Yojana. 49.18 lakh workers, including rural and farm labourers, have been enrolled under the Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Maan-dhan. 21.02 crore individuals have been verified and provided with the Ayushman Cards under Ayushman Bharat- Pradhan Mantri Jan Arogya Yojana.



# CHAPTER 1: PRADHAN MANTRI AWAS YOJANA–URBAN (PMAY-U)

---

## INTRODUCTION

---

The Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Urban (PMAY–U) is a flagship scheme by the Government of India, implemented by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) since 2015. Through the scheme, the Centre provides states/union territories (UTs) monetary assistance in providing all-weather *pucca* homes to all eligible urban beneficiaries, including the urban poor (Unstarred Question No. 1669, Rajya Sabha, 01 August 2022). This scheme rightfully focuses on the provision of homes with access to civic facilities—toilets, sewage lines, water supply, electricity, etc. The salient features of the PMAY–U are:

- The scheme is implemented through four verticals, i.e., beneficiary-led construction (BLC), affordable housing in partnership (AHP), in-situ slum redevelopment (ISSR) and credit linked subsidy scheme (CLSS).
- The Mission covers the entire urban area consisting of statutory towns, notified planning areas, development areas falling under the jurisdiction of special area development authorities, industrial development authorities or any such authority under state legislation which is entrusted with the functions of urban planning and regulations.
- All houses under PMAY–U have basic amenities like toilets, water supply, electricity and kitchen.
- The Mission promotes women empowerment by providing the ownership of houses in the name of the female member or in joint name
- Preference is also given to differently-abled persons, senior citizens, persons from scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, other backward classes, minorities, single women, transgender and other weaker and vulnerable sections of the society.

- A comprehensive and robust management information system is in place that helps all stakeholders to seamlessly manage information pertaining to physical and financial progress, including storing various records through digitisation such as survey, project information, beneficiary details, fund utilisation, etc. All houses under BLC/AHP/ISSR are geo-tagged to track actual progress on the ground.
- MoHUA has set up a Technology Sub-Mission under PMAY–U to facilitate adoption of modern, innovative and green technologies and building materials for faster and quality construction of houses (Unstarred Question No. 1655, Rajya Sabha, 01 August 2022).

With the goal of providing all citizens dignified and liveable homes and improving the standard of living, the scheme has been in force for seven years, and was set to achieve its goal of 'housing for all' by December 2022. Given the time consuming nature of constructing houses, administrative bottle-necks and the COVID–19 pandemic, the scheme has suffered some setbacks. Member of Parliament (MP) Shri. S Selvaganabathy quizzed the Ministry on delays, and its target for sanctioning homes by the 2022 deadline. The Ministry responded by stating that the scheme deadline was extended till 31 December 2024 for completion of all houses sanctioned until 31 March 2022. The Ministry clarified that about 37 lakh houses have been approved during the last two years, and the completion time of the houses varied between 12 to 18 months for individual houses and 24 to 36 months in case of multi-storeyed houses sanctioned under the Scheme. The government was making all efforts to accelerate the pace of construction and ensure completion of projects within the stipulated timelines of the Detailed Project Report (Unstarred Question No. 1333, Rajya Sabha, 19 December 2022).



The PMAY-U initially had four components.

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 economically weaker section (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 the housing loan up to INR 6 lakh, INR 9 lakh and INR 12 lakh, respectively, over a loan tenure of 20 years.
5. **Affordable Rental Housing Complexes (ARHCs):** 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 affordable rental accommodations to urban migrants/poor. An estimated amount of INR 600 crore has been envisioned as the total outlay of the Scheme till the Mission period of PMAY-U, i.e., March 2022 (Source: YUVA, 2020).

S. NO.	VERTICAL	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE TO EACH BENEFICIARY		
1	BENEFICIARY-LED INDIVIDUAL HOUSE CONSTRUCTION/ENHANCEMENT (BLC)	INR 1.50 LAKH		
2	AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN PARTNERSHIP (AHP)	INR 1.50 LAKH		
3	IN-SITU SLUM REDEVELOPMENT (ISSR)	INR 1.00 LAKH		
4	CREDIT LINKED SUBSIDY SCHEME (CLSS)	CATEGORY (ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME)	LOAN AMOUNT	INTEREST SUBSIDY
		ECONOMICALLY WEAKER SECTION (UP TO INR 3,00,000)	UP TO INR 6 LAKH	6.5 PER CENT
		LOW INCOME GROUP (FROM INR 3,00,001 TO INR 6,00,000)		
		MIDDLE INCOME GROUP-I (FROM INR 6,00,001 TO INR 12,00,000)	UP TO INR 9 LAKH	4.0 PER CENT
		MIDDLE INCOME GROUP-II (FROM INR 12,00,001 TO INR 18,00,000)	UP TO INR 12 LAKH	3.0 PER CENT

**Table 1.1 | PMAY components and corresponding central assistance provisions**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 1669, Rajya Sabha, 01 August 2022

This chapter will focus on highlighting the physical and financial progress of the different components of the

PMAY-U, as asked and reported upon during the 2022 parliamentary proceedings.

## NATURE OF QUESTIONS

---

The questions asked in both the houses of Parliament with respect to PMAY–U, were primarily concentrated on the physical progress of the Scheme and the funds that were allocated for the same. Approximately 76 questions on funds and implementation were raised across all three sessions, and in both houses, and included state/UT specific inquiries. Given the backdrop of the pandemic and the continued distress of migrants and worker(s) families in cities, it is no surprise that ~26 questions were raised on in-situ slum redevelopment (ISSR) and affordable rental housing complexes (ARHCs). However, the MPs staged no overt inquiries into the credit linked subsidy scheme (CLSS), beneficiary-led construction (BLC) and affordable housing in partnership (AHP), and the information presented regarding these three components of PMAY–U is gleaned from the data the

government categorically chose to share through other written responses.

The people's need, physical scale and financial outlay of the PMAY–U is very large, and the expectation from the people's representatives in Parliament is that they demand adequate transparency from the Ministry. Only four questions in 2022 were pertaining to irregularities or instances of corruption in the PMAY–U. When MPs Shri Anto Anton and Shri. Balubhau Alias Suresh Narayan Dhanorkar asked the Ministry if it was aware of irregularities in the construction of houses, the Ministry's answer was not satisfactory. It dodged the question on irregularities, instead explaining how the process of approving the beneficiaries and funds is already public knowledge (Unstarred Question No. 26, Lok Sabha, 08 December 2022).

## PMAY FEATURES AND FINANCIAL FLOWS

---

MP Shri Prabhakar Reddy Vemireddy asked the Rajya Sabha about the pending release of the PMAY subsidy, and the Ministry tabled a detailed response by presenting the overall features and a financial map of PMAY. PMAY essentially has three centrally sponsored components (CSS) namely, beneficiary-led individual house construction/enhancement (BLC), affordable housing in partnership (AHP) and "in-situ" slum redevelopment (ISSR). There is one central sector component, which is the credit linked subsidy scheme (CLSS).

Under the CSS component of PMAY–U, central assistance is released in three instalments of 40 per cent, 40 per cent and 20 per cent upon fulfilment of mandatory compliances as envisaged in the scheme guidelines. Under the CSS component, committed central assistance for release is INR 1,44,676 crore, of which INR 65,188 crore has already been released to states/UTs so far. Subsequent releases are to be based on the utilisation of funds already released.

The interest subsidy under the CLSS component of PMAY–U is disbursed to beneficiaries upfront in their home loan account 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 to disburse interest subsidies 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. Interest subsidy of INR 41,415 crore (including INR 5,320 crore in the current financial year so far) has been disbursed to 17.68 lakh beneficiaries so far and subsequent release is subject to utilisation of funds already released (Starred Question No. 46, Rajya Sabha, 07 February 2022).

## PHYSICAL PROGRESS AND FUNDS

The total assessed demand reported by the states/UTs is 112 lakh houses, and as on 31 March 2022 the government had sanctioned a total of 122.69 lakh houses under PMAY-U. The government data shows that 106 lakh houses had been grounded and 65.5 lakh houses completed and delivered to the beneficiaries (Unstarred Question No. 2569, Lok Sabha, 22 December 2022). Only about half (53.38 per cent) of total sanctioned homes have been completed since 2015. Another caveat of the presented data is that the government acknowledges that 3.41 lakh completed houses were those sanctioned under the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JnNURM), a scheme that was discontinued in 2014.

However, the monetary allocation for the scheme continues. For FY 2021–22, an amount of INR 8,000 crore (including INR 1,000 crore for the CLSS component) was allocated for PMAY-U in budget estimates, which has now been enhanced to INR 27,000 crore (including INR 12,000 crore for CLSS component) at revised estimates stage, in consultation with Ministry of Finance (Starred Question No. 46, Rajya Sabha, 07 February 2022).

Over the course of the implementation of the Scheme, central assistance (CA) of INR 2.2 lakh crore has been approved and INR 1.28 lakh crore has been released to the states (Unstarred Question No. 542, Rajya Sabha, 12 December 2022). A small but significant fraction of the money released, INR 85,409.83 crore, is reported as being utilised only within the last three years (Unstarred Question No. 2569, Lok Sabha, 22 December 2022).

Over the last three years, 33,25,052 houses have been completed under PMAY-U. This means 50 per cent of the total houses completed under the Scheme have been completed in the last 3 years.

Ten states—Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, West Bengal, Karnataka and Rajasthan—have completed more than 1 lakh houses in the last three years alone. The ten states account for 84.99 per cent of total houses constructed in the last three years.

Five states—Maharashtra, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh—account for 63.49 per cent of the CA released to states in the last three years. The funds released to states more or less match the performance of the states over the last three years in terms of houses completed. No houses have been constructed under the Scheme in Lakshadweep in three years, while Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Sikkim, Ladakh, Meghalaya and Chandigarh have completed less than 1,000 houses. This accounts for 0.048 per cent of total homes constructed in three years. A smaller number of PMAY-U beneficiaries in UTs is expected, given their geographical size, although the lowly numbers from hilly and tribal states of Sikkim and Meghalaya pose questions regarding the awareness, access, and implementation of schemes in remote regions. These states/UTs received only INR 49.46 crore in CA in the last three years. It is important to note that the CA released in a particular financial year is given towards houses completed 12–36 months down the line. Hence, drawing more nuanced correlations between CA released and houses completed is erroneous.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	HOUSES COMPLETED (NOS.)			CENTRAL ASSISTANCE RELEASED (IN INR CRORE)		
		2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0	23	1	0.17	0.46	1.06
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	30,100	98,115	64,352	918.78	2,419.06	2,475.25
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	385	1,222	556	21.31	8.57	27.70
4	ASSAM	3,953	10,245	15,663	494.46	125.57	180.48
5	BIHAR	13,229	23,628	13,184	528.23	572.14	93.37
6	CHANDIGARH	363	406	144	8.24	9.18	3.45
7	CHHATTISGARH	35,423	48,442	13,575	724.64	690.18	380.89
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	1,483	1,811	1,127	35.90	45.57	26.06
9	DELHI	6,320	6,311	1,748	144.27	145.09	44.65
10	GOA	425	1,579	358	9.82	37	9.17
11	GUJARAT	1,11,871	1,64,759	1,62,709	2,254.24	3,241.67	4,192.91
12	HARYANA	10,644	19,008	7,074	247.72	290.17	172.77
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	1,268	1,877	1,681	29.96	32.81	46.49
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	1,877	3,643	3,758	99.78	131.54	43.67
15	JHARKHAND	12,775	24,029	10,985	331.12	535.22	260.35
16	KARNATAKA	30,591	66,857	27,190	702.37	1,142.07	529.76
17	KERALA	24,314	22,863	8,398	265.94	173.63	371.92
18	LADAKH	28	41	132	0	0.43	4.46
19	LAKSHADWEEP	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	MADHYA PRADESH	50,505	1,09,151	61,757	1,044.94	2,411.97	1,977.88
21	MAHARASHTRA	1,17,042	1,54,873	1,91,395	2,405.44	3,943.22	3,358.43
22	MANIPUR	647	1,580	430	65.09	99.94	0.13
23	MEGHALAYA	0	57	261	0.64	1.30	16.77
24	MIZORAM	1,832	1,394	1,000	7.89	71.92	14.34
25	NAGALAND	276	1,552	2,882	14.48	106.43	34.19
26	ODISHA	15,413	25,939	10,199	320.96	386.57	328.49
27	PUDUCHERRY	919	2,193	1,041	51.08	37.11	16.67
28	PUNJAB	12,272	16,345	10,441	188.08	507.35	252.69
29	RAJASTHAN	28,425	43,074	32,104	600.89	789.30	995.61
30	SIKKIM	18	97	33	0.38	1.57	1.35
31	TAMIL NADU	66,089	1,21,239	52,166	1,942.30	1,627.37	1,569.99
32	TELANGANA	39,144	88,615	23,474	384.76	777.17	297.90
33	TRIPURA	6,261	10,281	3,956	166.45	233.95	61.69
34	UTTAR PRADESH	1,65,638	2,99,327	2,79,947	4,046.35	4,913.38	3,942.93
35	UTTARAKHAND	5,137	5,120	5,490	79.95	160.84	89.21
36	WEST BENGAL	45,997	75,974	23,507	931.36	1,606.51	420.50
TOTAL		8,40,664	14,51,670	10,32,718	19,067.99	27,276.26	22,243.18

**Table 1.2 | Houses completed, and central assistance released between FY 2019-20 and 2021-22 under PMAY**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 714, Lok Sabha, 21 July 2022

## SLUM DWELLERS AND THE HOMELESS

This year, many questions pertaining to housing for slum dwellers and the homeless population were raised in Parliament. The questions covered a range of topics from demolition and rehabilitation of slum dwellers to the number of houses constructed under PMAY–U for the urban homeless. As the 'Housing for All' scheme is meant to provide houses to all eligible urban households including homeless and landless (Unstarred Question No. 545, Rajya Sabha, 07 February 2022) and slum dwellers (Starred Question No. 231, Lok Sabha, 22 December 2022), the expectation is for the government to collate, maintain and present current statistics on the physical progress of the PMAY–U for these most marginalised city dwellers.

To the questions relating to slum dwellers, the Ministry replied that 'Land and Colonisation' are state subjects and therefore any schemes related to development of slums, including civic amenities (Starred Question No. 231, Lok Sabha, 22 December 2022), and slum rehabilitation (Unstarred Question No. 714, Lok Sabha, 21 July 2022) were implemented by the state/UT. Furthermore, the Ministry did not maintain any data on the number of slums demolished and rehabilitation compensation released (Unstarred Question No. 3568, Rajya Sabha, 04 April 2022). The government dodged a question

on whether any study has been conducted on the increasing number of urban slum households in the last five years (Unstarred Question No. 538, Rajya Sabha, 07 February 2022).

The Ministry did not directly answer a key question on the homeless and landless population.. Shri. Thirumaavalavan Thol asked the Ministry to share in percentage terms about the reduction in the incidence of homelessness under PMAY–U. The Ministry maintained that under the PMAY–U guidelines, the states/UTs were mandated to conduct a demand survey through the ULBs with the vision of 'housing for all' and following a saturation approach. However, the Ministry did not disclose any data on the degree/percentage change in incidences of homelessness as a result of the scheme, despite the fact that houses under PMAY–U are sanctioned based on the project proposals submitted by the states/UTs (Unstarred Question No. 1604, Lok Sabha, 15 December 2022).

The Ministry cited dated Census 2011 data on the number of homeless people and stated that it does not maintain any data on the landless population in the country (Unstarred Question no. 545, Rajya Sabha, 07 February 2022).

## COMPONENT WISE PROGRESS

The selection of beneficiaries under affordable housing in partnership (AHP), in-situ slum redevelopment (ISSR), beneficiary-led construction (BLC) components is done by the state/UT governments through their implementing agencies/urban local bodies (ULBs) and selection under credit linked subsidy scheme (CLSS) is done by the central nodal agencies (CNAs), Banks or housing finance companies based on eligibility criteria as under:

- (i) Not owning a *pucca* house in his/her name or any other family member's name, anywhere in India.

- (ii) For BLC/ISSR/AHP vertical, the beneficiary must belong to the economically weaker section (EWS) category.

- (iii) Beneficiaries of EWS/low income group (LIG) and middle income group (MIG) category were considered for CLSS. CLSS for MIG ended on 31 March 2021 and CLSS for EWS/LIG ended on 31 March 2022 (Unstarred Question No. 865, Rajya Sabha, 25 July 2022).

The completion and delivery of PMAY houses each year

to beneficiaries has been varied in scale and has consistently improved. In the initial year 2016–2017, only 1,29,111 houses were completed and delivered; 3,27,898 houses delivered in 2017–2018. 2018–2019 was a standout year with the completion and delivery of 18,16,650 houses to beneficiaries. Since then, PMAY has

averaged the delivery of approximately 10 lakh houses a year (Unstarred Question No. 3575, Rajya Sabha, 04 April 2022). Of the 54,39,898 houses that were completed and delivered by February 2022 under PMAY, only 5,76,735 lie vacant (Starred Question No.34, Lok Sabha, 2022).

## IN-SITU SLUM REDEVELOPMENT (ISSR)

---

As per Census 2011, 1,39,20,191 households live in slums in urban areas and metropolitan cities across India. Maharashtra has the highest number of slum dwelling households (24,99,948), followed by Tamil Nadu (14,63,689), Andhra Pradesh (14,27,037), West Bengal (13,91,756) and Madhya Pradesh (11,17,764) (Unstarred Question No. 1334, Rajya Sabha, 19 December 2022). As of 12 December 2022, of the 1.20 crore sanctioned homes, 17.77 lakh homes fall under the BLC/AHP/ISSR components of PMAY–U and have been sanctioned for slum dwellers (Unstarred Question No. 1334, Rajya Sabha, 19 December 2022).

The most number of ISSR houses have been sanctioned in the state of Maharashtra (2,24,618). In all other states and UTs, less than one lakh houses have been sanctioned

under the ISSR component. Since the inception of the Scheme, of the 4,33,334 ISSR houses sanctioned, 2,40,744 houses (55.56 per cent) have been grounded, and only 1,49,116 houses have been completed (34.41 per cent). Five states—Maharashtra, Gujarat, Karnataka, Rajasthan, and Madhya Pradesh—account for 79.52 per cent of total homes completed and delivered to beneficiaries. Ladakh, Andhra Pradesh, Mizoram, West Bengal, Telangana and Chhattisgarh have completed 300 or less houses under ISSR. Very few ISSR houses have been sanctioned in these 5 states/UTs (less than 2,000). In fifteen states/UTs no houses have been sanctioned under ISSR in the Scheme period. Of 8 UTs, Ladakh is the only UT with 369 sanctioned houses of which only 62 are completed.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	NUMBER OF HOUSES SANCTIONED	NUMBER OF HOUSES GROUNDED	NUMBER OF HOUSES COMPLETED
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	-	-	-
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	1,617	161	82
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	1,536	1,536	-
4	ASSAM	108	64	-
5	BIHAR	11,276	7,344	4,171
6	CHANDIGARH	-	-	-
7	CHHATTISGARH	300	300	300
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	-	-	-
9	DELHI	-	-	-
10	GOA	-	-	-
11	GUJARAT	89,502	62,031	31,884
12	HARYANA	3,593	2,126	1,417
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	300	104	-
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	-	-	-
15	JHARKHAND	3,931	2,986	2,882
16	KARNATAKA	23,125	22,853	20,975
17	KERALA	2,118	1,188	725
18	LADAKH	369	77	62
19	LAKSHADWEEP	-	-	-
20	MADHYA PRADESH	8,123	8,123	6,335
21	MAHARASHTRA	2,24,618	86,213	46,552
22	MANIPUR	-	-	-
23	MEGHALAYA	-	-	-
24	MIZORAM	142	142	142
25	NAGALAND	1,054	1,054	702
26	ODISHA	17,595	9,981	4,942
27	PUDUCHERRY	-	-	-
28	PUNJAB	1025	-	-
29	RAJASTHAN	21,908	16,699	12,841
30	SIKKIM	-	-	-
31	TAMIL NADU	4,880	4,871	4,770
32	TELANGANA	1,198	256	256
33	TRIPURA	3,005	3,005	3,000
34	UTTAR PRADESH	8,409	5,495	5,438
35	UTTARAKHAND	3,130	2,237	1,448
36	WEST BENGAL	472	442	192
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>4,33,334</b>	<b>2,40,744</b>	<b>1,49,116</b>

**Table 1.3 | Houses sanctioned, grounded for construction and completed under ISSR component of PMAY-U, state/UT- wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 772, Lok Sabha, 21 July 2022

## CREDIT LINKED SUBSIDY SCHEME (CLSS)

The benefits of the CLSS have reached 19,13,779 beneficiary households in the middle income group (MIG), economically weaker sections (EWS) and low income groups (LIGs). A total of INR 44,625 crore has been released as central subsidy as of 31 March 2022. 20 major states make up 97.73 per cent of the total beneficiary households, i.e., a whopping 18,68,555 households. Three states—Maharashtra, Gujarat and Uttar Pradesh—account for a staggering 55.15 per cent of all beneficiary households under CLSS. Eight UTs

fare better in terms of beneficiaries reached and central subsidy released under this component, as compared to the entire north-eastern region of India. North-east India accounts for 0.41 per cent of all beneficiary households, where a central subsidy of INR 160.02 crore (i.e., 0.35 per cent of total central subsidy) has been released to eight states under CLSS. In comparison, the UTs have reached 1.94 per cent of total beneficiaries, and the Centre has released INR 846 crore (1.89 per cent of total central subsidy) towards CLSS.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	CENTRAL SUBSIDY AMOUNT (IN INR CRORE)	NO. OF BENEFICIARY HOUSEHOLDS
1	STATES	ANDHRA PRADESH	56,241
2		BIHAR	17,153
3		CHHATTISGARH	28,392
4		GOA	2,710
5		GUJARAT	4,57,931
6		HARYANA	38,061
7		HIMACHAL PRADESH	1,952
8		JHARKHAND	13,674
9		KARNATAKA	91,542
10		KERALA	26,856
11		MADHYA PRADESH	1,24,340
12		MAHARASHTRA	4,67,481
13		ODISHA	10,782
14		PUNJAB	36,483
15		RAJASTHAN	1,06,807
16		TAMIL NADU	96,172
17		TELANGANA	77,880
18		UTTAR PRADESH	1,30,107
19		UTTARAKHAND	15,949
20		WEST BENGAL	68,042
SUB-TOTAL (STATES)		43,170.16	18,68,555
21	NORTH EAST STATES	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	63
22		ASSAM	3,352
23		MANIPUR	211
24		MEGHALAYA	195
25		MIZORAM	1,509
26		NAGALAND	39
27		SIKKIM	137
28		TRIPURA	2,475



SUB-TOTAL (N.E. STATES)			160.02	7,981
29	UNION TERRITORIES	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0.54	23
30		CHANDIGARH	24.27	1,074
31		DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	125.17	5,309
32		DELHI (NCR)	604.51	26,445
33		JAMMU & KASHMIR	57.10	2,771
34		LADAKH	0.92	51
35		LAKSHADWEEP	-	-
36		PUDUCHERRY	33.75	1,570
SUB-TOTAL (UT)			846.26	37,243
GRAND TOTAL ^			44,625	19,13,779

^ Includes INR 448.56 crore. Central subsidy released to central nodal agencies recently under CLSS.

**Table 1.4 | Financial and physical progress of CLSS component of PMAY-U, state/UT-wise**  
*Source: Unstarred Question No. 3579, Rajya Sabha, 04 April 2022*

## BENEFICIARY LED CONSTRUCTION (BLC)

Under the BLC component, a total of 73,44,944 houses have been sanctioned, 61,52,163 houses have been grounded (83.76 per cent), of which 29,05,565 have been completed (i.e. 39.55 per cent of total sanctioned homes) till date. The highest number of BLC homes have been sanctioned in Andhra Pradesh (17,39,094); however a mere 16.25 per cent of the houses have been completed. The state of Uttar Pradesh has sanctioned

the second highest number of homes at 14,70,847 of which 9,61,072 (65.34 per cent) have been successfully completed. The five states of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and West Bengal account for 71.72 per cent of the total completed BLC homes. For the past 7 years, no BLC houses have been sanctioned in Telangana, Delhi (NCR), Chandigarh, Lakshadweep. The reasons for this require further study.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	NUMBER OF HOUSES SANCTIONED	NUMBER OF HOUSES GROUNDED FOR CONSTRUCTION	NUMBER OF HOUSES COMPLETED
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	25	25	22
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	17,39,094	15,40,314	2,82,636
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	7,393	6,367	3,172
4	ASSAM	1,57,421	1,44,354	45,037
5	BIHAR	3,37,290	2,81,556	73,189
6	CHANDIGARH (UT)	0	0	0
7	CHHATTISGARH	2,08,348	1,73,437	96,321
8	DADRA NH& DD (UT)	1,424	1,347	378
9	DELHI (NCR)	0	0	0
10	GOA	60	5	3
11	GUJARAT	1,38,614	1,34,435	68,728
12	HARYANA	67,649	45,507	11,648

13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	10,409	10,409	5,588
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	44,701	43,174	10,850
15	JHARKHAND	1,82,541	1,71,114	93,193
16	KARNATAKA	2,28,188	2,01,256	1,11,987
17	KERALA	1,23,269	96,788	72,561
18	LADAKH(UT)	943	943	481
19	LAKSHADWEEP (UT)	0	0	0
20	MADHYA PRADESH	7,33,569	6,41,142	3,47,059
21	MAHARASHTRA	3,23,089	1,25,373	41,863
22	MANIPUR	55,804	41,935	5,499
23	MEGHALAYA	4,554	3,415	705
24	MIZORAM	38,378	32,076	3,222
25	NAGALAND	31,241	30,665	6,439
26	ODISHA	1,62,486	1,31,321	89,907
27	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	14,216	13,931	5,182
28	PUNJAB	76,230	60,006	14,967
29	RAJASTHAN	71,199	10,289	543
30	SIKKIM	515	403	20
31	TAMIL NADU	4,06,044	3,82,905	2,86,630
32	TELANGANA	0	0	0
33	TRIPURA	87,551	72,934	54,034
34	UTTAR PRADESH	14,70,847	13,32,996	9,61,072
35	UTTARAKHAND	14,253	13,315	5,876
36	WEST BENGAL	6,07,599	4,08,426	2,06,753
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>73,44,944</b>	<b>61,52,163</b>	<b>29,05,565</b>

**Table 1.5 | Houses sanctioned, grounded for construction, and completed under BLC component of PMAY-U, state/UT-wise**

Source: Starred Question No. 163, Lok Sabha, 28 July 2022

## AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN PARTNERSHIP (AHP)

A total of 20,94,030 AHP houses have been sanctioned under PMAY. A total of 13,51,799 (64.55 per cent of sanctioned houses) have been grounded and 6,77,022 (32.33 per cent of sanctioned homes) have been completed. The highest number (4,86,167 houses), have been sanctioned in Maharashtra but an abysmal 33,675 have been completed over the years, i.e., a mere 6.92 per cent of total sanctioned houses. The states of Telangana and Andhra have each completed an impressive 80.52 per cent of AHP sanctioned houses in

their respective states. An important statistic at the end of the seventh year of PMAY is that in fourteen states/UTs not a single house has been sanctioned under the Scheme. Even when houses are sanctioned, completion of homes is still pending. In seven states/UTs, houses have been sanctioned but no house has been completed. Furthermore, in the three states of Haryana, West Bengal and Assam, and the UT of Jammu and Kashmir, AHP houses have been sanctioned, but not a single house has been grounded or completed.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	NUMBER OF HOUSES SANCTIONED	NUMBER OF HOUSES GROUNDED FOR CONSTRUCTION	NUMBER OF HOUSES COMPLETED
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS (UT)	555	329	0
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	2,68,002	2,68,002	2,15,813
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	0	0	0
4	ASSAM	128	0	0
5	BIHAR	0	0	0
6	CHANDIGARH (UT)	0	0	0
7	CHHATTISGARH	74,738	48,260	20,379
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU (UT)	1,726	1,531	81
9	DELHI (NCR)	0	0	0
10	GOA	0	-	0
11	GUJARAT	2,09,629	1,65,146	1,22,473
12	HARYANA	50,000	0	0
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	0	0	0
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR (UT)	1,008	0	0
15	JHARKHAND	32,701	19,341	1,406
16	KARNATAKA	3,47,453	2,71,087	43,523
17	KERALA	970	938	280
18	LADAKH (UT)	0	0	0
19	LAKSHADWEEP (UT)	0	0	0
20	MADHYA PRADESH	72,037	55,869	22,554
21	MAHARASHTRA	4,86,167	1,40,163	33,675
22	MANIPUR	0	0	0
23	MEGHALAYA	0	0	0
24	MIZORAM	0	0	0
25	NAGALAND	0	0	0
26	ODISHA	20,920	6,462	0
27	PUDUCHERRY (UT)	0	0	0
28	PUNJAB	570	570	176
29	RAJASTHAN	33,580	25,840	7,248
30	SIKKIM	0	0	0
31	TAMIL NADU	1,66,499	1,35,370	61,208
32	TELANGANA	1,59,372	1,53,796	1,28,328
33	TRIPURA	1,000	1,000	0
34	UTTAR PRADESH	1,33,533	5,1047	19,398
35	UTTARAKHAND	29,900	7,048	480
36	WEST BENGAL	3,542	0	0
GRAND TOTAL		20,94,030	13,51,799	6,77,022

**Table 1.6 | Houses sanctioned, grounded for construction and completed under AHP component of PMAY-U, state/UT-wise**

Source: Starred Question No. 163, Lok Sabha, 28 July 2022

## AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING COMPLEXES (ARHC)

---

The ARHCs are set to provide dignified living with necessary civic amenities to urban migrants/poor near their workplace at affordable rent. The ARHC sub-scheme is being implemented through two models:

**Model-1:** Utilising existing government funded vacant houses constructed under JnNURM and Rajiv Awas Yojana (RAY) to convert into ARHCs through public private partnership or by public agencies.

Under model 1, out of a total 83,534 vacant houses constructed under JnNURM, 5,478 have been converted into ARHCs and 7,483 are under the process of getting converted (Unstarred Question No. 3586, Rajya Sabha, 04 April 2022). Of the vacant homes waiting to be converted into ARHCs, 73.57 per cent of the houses are in Maharashtra and Delhi (See table 1.7)

**Model-2:** Construction, operation and maintenance of ARHCs by public/private entities on their own available vacant land.

So far, proposals for construction of 80,273 new ARHC units have been sanctioned under Model-2 (Unstarred Question No. 872, Lok Sabha, 21 July 2022). 58,386 of the sanctioned 80,273 units will be constructed in Tamil Nadu, i.e., 72.73 per cent of all housing units sanctioned under Model 2. The locations of a majority of the new ARHCs units are in satellite towns to major metropolises like Nizampet, which is a satellite town to Hyderabad or Vizianagram, a satellite town to Chennai (See Table 1.8).

If the purpose of the ARHC units is the provision of rental housing to urban migrants/poor then there must be uniformity and rationality in its planning and implementation. The government must be urged to uniformly acquire vacant housing units across India, not just in Maharashtra or Delhi, and be urged to rethink the locations of the newly built ARHCs. The cost of the commute from satellite towns to major cities alone will nullify the positive effects of affordable rental housing.

Furthermore, only a very small fraction of vacant houses have been converted to ARHCs even though the period of implementation of the ARHC scheme was until 31 March 2022 (Unstarred Question No. 872, Lok Sabha, 21 July 2022). Although the funding is expected to continue for 18 months for the sanctioned new units under Model 2, the Ministry was not adequately questioned on why it was dragging its feet on the implementation of the time-sensitive ARHC sub-scheme.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	NO. OF GOVT. FUNDED VACANT HOUSES TO BE CONVERTED INTO ARHCS	NO. OF HOUSES CONVERTED INTO ARHCS
1	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	752	-
2	CHANDIGARH	2,195	2,195
3	DELHI	29,112	-
4	GUJARAT	4,414	2,467
5	HARYANA	2,545	-
6	HIMACHAL PRADESH	314	-
7	MADHYA PRADESH	364	-
8	MAHARASHTRA	32,345	-
9	NAGALAND	664	-
10	RAJASTHAN	4,884	480
11	UTTAR PRADESH	5,232	-
12	UTTARAKHAND	377	-
13	JAMMU & KASHMIR	336	336
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>83,534</b>	<b>5,478</b>

**Table 1.7 | Government funded JnNURM houses to be converted into ARHCs under model-I**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 3586, Rajya Sabha, 04 April 2022

S. NO.	CITY, STATE	TOTAL UNITS
1	SRIPERUMBUDUR, TAMIL NADU	18,112
2	SRIPERUMBUDUR, TAMIL NADU	3,969
3	HOSUR, TAMIL NADU	11,500
4	CHENNAI, TAMIL NADU	18,720
5	CHENNAI, TAMIL NADU	1,040
6	RAIPUR, CHHATTISGARH	2,222
7	KAMPUR TOWN, ASSAM	2,222
8	PRAYAGRAJ, UTTAR PRADESH	1,112
9	SURAT, GUJARAT	453
10	CHENNAI, TAMIL NADU	5,045
11	NIZAMPET, TELANGANA	14,490
12	KAKINADA, ANDHRA PRADESH	736
13	VIZIANAGRAM, ANDHRA PRADESH	652
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>80,273</b>

**Table 1.8 | Number of ARHC units sanctioned for construction under Model-2**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 872, Lok Sabha, 21 July 2022

When questioned by MP Shri Vincent H. Pala, the Ministry stated that to avoid exploitation of the tenants, the operational guidelines of ARHCs prescribes that the initial affordable rent of ARHCs will be fixed by the local authority based on a local survey. Subsequently, rent will be enhanced biennially by 8 per cent, subject to maximum funding of 20 per cent in aggregate, over a period of 5 years, effective from the date of signing the

contract. The same mechanism is to be followed over the entire concession period of 25 years (Unstarred Question No. 1487, Lok Sabha, 15 December 2022). The Central Government should monitor the rent fixed by local authorities, and mandate the affordability of the ARHCs. The implementation of these rent control guidelines should be a key area of questioning in the coming years.

## PMAY AND PROVISIONS FOR MARGINALISED GROUPS

---

MP Shri Jayadev Galla asked the Lok Sabha about the number of slum dwelling women who have received permanent housing. The Ministry presented details on all women beneficiaries reached through the PMAY. The PMAY has sanctioned houses to 96,46,036 women beneficiaries across the country. Apart from Lakshadweep, the PMAY has reached women beneficiaries to varying degrees across the states/UTs. Andhra Pradesh has the highest number of women beneficiaries standing at 17,87,729, followed by Uttar Pradesh (12,32,472) and Maharashtra (11,39,489). The three states account for 43.12 per cent of all women beneficiaries (Unstarred Question No. 772, Lok Sabha, 21 July 2022).

MP Prof. Manoj Kumar Jha and Shri. Kumar Ketkar asked the Ministry for data on the number of Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribe and Other Backward Class beneficiaries of PMAY. In its responses, the Ministry provided the following URL: [http://pmay-urban.gov.in/city-additional -details-2.pdf](http://pmay-urban.gov.in/city-additional-details-2.pdf). Over the course of the Scheme, houses have been provided to 20,07,765 SC beneficiaries, 5,73,024 ST beneficiaries and 40,60,588 OBC beneficiaries (Unstarred Question No. 3579, Rajya Sabha, 04 April 2022).

In response to a question on providing affordable houses to transgenders raised in the Rajya Sabha by Dr. Santanu Sen and Shri Abir Ranjan Biswas, the Ministry stated that the sanctioned 1.20 crore houses included 2,285 houses for transgender persons (Unstarred

Question No. 1349, Rajya Sabha, December 19, 2022).

The success of the PMAY in reaching previously marginalised communities requires mention and should be duly celebrated. There remains scope for further inquiry into how and where, and with how much ease these beneficiaries were able to access the Scheme.

## CONCLUSION

---

Slowly and incrementally the PMAY housing is reaching beneficiaries from the most marginalised communities. The commitment to provide 'housing for all' is a commendable step. However, in terms of completion and delivery of homes, the PMAY mechanisms have been extremely slow. An abysmal 0.53 per cent of total sanctioned homes have been completed; 50 per cent of the total houses having been completed in the last 3 years, and a small fraction of which were sanctioned during JnNURM. The long wait for affordable housing raises questions about administrative red-tape, a lack of political will and total disregard of housing and ownership rights.

A cursory look at the progress of the ISSR and ARHC components shows that these sub-schemes are yet to reach their full potential. As cities continue to become

gentrified, the tenancy and ownership of slum dwellers and affordable rental housing options for moving populations become time-sensitive matters. Moreover, evictions and demolitions of unauthorised settlements/colonies have added distress and threat to the lives of marginalised populations. Shelters for the urban homeless too have not featured on the state/UT priority lists, nor on the Central government's mandates.

A right-based lens to housing for all is essential for the success of PMAY. This holistic lens will prioritise fundamental components with respect to housing—housing ownership, tenure security, in-situ upgradation, fully equipped shelters, access to basic services, ensuring adequate protection against evictions/displacements, and introduction of new housing typologies like rental housing.

## CHAPTER 2

# ATAL MISSION FOR REJUVENATION AND URBAN TRANSFORMATION

---

### (RE)INTRODUCTION OF THE SCHEME

---

The Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT) was launched in 2015 to 'Upgrade existing urban centers, transitioning focus from basic infrastructure to public utility services like Waste and Water Management - for a clean and healthy city life' (BJP Manifesto, 2014). AMRUT aimed to provide basic services (water, sewerage, public transport) to individual households, and embolden public utility services like storm water and septage management, green spaces and urban transport, especially to make cities accessible and inclusive for poor and disadvantaged citizens.

In 2021, five years after its initial launch, AMRUT was relaunched as AMRUT 2.0 on 1 October 2021 for the next five years, i.e., from the financial year 2021–22 to 2025–26. PM Modi in his address stated that the goal of the mission was to make urban Indian 'water secure.' To this effect, the overall thrust areas of the Mission remain the same, but AMRUT 2.0 is designed to promote a circular economy of water through the following:

- The development of the City Water Balance Plan for each city focusing on recycle/reuse of treated sewage, rejuvenation of water bodies and water conservation.
- Universal coverage of water supply through functional taps to all households in all the statutory towns in the country and coverage of sewage/septage management in 500 cities covered in the first phase of the AMRUT scheme.
- Reform the ease of living of citizens through the reduction of non-revenue water, recycle of treated used water, rejuvenation of water bodies, augmenting double entry accounting system, urban planning,

strengthening urban finance, etc.

- Pey Jal Survekshan to ascertain equitable distribution of water, reuse of wastewater, mapping of water bodies and promote healthy competition among the cities/towns.
- Technology sub-mission for water to leverage latest global technologies in the field of water.
- Information, education and communication (IEC) campaign to spread awareness among masses about conservation of water.

(Unstarred Question no. 458, Lok Sabha, 03 February 2022).

Other salient features of AMRUT 2.0 include the government's push to involve the community in the process of monitoring of project progress through:

- Women self-help group (SHG) involvement in water demand management, water quality testing and water infrastructure operations
- Students engagement for survey of projects and outputs through gig economy model
- Random verification of project progress reported on the portal through citizen/third party feedback. Facilitation of implementing agencies and community stakeholders to access the portal and upload the progress and feedback
- Central assistance processing through an online claims and settlement system, emerging from the actual progress updated on the portal through



physical/financial data, photos and videos obtained through citizen feedback and third-party assessment.

(Unstarred Question No. 3194, Lok Sabha, 04 August 2022)

## FUNDING PATTERN AND CURRENT 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 (CA) as per Mission guidelines.

It is important to note that all ongoing schemes of AMRUT (launched on 25 June 2015 and for the period of 5 years) have been subsumed in AMRUT 2.0, and the ongoing projects will be supported up to March, 2023 (Unstarred Question No. 458, Lok Sabha, 03

February 2022). The Central allocation of INR 35,990 crore for AMRUT projects was distributed among states/ UTs using an equitable formula in which equal (50:50) weightage was given to the urban population (Census 2011) of each state/UT and the number of statutory towns in the state/UT. The central allocation of INR 66,750 crore for AMRUT 2.0 projects have been distributed among the states/UTs using the equitable formula wherein weightage to urban population (Census 2011) and area of each state/UT have been given in the ratio of 90:10 (Unstarred Question No. 3583, Rajya Sabha, 04 April 2022).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	CENTRAL ALLOCATION FOR PROJECTS UNDER AMRUT (IN INR CRORE)	CENTRAL ALLOCATION FOR PROJECTS UNDER AMRUT 2.0 (IN INR CRORE)
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	10.82	35
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	1,056.62	3,158
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	126.22	225
4	ASSAM	591.42	770
5	BIHAR	1,164.80	2,620
6	CHANDIGARH	54.09	170
7	CHHATTISGARH	1,009.74	1,294
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	28.85	30
9	DELHI	802.31	2,880
10	GOA	104.58	85
11	GUJARAT	2,069.96	4,500
12	HARYANA	764.51	1,494
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	274.07	252
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	500.62	856
15	JHARKHAND	566.17	1,178
16	KARNATAKA	2,318.79	4,615

17	KERALA	1,161.20	1,372
18	LADAKH	79.92	124
19	LAKSHADWEEP	3.61	2
20	MADHYA PRADESH	2,592.86	4,045
21	MAHARASHTRA	3,534.08	9,285
22	MANIPUR	162.28	169
23	MEGHALAYA	72.12	110
24	MIZORAM	126.22	142
25	NAGALAND	108.19	175
26	ODISHA	796.97	1,363
27	PUDUCHERRY	64.91	150
28	PUNJAB	1,204.47	1,833
29	RAJASTHAN	1,541.95	3,530
30	SIKKIM	36.06	40
31	TAMIL NADU	4,756.58	4,935
32	TELANGANA	832.60	2,780
33	TRIPURA	133.43	156
34	UTTAR PRADESH	4,922.46	8,145
35	UTTARAKHAND	533.72	582
36	WEST BENGAL	1,929.32	3,650
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>*36,036.52</b>	<b>66,750</b>

**Table 2.1 | : Central allocation of funds under AMRUT and AMRUT 2.0, state/UT-wise***Source: Unstarred Question No. 3583, Rajya Sabha, 04 April 2022*

\* Total committed central assistance for AMRUT projects increased from initially approved amount of INR 35,990 crore due to reorganisation of erstwhile State of Jammu and Kashmir (J&K) into UT of J&K and UT of Ladakh.

As Table 2.1 shows, financial outlay for each state is not earmarked year-wise but instead for the entire Mission period. For AMRUT, Uttar Pradesh was allocated the highest amount of funds (INR 4,922.46 crore), followed by Tamil Nadu (INR 4,756.58 crore), Maharashtra (INR 3,534.08 crore). For AMRUT 2.0, Maharashtra (INR 9,285 crore) will receive the highest CA, followed by Uttar Pradesh (INR 8,145 crore), Tamil Nadu (INR 4,935 crore), Karnataka (INR 4,615 crore) and Gujarat (INR 4,500 crore). These five states will make up 47.16 per cent of the total outlay of the Mission 2.0.

In July 2022, in response to a question raised in the Rajya Sabha, the government stated that INR 2,490.71 crore CA was released under AMRUT 2.0 between

2021–2023, i.e., only 3.73 per cent of the total Mission outlay of INR 66,750 crore. The CA released to Maharashtra over the two financial years was INR 81.86 crore (i.e. 0.85 per cent of its promised CA), even though the state has the highest allotted AMRUT 2.0 budget of INR 9,285 crore (Starred Question No. 4, Rajya Sabha, 18 July 2022). The picture is the same across the 36 states and UTs of India; the CA released appears to be significantly lower than expected, given the generous state/UT CA allocations. Only the two states of Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu made up 61.02 per cent of the total CA released in FY 22–23 (Starred Question No. 4, Rajya Sabha, 18 July, 2022).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	CA RELEASED FOR AMRUT 2.0 DURING 2021-22 (IN INR CRORE)	CA RELEASED FOR AMRUT 2.0 PROJECT DURING 2022-23 (IN INR CRORE)
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0	0
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	15.60	0
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	2.90	0
4	ASSAM	10	56.65
5	BIHAR	28.60	0
6	CHANDIGARH	0	0
7	CHHATTISGARH	17.80	148.40
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	0	0
9	DELHI	0.90	0
10	GOA	1.50	0
11	GUJARAT	19.60	311.59
12	HARYANA	11.20	0
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	7	0
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	8.30	0
15	JHARKHAND	103.93	0
16	KARNATAKA	34.20	0
17	KERALA	10.20	0
18	LADAKH	0	0
19	LAKSHADWEEP	0	0
20	MADHYA PRADESH	174.58	12.70
21	MAHARASHTRA	45.70	36.16
22	MANIPUR	2.80	0
23	MEGHALAYA	1.10	21.69
24	MIZORAM	2.40	0
25	NAGALAND	4.10	0
26	ODISHA	139.77	0
27	PUDUCHERRY	1	0
28	PUNJAB	18.30	0
29	RAJASTHAN	24.20	0
30	SIKKIM	0.80	0
31	TAMIL NADU	69.40	398.13
32	TELANGANA	115.50	0
33	TRIPURA	2.10	0
34	UTTAR PRADESH	80.90	521.41
35	UTTARAKHAND	10.80	0
36	WEST BENGAL	18.80	0
GRAND TOTAL		983.98	1,506.73

**Table 2.2 | :** Central assistance for AMRUT 2.0 released during FY 2021-22 and 2022-23, state/UT-wise  
Source: Starred Question No. 4, Rajya Sabha, 18 July 2022

S. NO.	STATE/UT	FUND RELEASED (IN INR CRORE)					
		UP TO 2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	TOTAL
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	2.17	4.32	0	4.32	0	10.81
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	619.69	246.69	0	0	0	866.38
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	25.25	17.63	0	56.44	0	99.32
4	ASSAM	73.23	0	0	179.64	56.65	309.52
5	BIHAR	369.94	0	685.93	0	0	1,055.87
6	CHANDIGARH	26.95	26.32	0	0	0	53.27
7	CHHATTISGARH	407.90	145.67	415.55	0	148.40	1,117.52
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	5.76	4.27	0	4.16	0	14.19
9	DELHI	160.46	151.55	0	206.20	0	518.21
10	GOA	20.91	0	0	0	0	20.91
11	GUJARAT	518.78	1,074.58	0	73.60	311.59	1,978.55
12	HARYANA	152.90	289.71	147.18	147.18	0	736.97
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	85.39	60.23	56.73	66.71	0	269.06
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR (I/C LADAKH)	265.15	154.35	0	95.64	0	515.14
15	JHARKHAND	197.23	135.22	109.62	207.85	0	649.92
16	KARNATAKA	1,141.88	710.54	280.50	125.93	0	2,258.85
17	KERALA	232.24	194.74	399.25	119.62	0	945.85
18	LAKSHADWEEP	0.73	0.70	0.41	0.41	0	2.25
19	MADHYA PRADESH	1,471.29	925	0	230.84	12.70	2,639.83
20	MAHARASHTRA	1,532.52	0	1,243.73	330	36.16	3,142.41
21	MANIPUR	96.21	0	66.07	0	0	162.28
22	MEGHALAYA	8.91	0	0	22.69	21.69	53.29
23	MIZORAM	74.45	0	45.27	0	0	119.72
24	NAGALAND	21.63	12.03	0	43.52	0	77.18
25	ODISHA	472.40	312.83	0	127.47	0	912.70
26	PUDUCHERRY	12.98	12.73	9.19	9.19	0	44.09
27	PUNJAB	240.89	0	121.44	623.57	0	985.90
28	RAJASTHAN	727.52	143.91	586.54	0	0	1,457.97
29	SIKKIM	7.21	5.30	0	18.55	0	31.06
30	TAMIL NADU	1,686.74	377.16	278.84	1,454.55	398.13	4,195.42
31	TELANGANA	302.01	178.82	350.70	100	0	931.53
32	TRIPURA	26.68	0	26.21	79.58	0	132.47
33	UTTAR PRADESH	1,244.49	226.03	964.37	1,418.72	521.41	4,375.02
34	UTTARAKHAND	149.49	122.01	113.39	147.02	0	531.91
35	WEST BENGAL	831.01	153.30	245.82	675.26	0	1,905.39
TOTAL		13,212.99	5,685.64	6,146.74	6,568.66	1,506.73	33,120.76

**Table 2.3 | : AMRUT and AMRUT 2.0 funds released during the last three years and the current year, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1670, Rajya Sabha, 01 August 2022

Funds released under the AMRUT have been steadily declining since 2018 (YUVA, 2021). The breakdown of funds released and utilised against the various schemes/plans of the Mission was not readily available amongst the data released by the Ministry. In response to MLA Smt. Rajashree Mallick's question, the MoHUA provided details of the Utilisation Certificates (UCs) pending/ unspent balance under AMRUT 2.0 project over FY 2021–22 in November 2022.

Together, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha and

Telangana make up 54.47 per cent of the unspent balance for financial year FY 2021–22. Smaller states like Goa, Arunachal Pradesh, Tripura, Manipur, Meghalaya, Sikkim, Nagaland, Mizoram have less than INR 5 crore unspent in their AMRUT budgets. However, the reasons for these unspent amounts remain unclear as the government has not shared a full picture of the financial progress— the funds released vs the funds pending or unspent per state since the beginning of AMRUT 2.0.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	FY 2021–22 (IN INR CRORE)
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	15.60
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	0
3	ASSAM	10
4	BIHAR	28.60
5	CHANDIGARH	
6	CHHATTISGARH	17.80
7	DELHI	0.90
8	GOA	1.50
9	GUJARAT	19.60
10	HARYANA	11.20
11	HIMACHAL PRADESH	7
12	JAMMU & KASHMIR	8.30
13	JHARKHAND	103.93
14	KARNATAKA	34.20
15	KERALA	10.20
16	LADAKH	
17	MADHYA PRADESH	174.58
18	MAHARASHTRA	45.70
19	MANIPUR	2.80
20	MEGHALAYA	1.10
21	MIZORAM	2.40
22	NAGALAND	4.10
23	ODISHA	139.77
24	PUDUCHERRY	0
25	PUNJAB	18.30
26	RAJASTHAN	24.20
27	SIKKIM	0.57
28	TAMIL NADU	69.40

29	TELANGANA	115.50
30	TRIPURA	2.10
31	UTTAR PRADESH	80.90
32	UTTARAKHAND	10.80
33	WEST BENGAL	18.80
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>979.84</b>

**Table 2.4 | : Utilisation certificates pending/unspent balance under AMRUT 2.0, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 411, Lok Sabha, 08 December 2022

\*AMRUT 2.0 was launched on 1 October 2021

## PHYSICAL PROGRESS

### SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS

In the first phase of AMRUT, the total financial outlay of the States and UTs for the entire Mission period is INR 77,640 crore, including committed central assistance (CA) of INR 35,990 crore. Of this, INR 32,456 crore (42 per cent of total outlay) has been allocated to projects under sewerage and septage management sector. Under phase two, i.e., AMRUT 2.0, the total financial outlay of the States and UTs for the entire Mission period is INR 2,77,000 crore, including committed CA of INR 76,760 crore. Of this, INR 66,750 crore (87 per cent of CA) has been allocated to projects under sewerage and septage management sector (Unstarred Question No. 1670, Rajya Sabha, 01 August 2022).

whopping 42.25 per cent of the share of total sewage treatment capacity generated by 282 projects. As a result, the sewage treatment capacity across the rest of the country (i.e., the rest of the 19 states), generated through the sanctioned 282 STPs, is very small or almost negligible. Further, the sewage treatment capacity varies widely and is unequally distributed.

Noticeably, the more populous states of West Bengal and Jharkhand are in-process of building just 1 STP with the capacities of 4.3 MLD and 50 MLD respectively, whereas Orissa has completed just 1 STP with the abysmal treatment capacity of 1 MLD. (Unstarred Question No. 1921, Lok Sabha, 28 July 2022).

In terms of physical progress, 95 lakh new sewer connections have been achieved against the target of 149 lakhs (Starred Question No. 137, Lok Sabha, 10 February 2022). However, as regards the sewage and septage management infrastructure, the states are falling short. So far only 282 sewage treatment plants (STPs) with a total capacity of 6,246 million litres per day (MLD) have been sanctioned. Of this, 128 STPs with a total capacity of 2,740.7 MLD have already been completed, and 154 STPs with a capacity of 3504.84 MLD are in progress. Madhya Pradesh (50), Gujarat (40) and Rajasthan (36) led the way in terms of number of projects sanctioned or in process of completion and make up a

S. NO.	STATE/UT	STP COMPLETED		STP UNDER		TOTAL	
		NO.	CAPACITY (IN MLD)	NO.	CAPACITY (IN MLD)	NO.	CAPACITY (IN MLD)
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	0	0	22	187	22	187
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	0	0	1	3	1	3
3	CHHATTISGARH	2	31.20	2	232	4	263.20
4	DAMAN & DIU	1	4	0	0	1	4
5	GUJARAT	30	1,437.50	10	241.50	40	1,679
6	HARYANA	15	112	7	144	22	256
7	HIMACHAL PRADESH	0	0	2	20.90	2	20.90
8	JAMMU & KASHMIR	1	4	1	2	2	6
9	JHARKHAND	0	0	1	50	1	50
10	KARNATAKA	19	187	4	85	23	272
11	KERALA	1	5	9	34.97	10	39.97
12	MADHYA PRADESH	20	493	30	466.75	50	959.75
13	MAHARASHTRA	2	50	23	931.50	25	981.50
14	MEGHALAYA	0	0	1	1.65	1	1.65
15	ODISHA	1	1	0	0	1	1
16	PUNJAB	3	64	5	402	8	466
17	RAJASTHAN	22	88	14	37	36	125
18	TAMIL NADU	4	114	8	335.82	12	449.82
19	TELANGANA	2	18	0	0	2	18
20	UTTAR PRADESH	5	132	9	276	14	408
21	UTTARAKHAND	0	0	4	49.45	4	49.45
22	WEST BENGAL	0	0	1	4.30	1	4.30
GRAND TOTAL		128	2,740.70	154	3,504.84	282	6,245.54

**Table 2.5 | Sewage treatment plant projects under AMRUT, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1921, Lok Sabha, 8 July, 2022.

## TAPS

So far, no AMRUT city is said to have achieved hundred percent tap water supply coverage. Against the target to provide 139 lakh water tap connections, 126 lakh new water tap connections have been provided under AMRUT and in convergence with other schemes (Starred Question No. 137, Lok Sabha, 10 February 2022).

The highest number of target households (above 10 lakh) are in the state of Maharashtra (19,83,405), followed by Tamil Nadu (16,15,641), West Bengal (14,61,620), Karnataka (12,89,119) and Madhya Pradesh (10,09,765). In actuality, the highest number of tap connections

have been provided in the five states of West Bengal, Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh. These five states make up 47.28 per cent of tap connections provided across the country.

On the other hand, nine states and UTs have provided less than 5,000 tap connections since the start of the Mission. Of these nine states, only Sikkim is on track to meet its target (82.18 per cent of target met), while the other states/UTs (Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Jammu and Kashmir, Ladakh and Puducherry) are lagging far behind the defined targets (< 50 per cent of targets met).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	TARGET HOUSEHOLDS	TAP CONNECTIONS PROVIDED
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	7,28,997	3,93,073
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	1,785	750
3	ASSAM	1,08,447	64,775
4	BIHAR	8,24,823	5,75,536
5	CHHATTISGARH	3,70,151	3,09,248
6	GOA	400	150
7	GUJARAT	1,54,495	5,72,864
8	HARYANA	2,73,670	3,30,836
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	13,003	22,563
10	JHARKHAND	3,61,170	2,54,423
11	KARNATAKA	12,89,119	7,80,509
12	KERALA	1,53,387	2,16,474
13	MADHYA PRADESH	10,09,765	13,51,140
14	MAHARASHTRA	19,83,405	8,20,234
15	MANIPUR	33,867	28,947
16	MEGHALAYA	7,170	190
17	MIZORAM	12,127	56,535
18	NAGALAND	32,881	3,755
19	ODISHA	2,91,204	4,92,723
20	PUNJAB	4,59,365	2,33,915
21	RAJASTHAN	6,66,761	6,86,704
22	SIKKIM	4,754	3,907
23	TAMIL NADU	16,15,641	14,99,801
24	TELANGANA	9,01,031	5,43,710
25	TRIPURA	20,130	43,137
26	UTTAR PRADESH	7,02,907	7,93,958
27	UTTARAKHAND	56,347	71,308
28	WEST BENGAL	14,61,620	15,03,394
29	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	2,705	7,198
30	CHANDIGARH	24,731	1,76,434
31	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	5,895	21,458
32	DAMAN & DIU	7,528	7,000
33	DELHI	1,82,196	7,53,791
34	JAMMU & KASHMIR	1,07,674	170
35	LADAKH	WITH JAMMU & KASHMIR	1,620
36	LAKSHADWEEP	-	-
37	PUDUCHERRY	7,607	1,050
TOTAL		1,38,76,758	1,26,23,280

**Table 2.6 | Tap connection targets set and tap connections provided under AMRUT and in convergence with other schemes, state/UT-wise**

Source: Starred Question No. 137, Lok Sabha, 10 February, 2022



## WATER BODIES REJUVENATION

The rejuvenation of existing water sources is a key component of achieving water security in cities. However, little to no information on country-wide water body rejuvenation projects was demanded in either house of Parliament, apart from Smt. Vandana Chavan in the Rajya Sabha. The Ministry responded by stating that under AMRUT, 31 projects of rejuvenation of water bodies costing INR 114.28 crore were taken up in the five years, of which 20 water bodies have been rejuvenated and 11 remained in-progress as of July 2022 (Unstarred Question No. 64, Rajya Sabha, 18 July 2022).

The government has approved rejuvenation projects of 690 water bodies worth INR 1,628.78 crore in 14 states/UTs under AMRUT 2.0. Of this, 279 projects worth INR 277.69 crore have been proposed in the State Water Action Plans-1 (SWAP-1) submitted by 04 States/UTs and 411 projects worth INR 1,351.09 crore have been proposed in the Special State Water Action Plans

(SSWAPs) submitted by 11 states/UTs in the month of July 2022. The approved central assistance (CA) is higher than the estimated project costs released by the government (See Table 2.7), which shows the states/UTs are reaffirming the Mission's commitment toward the renewal of urban water bodies.

The government's written response also provided clarity on the funding procedures of water rejuvenation projects. As was the case in AMRUT, under AMRUT 2.0 too, funds are not released project-wise. CA is released against approved SWAP/SSWAP. So far, INR 709.72 crore of CA has been released against SWAP-1 which includes projects related to water supply, sewerage and septage management, parks and green spaces development and water bodies rejuvenation. Further, INR 51.67 crore of CA has also been released against SSWAP, which includes water bodies rejuvenation projects (Unstarred Question No. 64, Rajya Sabha, 18 July 2022).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	NO. OF PROJECTS	ESTIMATED COST (IN INR CRORE)
1	ASSAM	30	15.55
2	CHHATTISGARH	60	41.40
3	DELHI	38	93.02
4	GUJARAT	123	341.49
5	LADAKH	1	2.70
6	MADHYA PRADESH	89	153.07
7	MAHARASHTRA	77	512.05
8	MANIPUR	17	3.31
9	ODISHA	16	50.41
10	PUDUCHERRY	3	2.89
11	RAJASTHAN	25	85.82
12	SIKKIM	1	1.13
13	TAMIL NADU	187	113.74
14	WEST BENGAL	23	38.52
GRAND TOTAL		690	1,455.10

**Table 2.7| : List of proposed/upcoming water bodies rejuvenation projects under AMRUT 2.0, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 64, Rajya Sabha, 18 July 2022

Data as on 4 July 2022

Note: Majority of the water bodies rejuvenation projects are at the stage of preparation/approval of detailed project report and states/UTs have updated their completion time-line varying from financial year 2022-23 to 2025-26.

## PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

The Ministry's Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT) promotes non-motorised urban transport for the benefit of pedestrians. Against the total plan size of INR 77,640 crore, INR 1,436 crore (2 per cent) has been allocated for non-motorised urban transport. The admissible components under this include development of footpaths/walkways, sidewalks, foot

over-bridges, etc. So far (as of December, 2022), 347 projects worth INR 1,025 crore have been grounded, of which 263 projects worth INR 544 crore have been completed. Through these projects, 372 km of walkways have been developed and work on the remaining 15 km is under progress (Unstarred Question No. 1330, Rajya Sabha, 19 December 2022).

## AMRUT 2.0 AND URBAN-RURAL CONVERGENCE

---

In an effort to promote water security, the government has also envisioned effective, responsible and sustainable use of the sanctioned infrastructure and treated water through urban-rural convergence, and by expanding the market for treated water to rural markets. In response to MP Shri. Y.S. Avinash Reddy's question about rural-urban convergence under revamped AMRUT 2.0 (Unstarred Question No. 383, Lok Sabha, 03 February 2022) the Ministry responded vide a written response.

The Ministry stated that under AMRUT 2.0, rural-urban synergy will be maintained whereby urban as well as rural areas can access reuse of treated used water. To this

effect, co-treatment of sewage/septage from nearby villages in spare capacities of sewage treatment plants (STPs) will be explored by urban local bodies (ULBs). To facilitate this, national, state and ULB-level committees on water/sewerage/river/water body coordination shall be represented by members of rural areas, especially for peri-urban areas (i.e. zones of transition from rural to urban land). Further, under AMRUT 2.0, wherever feasible, there will be a capacity building convergence also between urban and rural. The nature of this 'capacity building', however, was not specified.

## CONCLUSION

---

AMRUT was to achieve its objectives by December 2022. However, the Mission was relaunched with newer areas of action in October 2021. With the lack of data on the objective and project specific allocation of funds, it becomes difficult to track whether resources are being equitably distributed across all the AMRUT 2.0 targets. Without this, there is no public information on the nature of efforts to ensure adequate storm water drainage and flood management, investments in pedestrian safety and public transportation. These public utilities most influence and impact the lives and livelihoods of the urban poor and marginalized. Given the volatility of climate change and its impacts on human settlements, the progress on these indicators should find special mentions in Parliamentary proceedings.

The government on its part is making a conscious effort not to duplicate interventions and funds by proposing an urban-rural convergence and by aligning the jurisdictions of AMRUT and SBM. However, since the MPs remain silent on their inquiries of these convergence proceedings, the Mission must expand its reach to the grassroots stakeholders involved to gauge the position and implementation on the ground. The plan to monitor the AMRUT 2.0 project via public engagement is a step in this direction. It will allow for issue focused work on water and sewage, and create a platform for public engagement, public consultations, spread information, and keep the Mission transparent.

## CHAPTER 3

# SWACHH BHARAT MISSION–URBAN

---

### INTRODUCTION

---

Swachh Bharat Mission–Urban (SBM–U) was launched in 2014 with the aim to achieve Clean India by 2019. The Mission was extended with the launch of Swachh Bharat Mission–Urban (SBM–U) 2.0 on October 1, 2021 with the aspiration to make India's cities 'garbage free.' The extension of the flagship Mission is touted as the NDA government's affirmation to tackle the challenges of a rapidly urbanising India and to contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 2030.

The aims of SBM–U 2.0 are as follows:

1. Make all cities 'Garbage Free'
2. Ensure grey and black water management in all cities other than those covered under AMRUT
3. Make all ULBs as ODF+ and those ULBs with a population of less than 1 lakh as ODF++
4. Focus on source segregation of solid waste, utilising the principles of 3Rs (reduce, reuse, recycle)
5. Scientific processing of all types of municipal solid waste
6. Remediation of legacy dumpsites for effective solid waste management

(Government of India, 2021b)

The government spending on SBM–U 2.0 too has increased. The Government of India launched SBM–U 2.0 with the total outlay of INR 1,41,600 crore, which includes central share of INR 36,465 crore, which is nearly 2.5 times the allocation of INR 14,623 crore under SBM–U launched in 2014 (Unstarred Question No. 382, Lok Sabha, 3 Feb 2022).

However, the data presented in the Parliament with regards to the state/UT-wise allocation of SBM–U 2.0

funds, shows only INR 32,826 crore has been allocated to the states (Unstarred Question No. 2063, Lok Sabha, 28 July 2022). The mismatch in the data on the Centre's claimed share in the Mission versus the state/UT-wise budgetary allocations were not clarified through any questions raised or answers presented in the Parliament. At the time of writing this report, INR 1,129.17 crore had been released to the states. State-wise analysis revealed that Uttar Pradesh (INR 4,073.8 crore), Maharashtra (INR 3,758.5 crore) and Tamil Nadu (INR 3,296.7 crore) have been allocated the three highest shares for the Mission period. However, unlike the AMRUT 2.0, the government has not clarified its process and formula for determining the allocation for each state/UT for SBM 2.0.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	FUNDS ALLOCATED (IN INR CRORE)		FUNDS RELEASED (IN INR CRORE)		BALANCE (IN INR CRORE)	
		FLOATING	TOTAL	FLOATING	TOTAL	FLOATING	TOTAL
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	405	8.6000	0	0.0600	405	8.5400
2	ANDHRA PRADESH		1,413.3000	0	67.0014		1,346.2986
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH		129.0000	0	6.1497		122.8503
4	ASSAM		503.5000	0	5.7600		497.7400
5	BIHAR		1,204.8000	0	8.5800		1,196.2200
6	CHANDIGARH		45.2000	0	11.4200		33.7800
7	CHHATTISGARH		727.3000	0	10.1400		717.1600
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU		31.2000	0	0.1800		31.0200
9	DELHI		692.6000	0	174.5400		518.0600
10	GOA		77.8000	0	0.8400		76.9600
11	GUJARAT		1,918.9000	0	64.4500		1,854.4500
12	HARYANA		645.7000	0	5.5800		640.1200
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH		156.7000	0	5.7989		150.9011
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR		429.9000	0	4.8000		425.1000
15	JHARKHAND		519.0000	0	2.5200		516.4800
16	KARNATAKA		2,245.3000	0	17.2200		2,228.0800
17	KERALA		875.1000	0	5.6400		869.4600
18	LADAKH		62.7000	0	0.3200		62.3800
19	MADHYA PRADESH		2,200.2000	0	30.4277		2,169.7723
20	MAHARASHTRA		3,758.5000	0	142.6817		3,615.8183
21	MANIPUR		96.2000	0	1.6200		94.5800
22	MEGHALAYA		67.3000	0	0.6000		66.7000
23	MIZORAM		82.5000	0	1.3800		81.1200
24	NAGALAND		90.0000	0	2.3400		87.6600
25	ODISHA		821.4000	0	164.7000		656.7000
26	PUDUCHERRY		58.1000	0	0.3000		57.8000
27	PUNJAB		1,054.2000	0	9.9600		1,044.2400
28	RAJASTHAN		1,765.8000	0	47.8400		1,717.9600
29	SIKKIM		19.4000	0	0.4200		18.9800
30	TAMIL NADU		3,296.7000	0	202.4320		3,094.2680
31	TELANGANA		1,067.3000	0	44.14436		1,905.39
32	TRIPURA		85.3000	0	5.5300		79.7700
33	UTTAR PRADESH		4,073.8000	0	43.4400		4,030.3600
34	UTTARAKHAND		343.4000	0	32.6760		310.7240
35	WEST BENGAL		1,449.3000	0	7.6800		1,441.6200
TOTAL		405	32,421.0000	0	1,129.1717	405	31,291.8280

**Table 3.1 | Central funds allocated, released and fund balance remaining under SBM-U 2.0**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2063, Lok Sabha, 28 July 2022

## SANITATION

### OPEN DEFECCATION FREE (ODF)

Besides releasing the central share of funds to states and UTs, the Government has introduced ODF, ODF+, ODF++ and Water+ protocols to impart further impetus to sustain the ODF outcomes. Under these protocols, the entire value chain of sanitation is addressed, including access to toilets, cleanliness of community/public toilets (CT/PTs), safe management of faecal sludge and waste water to prevent discharge of untreated liquid waste in open land or water bodies (Unstarred Question No. 1758, Lok Sabha, 29 July 2021).

The revamped revised protocol is aligned with SBM-2.0 objectives and is designed to ensure:

- No untreated used water or faecal sludge is discharged into the environment and all used water (including sewerage and septage, grey water and black water) is safely contained, transported, and treated, along with maximum reuse of treated used water, in all cities with less than 1 lakh population.
- To sustain open defecation free status in all statutory towns.

(Government of India, 2022b)

The Swachh Certification Protocols for ODF, ODF+, ODF++ and Water+ certifications were revised on 24 June 2022. Key features of each certification are given below:

- ODF – Focus on stronger evaluation mechanisms by increasing the survey sample size and location types. Higher focus on vulnerable open defecation spots like railway tracks, water bodies etc.
- ODF+ – Focus on functionality of CTs/PTs and sustainable operational and maintenance models.
- ODF++ – Emphasis on mechanised cleaning of septic tanks and sewers, safe collection and treatment of used water as well as safe management of faecal sludge.
- Water+ – Focus on collection, transportation, treatment and reuse of both used water and faecal sludge.

(Unstarred Question No. 761, Lok Sabha, 21 July 2022)

ODF CERTIFICATION TYPE	TARGET	NO. OF ULBS DECLARED ODF
ODF	ALL 4,372 ULBS OF THE COUNTRY	4,371
ODF+		3,339
ODF++		961

**Table 3.2 | Open Defecation Free (ODF) certification of ULBs in 2022**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 365, Lok Sabha, 03 February 2022

Except Purulia in West Bengal, of all 4,372 urban local bodies (ULBs) in the country 4,371 have been declared 100 per cent ODF (Unstarred Question No.1478, Lok Sabha, 10 February 2022).

4,316 out of 4,372 ULBs have been ODF certified through a third-party verification process. 3,339 out of 4,372 ULBs have been certified as ODF+, wherein an ODF+ city/ULB requires all its CT/PTs to be operated

and maintained as per the protocol for ODF+ rating, ensuring their functionality and proper maintenance for continued usage. 961 out of 4,372 ULBs have been certified as ODF++. An ODF++ city/ULB requires it to address the complete sanitation value chain, i.e., safe

containment, evacuation, transportation, processing and disposal of faecal sludge and septage from CT/PTs and ensuring that no untreated sludge is discharged into open drains, water bodies or in open fields (Unstarred Question No. 365, Lok Sabha, 03 March 2022).

SR. NO.	STATE/UT	ULBS CERTIFIED IN THE STATE/UT		
		ODF	ODF+	ODF++
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	110	104	7
2	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	1	1	1
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	23	0	0
4	ASSAM	96	27	0
5	BIHAR	131	24	0
6	CHANDIGARH	1	1	1
7	CHHATTISGARH	168	168	169
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	3	2	0
9	DELHI	5	4	3
10	GOA	14	14	0
11	GUJARAT	171	165	111
12	HARYANA	81	66	14
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	61	26	2
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	80	18	0
15	JHARKHAND	42	41	3
16	KARNATAKA	272	152	2
17	KERALA	93	31	0
18	LADAKH	2	0	0
19	MADHYA PRADESH	383	380	296
20	MAHARASHTRA	391	388	213
21	MANIPUR	27	3	0
22	MEGHALAYA	10	1	0
23	MIZORAM	23	0	0
24	NAGALAND	19	0	0
25	ODISHA	114	91	21
26	PUDUCHERRY	5	3	0
27	PUNJAB	170	166	66
28	RAJASTHAN	192	126	9
29	SIKKIM	7	3	0
30	TAMIL NADU	666	500	0
31	TELANGANA	74	116	9
32	TRIPURA	20	6	0

33	UTTAR PRADESH	666	644	31
34	UTTARAKHAND	99	63	3
35	WEST BENGAL	96	5	0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>4,316</b>	<b>3,339</b>	<b>961</b>

**Table 3.3| Number of open defecation free ULBs, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 365, Lok Sabha, 03 February 2022

## TOILETS

Since the Inception of the Swachh Bharat Mission, the government has celebrated its overachievement of the targets set for building Individual Household Latrines (IHHLs), community toilets (CTs) and Public Toilets (PTs). The SBM Mission is routinely criticised for its focus on the discrepancies in the on-ground construction of IHHL and CT/PTs, i.e. Mission outputs, without measuring the behavioural changes required to achieve ODF, i.e., the Mission outcomes (Akhilesh and Gudavarthy, 2022).

### Individual Household Toilets:

At the state level, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Rajasthan, Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh are the top five performing states, having overachieved the set targets and by completing almost 50 per cent of the total built IHHL toilets until March 2022. However, (over) achievement of the SBM targets has only become possible with the revision of the original targets, and by reducing them by almost 50 per cent (YUVA, 2020). Between SBM-U (2020) and SBM-U 2.0 (2022), the Ministry increased the target of IHHL by 69,230 toilets, and reduced state/UT targets for building IHHL. Of the top 5 performing states mentioned above, only Rajasthan's IHHL target increased by 15,488 toilets between 2020 and 2022. The rest of the states—Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, and Madhya Pradesh—saw their targets reduced and the number of completed toilets rose only marginally. Discrepancy in the data of other states and UTs is also observed, with the target of Andaman and Lakshadweep being set at 336 and 400 IHHLs respectively, which perfectly matches the number

of completed toilets. Currently, West Bengal is the lowest performing state where more than 2 lakh IHHLs need to be built to meet the targets. However, it is interesting to note that West Bengal was also the only state where the IHHL target jumped from 1,67,628 to 5,15,000 toilets in a span of 2 years, i.e. from 2020–2022.

		INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLD TOILETS, NOS.	
S. NO.	STATE/UT	MISSION TARGET	COMPLETED
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	1,93,426	2,43,764
2	ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR	336	336
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	12,252	9,743
4	ASSAM	75,720	74,416
5	BIHAR	3,83,079	3,93,613
6	CHANDIGARH	4,282	6,117
7	CHHATTISGARH	3,00,000	3,25,050
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	1,878	2,378
34	UTTARAKHAND	27,640	23,545
10	GOA	8,020	3,800
11	GUJARAT	4,06,388	5,60,046
9	DELHI	5,000	725
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	11,266	6,703
12	HARYANA	71,000	66,427
15	JHARKHAND	1,61,713	2,18,651
16	KARNATAKA	3,50,000	3,93,278
17	KERALA	29,578	37,207
18	LADAKH	400	400
19	MADHYA PRADESH	5,12,380	5,79,109
20	MAHARASHTRA	6,29,819	7,12,086
23	MIZORAM	16,441	11,199
22	MEGHALAYA	5,066	1,604
21	MANIPUR	43,644	37,732
24	NAGALAND	23,427	19,847
25	ODISHA	1,32,509	1,40,957
26	PUDUCHERRY	5,681	5,162
27	PUNJAB	1,02,000	1,03,683
28	RAJASTHAN	3,61,753	3,68,515
29	SIKKIM	1,587	1,181
30	TAMIL NADU	4,37,543	5,08,562
31	TELANGANA	1,63,508	1,57,165
32	TRIPURA	19,464	20,428
33	UTTAR PRADESH	8,28,237	8,97,697
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	59,600	51,246
35	WEST BENGAL	5,15,000	2,82,542
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>58,99,637</b>	<b>62,64,914</b>

**Table 3.4 | Individual household latrine targets set and toilets completed since 2014, state/UT-wise***Source: Unstarred Question No.4782, Lok Sabha, 31 March 2022*



### **COMMUNITY TOILETS (CTs)/PUBLIC TOILETS (PTs ):**

Under SBM 2.0 the cost of constructing Community Toilets (CTs) and Public Toilets (PTs) has been increased from INR 98,000 in SBM-U to INR 1,50,000 per seat in phase 2. The government has also introduced the category of aspirational PTs in urban local bodies (ULBs), for high footfall places like tourist or religious destinations, iconic cities, etc. for which the cost of construction per seat is set at INR 2,50,000. The aspirational PTs are expected to have the following indicative features:

- a) Walls and floors are clean and stain/graffiti free
- b) Low height toilets/Indian toilets and basins for children
- c) Plants/shrubs in the vicinity of toilet complex are well maintained
- d) Space earmarked for advertisement for revenue generation
- e) Hand dryer/paper napkin available
- f) Ladies' toilets have vending machine for sanitary napkins
- g) Incinerator facility available for disposal of used sanitary napkins for toilet having > 10 seats
- h) Toilet identification number, name of ULB under which jurisdiction toilet is covered, ward number and maintenance authority prominently displayed for each toilet block.
- i) SMS based feedback with number displayed on which SMS has to be sent

(Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, 2021b)

There is a dire need in the country for public sanitation facilities, including in high footfall locations. However, no questions were asked in Parliament about the progress of

identifying 'aspirational toilet' locations, and the progress on constructing the aspirational toilets. Especially given exceptionally high per seat cost of construction and the need for a timely delivery of these proposed aspirational PTs.

S. NO.	COMPONENT	UNDER SBM-U		UNDER SBM-U 2.0 (2021-2026)	
		RATE PER SEAT (IN INR)	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE (INR PER UNIT)	RATE PER SEAT (IN INR)	CENTRAL ASSISTANCE (INR PER UNIT)
1	INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLD LATRINES (IHHLs)	30,000	10,800 FOR NORTH EASTERN AND HILLY STATES AND 4,000 FOR OTHER STATES AND UTS	30,000	10,800 FOR NORTH EASTERN AND HILLY STATES AND 4,000 FOR OTHER STATES AND UTS
2	COMMUNITY TOILETS (CTs)	98,000	39,200	1,50,000	37,500 (FOR MILLION PLUS CITIES)
					49,500 (1-10 LAKH POPULATION ULBS)
					75,000 (<1 LAKH ULBS)
3	PUBLIC TOILETS (PTs)	98,000	39,200	1,50,000	37,500 (FOR MILLION PLUS CITIES)
					49,500 (1-10 LAKH POPULATION ULBS)
					75,000 (<1 LAKH ULBS)
	ASPIRATIONAL PUBLIC TOILETS (PTs) (ONLY FOR THOSE MANDATORILY REQUIRED IN RELIGIOUS AND OTHER TOURIST LOCATIONS)	NA	NA	2,50,000	62,500 (FOR MILLION PLUS CITIES)
					82,500 (1-10 LAKH POPULATION ULBS)
4	URINAL STALLS	32,000	12,800	32,000	1,25,000 (<1 LAKH ULBS)
					8,000 (FOR MILLION PLUS CITIES)
					10,560 (1-10 LAKH POPULATION ULBS)
					16,000 (<1 LAKH ULBS)

**Table 3.5 | Central assistance categories and criteria for sanitation facilities under SBM-U and SBM-U 2.0***Source: Unstarred Question No. 66, Rajya Sabha, 18 July 2022*

Yet again, an area of concern when analysing the states/UT data is the arbitrary setting of targets. SBM-U 2.0 is still in its nascent stages. However, more than half (18 states/UTs) of 35 states/UTs have already overachieved the targets of CT/PT construction. Furthermore, in the SBM-U 2.0 operational guidelines, the government has categorically stated it will continue to build CTs/PTs/urinals that are near and accessible to citizens, and to tackle the sanitation requirements of the floating population in the cities (Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, 2021b), but this sentiment remains invisible in its proposed targets. It begs the question: What incentives will the state/UT governments have to increase sanitation access if the Mission targets are already shown to be met?

The states of Maharashtra (1,66,465) and Mizoram

(1,324), along with the smaller UTs of Delhi (28,256), Andaman and Nicobar Islands (603), Chandigarh (2,512), and Dadra and Nagar Haveli (615) have already completed construction of more than twice the CTs/PTs target. Merely looking at the aggregate data, hides the larger variance in state/UT performance. Of the 6,23,682 CTs/PTs completed under the Mission, only 3 states of Maharashtra (1,66,465), Tamil Nadu (92,744) and Uttar Pradesh (69,381) account for 52.6 per cent of the total toilets built. Maharashtra accounts for a whopping 26.6 per cent of total CTs/PTs toilets built. On the other hand, the densely populated state of West Bengal has a mere 5,746 CTs/PTs (0.92 per cent of total toilets), while its geographically similar neighbour Arunachal Pradesh has 46 completed CTs/PTs (i.e. 0.0073 per cent of total toilets).

SR. NO.	STATE/UT	INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLD TOILETS (NO. OF UNITS)		TOTAL COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC TOILETS (NO. OF SEATS)	
		MISSION TARGET	COMPLETED	MISSION TARGET	COMPLETED
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	1,93,426	2,43,764	21,464	17,797
2	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	336	336	126	603
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	12,252	9,743	387	46
4	ASSAM	75,720	78,137	3,554	3,356
5	BIHAR	3,83,079	3,93,613	26,439	26,453
6	CHANDIGARH	4,282	6,117	976	2,512
7	CHHATTISGARH	3,00,000	3,26,287	17,796	18,832
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	1,878	2,378	219	615
9	DELHI	5,000	725	11,138	28,256
10	GOA	8,020	3,800	507	1,270
11	GUJARAT	406,388	5,60,046	31,010	24,149
12	HARYANA	71,000	66,638	10,393	11,374
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	11,266	6,741	876	1,700
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	59,600	51,246	3,585	3,329
15	JHARKHAND	1,61,713	2,18,677	12,366	9,643
16	KARNATAKA	3,50,000	3,93,278	34,839	36,556
17	KERALA	29,578	37,207	4,801	2,803
18	LADAKH	400	400	194	194
19	MADHYA PRADESH	5,12,380	5,79,347	40,230	20,280
20	MAHARASHTRA	6,29,819	7,12,086	59,706	1,66,465
21	MANIPUR	43,644	39,202	620	534
22	MEGHALAYA	5,066	1,604	362	152
23	MIZORAM	16,441	12,373	491	1,324
24	NAGALAND	23,427	19,847	478	235
25	ODISHA	1,32,509	1,42,475	17,800	12,211
26	PUDUCHERRY	5,681	5,162	1,204	836
27	PUNJAB	1,02,000	1,03,683	10,924	11,522
28	RAJASTHAN	3,61,753	3,68,515	26,364	31,300
29	SIKKIM	1,587	1,398	142	268
30	TAMIL NADU	4,37,543	5,08,562	59,921	92,744
31	TELANGANA	1,63,508	1,57,165	15,543	15,465
32	TRIPURA	19,464	20,715	586	1,089
33	UTTAR PRADESH	8,28,237	8,97,697	63,451	69,381
34	UTTARAKHAND	27,640	24,000	2,611	4,642
35	WEST BENGAL	5,15,000	2,82,542	26,484	5,746
TOTAL		58,99,637	62,75,506	5,07,588	6,23,682

**Table 3.6 | Individual household latrines and community/public toilet targets set and units completed since 2014, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No.1882, Lok Sabha, 28 July 2022

## MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

---

SBM-U 2.0 targets 100 per cent management of municipal solid waste for garbage free cities. Solid Waste Management (SWM) includes a series of linear processes and procedures beginning from collection, segregation, storage, transportation, treatment, and finally to safe disposal of solid waste. Under SBM-U 2.0, the government has extended its understanding of MSWM, from the mere safe disposal of everyday solid waste to the remediation of old and neglected garbage dump sites, i.e., legacy waste dumpsites in urban India.

For achieving 100 per cent management of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW), funding under SBM-U 2.0 is provided to states/UTs for:

- (iv) setting up waste processing facilities such as material recovery facility, transfer stations, composting plants, bio methanation plants, refused derived fuel processing facilities, plastic waste processing facilities, waste to electricity, sanitary landfill, etc.
- (v) procuring mechanised sweeping equipment and setting up processing facilities for effective management of Construction and Demolition waste;
- (vi) bio-remediation of all legacy dumpsites in all ULBs.

(Unstarred Question No. 404, Lok Sabha, 08 December 2022)

### **Municipal Waste Collection and Processing:**

When quizzed on the details of the municipal solid waste management by MP Dr. Krishna Pal Singh Yadav and fellow MPs, the Ministry stated that urban India generates 1,51,745 metric tons (MT) of municipal solid waste of which 1,12,291.3 MT, i.e., an average of 74 per cent of total generated waste, is successfully and scientifically processed (Unstarred Question No. 404, Lok Sabha, 08 December, 2022).

Since the start of the SBM the government has made substantial investments towards SWM, with a total of INR 7,398.62 crore central assistance (CA) released to the states until July 2022. Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, and Karnataka have received the maximum number of funds from the Centre for SWM from 2014 until 2022. The least amount of funds have been used by the smaller states/UTs of Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Sikkim, Meghalaya and Nagaland (Unstarred Question No. 73, Rajya Sabha, 18 July 2022).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	SBM-U (2014-2021) (IN INR CRORE)	SBM-U 2.0 (2021-2026) (IN INR CRORE)
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0.3976	0.02
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	308.54	61.66
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	7.25	4.61
4	ASSAM	76.75	1.92
5	BIHAR	182.19	2.86
6	CHANDIGARH	32.1	11.38
7	CHHATTISGARH	126.9282	3.38
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	0	0.06
9	DELHI	133.174	174.44
10	GOA	8.6826	0.28
11	GUJARAT	536.22	57.85
12	HARYANA	115.31	1.86
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	15.22	2.92
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	27.611	3.20
15	JHARKHAND	113.739	0.84
16	KARNATAKA	512.5229	5.74
17	KERALA	51.6417	1.88
18	LADAKH	11.834	0.14
19	MADHYA PRADESH	392.4668	10.67
20	MAHARASHTRA	947.0902	86.75
21	MANIPUR	9.61	0.54
22	MEGHALAYA	4.088	0.20
23	MIZORAM	8.6568	0.46
24	NAGALAND	7.1439	0.78
25	ODISHA	138.0495	61.39
26	PUDUCHERRY	10.935	0.20
27	PUNJAB	197.76	3.32
28	RAJASTHAN	344.26	33.68
29	SIKKIM	3.251	0.14
30	TAMIL NADU	689.88	163.89
31	TELANGANA	223.43	38.50
32	TRIPURA	15.51	4.73
33	UTTAR PRADESH	903.3424	14.48
34	UTTARAKHAND	72.1171	28.64
35	WEST BENGAL	384.94	2.56
TOTAL		6,612.6515	785.97

**Table 3.7 | Funds released under SBM-U and SBM-U 2.0, State/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 73, Rajya Sabha, 18 July 2022

A tertiary glance shows no particular state or UT is falling behind on the target of 100 per cent door-to-door (D2D) collection, rather almost all states/UTs (33) have achieved between 91 to 100 per cent D2D collection. The states of Nagaland and Meghalaya, however, are falling way behind the rest of the country, managing only 45.45 per cent and 47.15 per cent D2D collection. Jharkhan on the other hand has achieved 87.20 per cent D2D collection of municipal waste. The government reports D2D collection in 87,982 wards out of 90,617 (an achievement of average of 97 per cent of total wards), with source segregation of waste taking place in 79,932 (88 per cent of total wards). In terms of waste processing, Chhattisgarh processes 100 per cent of daily MSW which is a commendable feat. Madhya Pradesh (97 per cent), Maharashtra (96 per cent), Gujarat (92 per cent), Himachal Pradesh (91 per cent) follow suit and make up the top 5 states for SWM. Pondicherry and Meghalaya process 0 per cent of the 345 MT and 1 MT of waste respectively produced in the state. Nagaland too only processes 3 per cent of its daily MSW. The government claims an average of 73 per cent of total waste processing power in the country. However, our analysis shows the country only processes an average of 63 per cent of the waste generated.

A deeper analysis of the data shows very little uniformity in the amount of money being spent, the size of the states, quantity of waste produced, and the SWM capabilities being practised on the ground. Maharashtra generates the highest amount of MSW, weighing in at

21,997 MT, and successfully processes 96 per cent of the daily MSW generated. Maharashtra's ability to process high quantities of MSW can be assumed to be a reflection of almost 100 per cent D2D waste collection as well as the substantially high investments (upwards of INR 1,033.84 crore), made by the state in SWM. However, investment is not directly proportional to the processing capacity generated in all cases. Uttar Pradesh processes only 83 per cent of 15,205 MT of waste after having received a similar figure of INR 917.82 crore as CA. While Tamil Nadu received CA of INR 853.77 crore since 2014, practising D2D collection in 12,757 wards of 12,882 wards. However, only 42 per cent of the 13,491 MT of waste is processed.

Relatively high investments can also mask the subpar progress of the SWM in the states over a 7-year period when the quantum of waste produced is even lower. Rajasthan received CA of INR 344.26 crore since 2014 for SWM, achieves D2D waste collection in 7,550 out of 7,981 wards and yet merely processes 33 per cent of 7,345 MT waste generated. Yet again, West Bengal fared badly on SBM-U achievements. Having used INR 387.5 crore of CA, West Bengal practices D2D segregation in 2,527 out of 2,951 wards, but only manages to process an abysmal 10 per cent of the 7,876 MT of daily waste produced. Therefore, a more detailed, comparative analysis is required to understand what causes promote and reinforce the state-wise variance in SWM capabilities.

PROGRESS IN ACHIEVEMENT IN MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE (MSW) MANAGEMENT						
S. NO.	STATE/UT	TOTAL WARDS (Nos.)	TOTAL WARD WITH 100% DOOR TO DOOR COLLECTION (Nos.)	WARD WITH 100% SOURCE SEGREGATION (Nos.)	TOTAL WASTE GENERATION (MT/D)	TOTAL WASTE PROCESSING
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	3,756	3,574	3,517	6,140	77%
2	ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR ISLANDS	24	24	24	58	86%
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	501	458	323	125	28%
4	ASSAM	955	873	489	1,238	59%
5	BIHAR	3,405	3,392	3,392	5,068	30%
6	CHANDIGARH	35	35	35	565	96%
7	CHHATTISGARH	3,255	3,255	3,254	1,668	100%
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	43	43	43	97	89%
9	DELHI	302	297	295	11,143	90%
10	GOA	226	226	213	120	67%
11	GUJARAT	1,388	1,388	1,331	9,694	92%
12	HARYANA	1,673	1,628	1,168	5,618	84%
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	544	542	542	222	91%
14	JAMMU AND KASHMIR	1,099	1,086	539	860	66%
15	JHARKHAND	1,071	934	848	1,993	68%
16	KARNATAKA	6,863	6,696	5,644	10,054	81%
17	KERALA	3,533	3,278	3,224	1,659	75%
18	LADAKH UT	26	26	23	12	83%
19	MADHYA PRADESH	7,591	7,434	7,375	6,517	97%
20	MAHARASHTRA	6,525	6,522	6,507	21,997	96%
21	MANIPUR	305	298	258	167	92%
22	MEGHALAYA	123	58	55	1	0%
23	MIZORAM	205	205	108	289	28%
24	NAGALAND	418	190	127	119	3%
25	ODISHA	2,035	2,035	2,035	2,607	63%
26	PUDUCHERRY	126	126	126	345	0%
27	PUNJAB	3,174	3,163	3,125	3,809	61%
28	RAJASTHAN	7,981	7,550	6,404	7,345	33%
29	SIKKIM	51	51	48	71	22%
30	TAMIL NADU	12,882	12,757	11,871	13,491	42%
31	TELANGANA	3,625	3,623	3,572	10,169	90%
32	TRIPURA	334	334	334	318	59%
33	UTTAR PRADESH	12,389	12,153	11,444	15,205	83%
34	UTTARAKHAND	1,203	1,201	1081	1,456	67%
35	WEST BENGAL	2,951	2,527	558	7,876	10%
TOTAL/AVERAGE		90,617	87,982	79,932	1,48,115	73%

**Table 3.8 | Progress in achievement in municipal solid waste (MSW) management, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No.1882, Lok Sabha, 28 July 2022

## LEGACY DUMPSITES

The remediation of legacy waste is one of the most integral components of SBM-U 2.0. Under the Mission, the government has envisaged that all legacy waste shall be remediated, and the dumpsite land will be recovered to achieve the 'Lakshya Zero Dumpsite' during the Mission period of 2021-2026 (Unstarred Question No. 1923, Lok Sabha, 28 July 2022).

Legacy waste implies the waste that has been collected in unlined or unscientifically designed dumpsites and comprises a mix of degradable and non-degradable waste. To tackle the problem of air, water, and land pollution expounded by such dumpsites, the government has prioritised dumpsite remediation under SWM.

An advisory on Legacy Waste Remediation has been published and disseminated to inform stakeholders on the subject. IT-based template has also been formed on Swacchham Portal to help States and cities in undertaking the planning for remediation. Capacity building sessions have been conducted for States for effective planning of legacy waste remediation and the various environmental norms. In addition, central financial assistance is also available under SBM-U 2.0 for executing the remediation (Unstarred Question No. 1523, Lok Sabha, 10 February 2022).

Further, to assess the progress made on the dumpsites, a third-party is assigned to compile the best practices of dumpsite remediation carried out in different cities. This compilation covers different aspects of remediation like measurement of quantity, tendering and remediation process, monitoring mechanism, etc. This compilation of best practices is expected to act as a ready reckoner and provide better understanding to urban local bodies (ULBs) to adopt such practices while carrying out dumpsite remediation in the cities (Unstarred Question No. 1899, Lok Sabha, 28 July 2022).

In 2022, only 3 questions were asked in parliament pertaining to legacy waste management, of which one question was specific to Delhi. However, the government seems to have refrained from providing an overview about the monetary and physical progress made on this matter. The only information available is on the SBM-U website dashboard which states that 1,400.94 lakh MT of legacy waste is yet to be processed. Further, there is no information on the legacy waste processed, the state/UT wise allocation of funds and fund utilization by the states/UTs.

LANDFILL SITE	LEGACY WASTE (IN LAKH MT)	LEGACY WASTE REMEDIATED (IN LAKH MT)	REMARKS
Bhalswa	80 (Approx.)	25	Ongoing.
Okhla	60 (Approx.)	18.50	Ongoing, 15 acres of area cleared.
Ghazipur	140 (Approx.)	11.25	Ongoing

**Table 3.9 | Municipal Corporation of Delhi's progress and plans for legacy waste management**  
Source: Unstarred Question No.1899, Lok Sabha, 28 July 2022.



## CONCLUSION

---

On paper, the SBM-U has overachieved its target of building sanitation infrastructure. The misreporting of quantitative data by inflating and exaggerating Mission targets and on-ground achievements is not aiding the fundamental goals of universal and safe sanitation for the country's population. Rather, it is distorting and hindering the future planning, implementation and monitoring of the Mission.

Even today ODF has not been completely eliminated in rural and urban India. The National Family Health Survey 5 (2019–2020) revealed that 19 per cent of the Indian population still do not have access to toilets and are therefore defecating in the open; the access to toilets was better in urban India ("Nearly One in", 2022). There exist deep divides in the access to and use of toilets between urban and rural India, and between caste and religious groups (Rajalakshmi, 2022). To achieve true success, the Mission should target a combination of physical infrastructure with key behavioural components of accessibility, safety, feasibility, and usability too.

The SBM is indeed imagined as the world's largest behaviour change programme. In 2022, SBM 2.0 launched the 'National Behaviour Change Communication Framework for Garbage Free Cities' to serve as a guiding document for States and Cities to undertake large scale multimedia campaigns (Government of India, 2022a). Similar IEC investments could be made to cover all aspects of health and sanitation in long term behavioural change as a key to achieve a higher standard of hygiene and sanitation practice in the country. The IEC and public awareness campaigns must not only address its 'cleanliness' objective but must tackle open defecation and health from a caste, gender, disability and health perspective.

Sanitation and hygiene should also be looked at from the informal sanitation workers and waste pickers' perspectives, especially now when the remediation of legacy dumpsites is being addressed through policy.

In a welcome move, Swachh Sarvekshan 2022 has incorporated specific indicators that drive cities to improve working conditions and livelihood opportunities for these frontline soldiers in urban India's sanitation journey (Government of India, 2021a).

## CHAPTER 4

# SMART CITIES MISSION

### BACKGROUND

The Government of India launched the Smart Cities Mission (SCM) on 25 June 2015. With urban India expected to house 40 per cent of the population and contribute 70 per cent of India's GDP, the SCM was launched to transform and democratise the physical, institutional, social, and economic landscape of the rapidly urbanising Indian cities. The overarching goal of the Mission is to capture and realise the needs and aspirations of the urban citizens by incrementally adding layers of 'smartness' to the urban ecosystem. As the SCM guidelines published by the government state, 'there is no universally accepted definition of a 'Smart City' (Ministry of Urban Development, 2015, page 5). However, the government does include the core areas for infrastructural advancement and transformation which include the environment, governance, housing, transportation, education, safety and inclusion, etc. To

ensure the sustainability of the Mission objectives, the idea is to create, 'replicable model which will act like a light house to other aspiring cities' (Ibid.).

With these goals in mind, 100 Smart Cities were selected through 4 rounds of competition from January 2016 to June 2018. The 'Smart Cities National Challenge' came to a close with the selection of Shillong as the 100th Smart City in June 2018. The COVID-19 pandemic and the lockdowns have resulted in delays and temporary interruptions in the implementation of the SCM projects. The period of implementation for all SCM projects, across 100 cities, has therefore been extended up to June 2023 (Unstarred Question No. 1592, Lok Sabha, 10 February 2022). Earlier, all SCM projects were to be completed within five years of the selection of the city ("Centre extends timeline", 2021) .

	JAN-16		MAY-16		SEP-16		JUN-17		JAN-18
	20 SELECTED FROM 97		13 SELECTED FROM 23		27 SELECTED FROM 63		30 SELECTED FROM 45		10 SELECTED FROM 15
S. NO.	ROUND 1	S. NO.	FAST TRACK	S. NO.	ROUND 2	S. NO.	ROUND 3	S. NO.	ROUND 4
1	BHUBANESWAR	1	LUCKNOW	1	AMRITSAR	1	THIRUVANANTH-APURAM	1	SILVASSA
2	PUNE	2	WARANGAL	2	KALYAN-DOMBIVALI	2	RAJKOT	2	ERODE
3	JAIPUR	3	DHARAMSHALA	3	UJJAIN	3	NAYA RAIPUR	3	DIU
4	SURAT	4	CHANDIGARH	4	TIRUPATI	4	AMARAVATI	4	BIHAR SHARIF
5	KOCHI	5	RAIPUR	5	NAGPUR	5	PATNA	5	BAREILLY
6	AHMADABAD	6	NEW TOWN KOLKATA	6	MANGALURU	6	KARIMNAGAR	6	ITANAGAR
7	JABALPUR	7	BHAGALPUR	7	VELLORE	7	MUZAFFARPUR	7	MORADABAD
8	VISAKHAPATNAM	8	PANAJI	8	THANE	8	PUDUCHERRY	8	SAHARANPUR
9	SOLAPUR	9	PORT BLAIR	9	GWALIOR	9	GANDHINAGAR	9	KAVARATTI
10	DAVANAGERE	10	IMPHAL	10	AGRA	10	SRINAGAR	10	SHILLONG*
11	INDORE	11	RANCHI	11	NASHIK	11	SAGAR		*SELECTED IN JUN 2018
12	NDMC	12	AGARTALA	12	RAURKELA	12	KARNAL		

13	COIMBATORE	13	FARIDABAD	13	KANPUR	13	SATNA		
14	KAKINADA			14	MADURAI	14	BENGALURU		
15	BELAGAVI			15	TUMAKURU	15	SHIMLA		
16	UDAIPUR			16	KOTA	16	DEHRADUN		
17	GUWAHATI			17	THANJAVUR	17	TIRUPPUR		
18	CHENNAI			18	NAMCHI	18	PIMPRI-CHINCHWAD		
19	LUDHIANA			19	JALANDHAR	19	BILASPUR		
20	BHOPAL			20	SHIVAMOGGA	20	PASIGHAT		
				21	SALEM	21	JAMMU		
				22	AJMER	22	DAHOD		
				23	VARANASI	23	TIRUNELVELI		
				24	KOHIMA	24	THOOTHUKUDI		
				25	HUBBALLI-DHARWAD	25	TIRUCHIRAPALLI		
				26	AURANGABAD	26	JHANSI		
				27	VADODARA	27	AIZAWL		
						28	PRAYAGRAJ		
						29	ALIGARH		
						30	GANGTOK		

**Table 4.1 | List of 100 Smart Cities selected in various rounds of the SCM challenge**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 543, Rajya Sabha, 12 December 2022

## NATURE OF QUESTIONS

A majority of the questions (~32 questions) raised in Parliament, across the three sessions, centred around the funding status of SCM in the country and at the state/city level, and for which the government provided its standard response. Four years after the completion of the selection process, four questions raised in Parliament asked for details on the 100 cities included under the Mission. Further, a qualitative analysis of the questions reveals a simplistic drafting of the questions. Most questions demand the 'details of' and/or the 'status' of the SCM, which the Ministry has easily interpreted as being a question on only the monetary details and status of the project.

Approximately 26 questions raised in both houses were regarding the status of the projects in a particular state or city, but only two questions asked for particulars on the projects or schemes as well as the expenditure. Only one question was asked about the newly launched Light House Project (LHP), one question was raised in the Rajya Sabha regarding solar power generation and utilisation, one question on child-friendly cities, and one on flood control in cities. No questions were raised on the digital governance infrastructure, data and communication, safety and surveillance, gender inclusion, etc. that were once considered the core work-areas for the Mission.

## FUNDS AND FUNDING

As per SCM guidelines, the central government will provide financial support to the extent of INR 48,000

crore over five years to the 100 Smart Cities, i.e., on an average INR 100 crore per city per year. An equal amount

on a matching basis will be contributed by the state government/urban local body (ULB). As on 2 December 2022, the Government of India has released INR 34,399 crore for 100 smart cities, out of which INR 30,400 crore (88 per cent) has been utilised (Unstarred Question No. 543, Rajya Sabha, 12 December 2022). This means 63.3 per cent of the initially planned CA of INR 48,000 crore has been utilised with only 6 months remaining to the deadline of June 2023.

The most recent aggregate figures released by the government on 12 December 2022, reveal that work orders have been issued for 7,738 projects worth around INR 1,81,112 crore of which 4,987 projects worth INR

92,439 crore have been completed, while 2,751 projects worth INR 88,673 crore are in progress (Unstarred Question No. 543, Rajya Sabha, 12 December 2022).

In terms of quantum of funds (See Table 4.2), the states of Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Karnataka and Madhya Pradesh make up the top five states with highest quantum of CA received and utilised (49.13 per cent of total CA released) by the states. However, it is the smaller states of Sikkim (99.82 per cent) and Jharkhand (98.16 per cent) who have utilised the highest amount of funds disbursed to them.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	GOI FUNDS RELEASED UNDER SCM (IN INR CRORE)	GOI FUNDS UTILISED BY SMART CITIES (IN INR CRORE)
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	245	196
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	1,860	1,693
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	439	339
4	ASSAM	294	212
5	BIHAR	929	706
6	CHANDIGARH	368	321
7	CHHATTISGARH	710	543
8	DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI	174	103
9	DAMAN AND DIU	110	82
10	DELHI	294	288
11	GOA	245	206
12	GUJARAT	2,352	2,194
13	HARYANA	588	538
14	HIMACHAL PRADESH	586	494
15	JAMMU & KASHMIR	439	342
16	JHARKHAND	490	481
17	KARNATAKA	2,901	2,591
18	KERALA	537	422
19	LAKSHADWEEP	60	44
20	MADHYA PRADESH	2,548	2,376
21	MAHARASHTRA	2,940	2,607
22	MANIPUR	245	169
23	MEGHALAYA	245	173

24	MIZORAM	196	120
25	NAGALAND	319	223
26	ODISHA	882	776
27	PUDUCHERRY	196	134
28	PUNJAB	931	709
29	RAJASTHAN	1,813	1,653
30	SIKKIM	562	561
31	TAMIL NADU	4,937	4,589
32	TELANGANA	392	392
33	TRIPURA	355	294
34	UTTAR PRADESH	3,577	3,284
35	UTTARAKHAND	297	253
36	WEST BENGAL	343	292
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>34,399</b>	<b>30,400</b>

**Table 4.2 | Central assistance released and utilised under SCM, state/UT-wise**  
*Source: Unstarred Question No. 543, Rajya Sabha, 12 December 2022*

A city-wise analysis reveals that from the 100 selected cities only 11 cities have received INR 490 crore or higher of the promised INR 500 crore per city. Of these 11 cities, Bhopal and Indore, both cities selected in the first round, have achieved 100 per cent fund utilisation while Surat, another city from round one, has achieved 98.39 per cent fund utilisation over the past six and a half years. Concurrently, Guwahati, from round one, has received INR 196 crore or the promised INR 500 crore since 2018, while having utilised only 44.65 per cent of the funds received.

Of the 10 cities selected in round four in 2018, only Erode has received more than 50 per cent of the allocated budget, i.e., INR 392 crores of 500 crore, and has successfully utilised 72.97 per cent of the funds. The remaining 9 cities have received less than INR 200 crore, with Kavaratti, Lakshadweep, having received only INR 60 crore and utilised a mere INR 30 crore since its selection in 2018.

In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the resulting lockdowns of 2020 and 2021, delays in SCM projects and under-expenditure is expected. Here we must note that cities were selected based on their comprehensive and intelligent Smart City Plans (SCP) that accounted for promised government assistance, but with 37 of 100 cities having received and utilised less than 40 per cent (>INR 200 crore) of the promised INR 500 crore budget in 2022, the lack of political commitment, effective oversight over the special purpose vehicles (SPVs), and bureaucratic red-tape can be called into question. However, in response to the questions raised in Parliament regarding COVID-19 induced delays, the government maintains the Mission is performing satisfactorily and all projects will be completed by June 2023 (Unstarred Question No. 1469, Lok Sabha, 15 December 2022).

STATE/UT	NAME OF CITY	DURING 2015-16 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2016-17 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2017-18 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2018-19 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2019-20 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2020-21 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2021-22 (IN INR CRORE)	TOTAL CENTRAL RELEASE (IN INR CRORE)	UTILISATION OF GOI FUNDS (IN INR CRORE)
ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	PORT BLAIR	0	194	2	0	0	0	0	196	162.11
ANDHRA PRADESH	AMARAVATI	0	0	18	372	106	0	0	496	488
	KAKINADA	190	6	0	98	98	98	0	490	476.54
	TIRUPATI	2	92	102	0	93	2.50	100.50	392	289
	VISAKHAPATNAM	188	8	0	98	5.20	98	98	495.20	422.59
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	ITANAGAR	0	0	0	58	50	43	0	151	90.49
	PASIGHAT	2	0	18	40	50	43	0	153	72.77
ASSAM	GUWAHATI	2	189	5	0	0	0	0	196	87.52
BIHAR	BHAGALPUR	2	63	131	0	0	0	0	196	153.97
	BIHARSHARIF	2	0	0	58	0	0	136	196	60
	MUZAFFARPUR	2	0	17	41	0	0	136	196	60
	PATNA	0	0	18	176	0	0	0	194	155.81
CHANDIGARH	CHANDIGARH	2	71	123	0	0	0	98	294	294
CHHATTISGARH	ATAL NAGAR	0	0	18	104	0	0	0	122	118
	BILASPUR	2	0	18	38	0	0	69	127	67.33
	RAIPUR	2	94.50	99.50	0	0	98	0	294	289
DADRE & NAGAR HAVELI	SILVASSA	0	2	0	102	0	0	0	104	56.72
DAMAN & DIU	DIU	0	0	0	110	0	0	0	110	32.69
DELHI	NDMC	2	194	0	0	0	98	0	294	236.12
GOA	PANAJI	2	0	110.20	83.80	0	0	0	196	116.40
GUJARAT	AHMEDABAD	2	194	0	98	0	49	49	392	392
	DAHOD	2	0	17	167	10	0	98	294	264.39
	GANDHINAGAR	2	0	18	90	86	0	147	343	237.72
	RAJKOT	2	0	19	175	0	49	49	294	244
	SURAT	2	194	0	98	204	0	0	498	490
	VADODARA	2	0	109	85	0	49	49	294	259.75
HARYANA	FARIDABAD	2	92	102	0	0	98	0	294	294
	KARNAL	2	0	17	41	0	68	68	196	128
HIMACHAL PRADESH	DHARAMSHALA	2	188	6	0	0	49	0	245	245
	SHIMLA	0	0	18	40	0	68	68	194	123.81
JAMMU & KASHMIR	JAMMU	0	1	18	40	0	68	68	195	140.94
	SRINAGAR	0	1	18	40	0	68	68	195	120.13

STATE/UT	NAME OF CITY	DURING 2015-16 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2016-17 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2017- 18 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2018- 19 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2019- 20 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2020- 21 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2021- 22 (IN INR CRORE)	TOTAL CENTRAL RELEASE (IN INR CRORE)	UTILISA- TION OF GOI FUNDS (IN INR CRORE)
JHARKHAND	RANCHI	2	92	102	0	196	98	0	490	466
KARNATAKA	BELAGAVI	2	194	0	0	0	98	98	392	346.49
	BENGALURU	0	0	0	58	136	0	98	292	252.24
	DAVANAGERE	2	194	0	0	0	0	196	392	290.28
	HUBBALLI-DHARWAD	2	0	109	85	8	0	98	302	293
	MANGALURU	2	0	109	6	79	0	98	294	294
	SHIVAMOGGA	2	0	109	85	0	0	98	294	293.94
	TUMAKURU	2	0	109	85	0	98	98	392	357.53
KERALA	KOCHI	2	194	0	0	1.51	0	98	295.51	191.18
	THIRUVANANTHAPURAM	0	0	18	176	0	0	0	194	185.82
LAKSHADWEEP	KAVARATTI	2	0	0	58	0	0	0	60	30.32
MADHYA PRADESH	BHOPAL	188	8	0	98	196	0	0	490	490
	GWALIOR	2	92	102	0	0	0	0	196	195.94
	INDORE	188	8	0	0	196	98	0	490	490
	JABALPUR	2	194	0	0	196	0	0	392	392
	SAGAR	2	0	18	65	0	55.50	55.50	196	196
	SATNA	2	0	18	176	0	0	0	196	169.93
	UJJAIN	2	92	102	0	106	0	98	400	305.69
MAHARASHTRA	AMRAVATI#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
	AURANGABAD	2	92	102	0	0	98	0	294	294
	GREATER MUMBAI#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
	KALYAN-DOMBIVALI	2	92	102	0	0	0	0	196	196
	NAGPUR	2	92	102	0	21.23	0	76.77	294	261.02
	NASHIK	2	92	102	0	0	0	0	196	196
	PIMPRI-CHINCHWAD	2	0	18	176	0	98	98	392	377.58
	PUNE	2	194	0	0	98	49	49	392	392
	SOLAPUR	2	194	0	0	0	49	147	392	392
	THANE	2	62	132	0	0	0	98	294	272.69
MANIPUR	IMPHAL	2	0	109	6	79	0	0	196	168.45
MEGHALAYA	SHILLONG	2	0	0	53	0	0	141	196	47.41
MIZORAM	AIZAWL	2	0	0	58	0	68	68	196	54.37
NAGALAND	KOHIMA	2	0	109	6	79	0	0	196	194.70
ODISHA	BHUBANESWAR	190	6	0	0	203.93	0	98	497.93	392
	ROURKELA	2	0	188	6	0	0	49	245	245
PUDUCHERRY	PUDUCHERRY	2	0	98	3	0	8	93	204	88.30

STATE/UT	NAME OF CITY	DURING 2015-16 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2016-17 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2017- 18 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2018- 19 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2019- 20 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2020- 21 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2021- 22 (IN INR CRORE)	TOTAL CENTRAL RELEASE (IN INR CRORE)	UTILISA- TION OF GOI FUNDS (IN INR CRORE)
PUNJAB	AMRITSAR	2	0	27	31	8	0	136	204	170.32
	JALANDHAR	2	0	27	31	0	0	136	196	186
	LUDHIANA	2	194	0	0	0	0	98	294	231.50
	SULTANPUR LODHI#	0	0	0	0	27.10	0	0	27.10	0
RAJASTHAN	AJMER	2	92	102	0	0	49	147	392	339.67
	JAIPUR	188	8	0	0	0	49	147	392	375
	KOTA	2	91	103	0	0	0	196	392	334.67
	UDAIPUR	161.20	34.80	0	0	98	49	147	490	428.39
SIKKIM	GANGTOK	0	0	17	177	0	49	0	243	242.56
	NAMCHI	2	0	109	85	0	98	0	294	294
TAMIL NADU	CHENNAI	2	188	6	0	105.62	98	98	497.62	386.70
	COIMBATORE	2	188	6	0	98	98	98	490	390.41
	DINDIGUL#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
	ERODE	2	0	0	194	0	98	98	392	286.07
	MADURAI	2	0	109	85	0	98	98	392	361.22
	SALEM	2	0	109	85	0	98	98	392	343
	THANJAVUR	2	0	109	85	0	98	0	294	289
	THOOTHUKUDI	2	0	18	176	0	0	98	294	285.86
	TIRUCHIRAPPALLI	2	0	18	176	0	56.33	41.67	294	290.55
	TIRUNELVELI	2	0	18	176	0	0	98	294	287.80
	TIRUPPUR	2	0	18	176	98	49	49	392	384.36
	VELLORE	2	0	109	85	0	98	49	343	290.15
TELANGANA	GREATER WARANGAL	2	92	0	6	96	0	0	196	174.01
	KARIMNAGAR	2	0	18	40	136	0	0	196	196
TRIPURA	AGARTALA	2	63	131	0	5.10	49	0	250.10	245
UTTAR PRADESH	AGRA	2	0	109	85	0	98	98	392	392
	ALIGARH	2	0	19	89	86	0	98	294	196
	BAREILLY	2	0	0	58	0	0	136	196	196
	GHAZIABAD#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
	JHANSI	2	0	36	22	0	0	136	196	196
	KANPUR	2	0	109	85	0	49	49	294	291.88
	LUCKNOW	2	66.20	127.80	0	0	0	98	294	291.01
	MEERUT/RAEBARELI#	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
	MORADABAD	2	0	0	58	0	0	136	196	139.94
	PRAYAGRAJ	2	0	17	175	0	51	49	294	293
	RAMPUR#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
	SAHARANPUR	2	0	17	41	0	0	136	196	59.56
	VARANASI	2	0	109	85	0	98	98	392	390.81



STATE/UT	NAME OF CITY	DURING 2015-16 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2016-17 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2017-18 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2018-19 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2019-20 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2020-21 (IN INR CRORE)	DURING 2021-22 (IN INR CRORE)	TOTAL CENTRAL RELEASE (IN INR CRORE)	UTILISATION OF GOI FUNDS (IN INR CRORE)
UTTARAKHAND	DEHRADUN	2	0	18	40	140.64	51.50	0	252.14	224.83
WEST BENGAL	BIDHANNAGAR#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
	DURGAPUR#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
	HALDIA#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
	NEW TOWN KOLKATA	2	0	0	58	136	0	98	294	195.70
TOTAL		1,469.20	4,492.50	4,497.50	5,856.80	3,332.33	3,345.83	6,219.44	29,213.60	25,177.65

**Table 4.3 | Central assistance released and utilised from 2015-16 to 2021-22, state/UT-wise and city-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2791, Rajya Sabha, 28 March 2022

## SLUM DEVELOPMENT

In response to the two questions raised about the government's plans for the development of slums under SCM, the MoHUA stated slum re-development is proposed and implemented by cities in accordance with their SCPs. In both instances, the government clearly stated that Land and Colonisation are state subjects, and therefore the central government did not undertake any direct action or produce any guidelines for monitoring of slum (re)development (Unstarred Question No. 1917, Lok Sabha, 28 July 2022).

The data shows that slum development projects were initiated in 22 smart cities worth INR 2,241.24 crore. 25 projects worth INR 939.98 crore have been completed, while 16 projects worth INR 1,303.26 crore are on-going.

A deeper analysis of the kinds of slum development projects undertaken under SCM reveal a very mixed and vague picture on the use of funds. At a cursory glance, the description of the slum development projects (Seen in Table 4.4) offer no clarity on the exact nature of the slum redevelopment/retrofit work that has been undertaken as most projects are described as 'slum development'. Even with a sophisticated geospatial management information system for project monitoring at hand, the undetailed project data indicates the centre has been largely a fund provider. However, on a positive note, SCM funds have been used in convergence with other centrally funded schemes like PMAY and SBM-U to achieve tangible amenities and benefits for the urban poor, with the construction of houses and IHHTs and CTs.

S. NO.	STATE/ UT	SMART CITY	PROJECT	COST (IN INR CRORE)
WORKS COMPLETED				
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	KAKINADA	DEVELOPMENT OF SLUMS PHASE-V JYOTHI RAO PULE NAGAR, SANJAY NAGAR, SAMBAMURTHY NAGAR	3.30
2			DEVELOPMENT OF SLUMS AT RAJEEV SWAGRUHA NEAR DAIRY FARM JN. PHASE - II	5.65
3			DEVELOPMENT OF SLUMS AT VADAPETA, PALLIPETA, PHASE-I	4.85
4			DEVELOPMENT OF SLUMS AT RAJEEV SWAGRUHA IN VETIMOGA AND RELIPETA NEAR D. MART, PHASE - III	5.80

5	GUJARAT	VADODARA	SLUM FREE AREA- ODD NAGAR	9.17
6			SLUM FREE AREA- MANJALPUR BAJANIYAWAS	24.76
7			SLUM FREE AREA-SAYAJIGUNJ JAMWADI	27.21
8			SLUM FREE AREA- DANTESWAR SAINATH NAGAR	10.02
9			SLUM FREE AREA- SAMA SANJAYNAGAR	71.87
10	HARYANA	KARNAL	ASHIANA SLUM REHABILITATION	15.65
11	KARNATAKA	TUMAKURU	CONSTRUCTION OF 1556 GROUND FLOOR DWELLING UNITS INCLUDING INFRASTRUCTURE AT 6 SELECTED SLUMS IN	68.59
12			INFRASTRUCTURE CORRECTION IN SLUM - DEVELOPMENT OF ROAD AND DRAINS	2.65
13		BELAGAVI	RAY SCHEME, DEVELOPMENT OF 1044,G+3 HOUSES FOR SLUM DWELLERS.	45.49
14			DEVELOPMENT OF SLUM AT RUKMINI NAGAR	5.32
15	KERALA	THIRUVANANTHA-PURAM	INTEGRATED SOCIAL HOUSING COMPLEX-SLUM HHS-PMAY	47.90
16	MADHYA PRADESH	BHOPAL	CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES AND DEVELOPMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE FOR IDENTIFIED SLUM LOCALITIES IN BHANPUR, BHOPAL M.P, UNDER HFA SCHEME	111.26
17		INDORE	CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES OF AND DEVELOPMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE FOR IDENTIFIED SLUM LOCALITIES IN INDORE M.P. UNDER PMAY AT BADA BANGARDA BUDHANIA AND BADA BANGARDA EXTENSION.	173.70
18			SLUM BEAUTIFICATION IN VARIOUS ZONES AND WARDS AT 16 LOCATIONS, INDORE	10.58
19			CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES AND DEVELOPMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE FOR SLUM LOCALITIES IN INDORE UNDER PMAY AT SANAWADIA PART A NEAR PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION SCHOOL	93.53
20			CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES AND DEVELOPMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE FOR IDENTIFIED SLUM LOCALITIES IN INDORE M.P AT LIMBODI KHASRA NO. 229, INDORE	27.40
21			CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES AND DEVELOPMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE FOR IDENTIFIED SLUM LOCALITIES IN INDORE, MADHYA PRADESH, AT BADA BANGERDA KHASRA NO. 242 1	44.95
22	ODISHA	ROURKELA	MAKING 27 SLUMS IN ADB AREA OF RSCL ODF THROUGH CLTS	0.47

23	UTTAR PRADESH	AGRA	REBUILDING LIVELIHOODS AND UPGRADING SLUMS - REDEVELOPMENT OF SLUMS	116.30
24		JHANSI	CONSTRUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL TOILETS IN SLUM HHS	8.06
25		ALIGARH	DEVELOPMENT OF 9 SLUM AREAS	5.50
WORK ORDERS ISSUED				
26	ANDHRA PRADESH	KAKINADA	DEVELOPMENT OF SLUMS (CC ROADS, DRAINS, CULVERTS & LIGHTING) PHASE-IV	52.41
27	CHHATTISGARH	BILASPUR	A30 BILASA GREENS - MINI BASTI SLUM REDEVELOPMENT WITH INTEGRATED URBAN PLAZA, MULTI MODAL HUB AND MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT	
28	GUJARAT	AHMEDABAD	PPP BASED SLUM REHABILITATION IN JUNAVADAJ AREA	539
29	HARYANA	FARIDABAD	SMART SLUM AREA RETROFITMENT - SANT NAGAR (9 SUB-PROJECTS)	9.69
30	MADHYA PRADESH	INDORE	SLUM HOUSING LODHA COLONY AND SETHI NAGAR 960 UNITS	61.67
31		INDORE	CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES AND DEVELOPMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE FOR IDENTIFIED SLUM LOCALITIES IN INDORE, MADHYA PRADESH, UNDER PMAY AT VARIOUS SITE PACKAGE 02, INDORE	200.72
32		SATNA	URBAN SLUM DEVELOPMENT	2.06
33	NAGALAND	KOHIMA	AREA REDEVELOPMENT STRATEGY - IN SITU SLUM UPGRADATION - SLUM REHABILITATION AND REJUVENATION OF THE OLD HOUSES	28.79
34	PUDUCHERRY	PUDUCHERRY	HOUSING FOR SLUM AT CHINNAYAPURAM SITE PHASE1	18.62
35	TELANGANA	KARIMNAGAR	SLUM REHABILITATION	36.18
36		GREATER WARANGAL	HOUSING FOR EXISTING HHS LIVING IN KACHHA SEMI PUCCA HOUSES IN ALUM AREA	81
37	UTTAR PRADESH	KANPUR	SLUM DEVELOPMENT IN ABD AREA	4
38		SAHARANPUR	DEVELOPMENT OF SLUM AT KISHANPURA (AT THE BANK OF PAON DHOI RIVER) WARD NO. 23 UNDER ABD AREA	0.51
39		SAHARANPUR	DEVELOPMENT OF SLUM AT MATAGARH WARD NO. 22 UNDER ABD AREA	2.76
40		SAHARANPUR	DEVELOPMENT OF SLUM AT RAMCHANDRAPURI (AT THE BANK OF PAON DHOI RIVER) WARD NO. 07 UNDER ABD AREA	0.30
41		SAHARANPUR	DEVELOPMENT OF SLUM AT PURANA KAMELA (NEAR GURU TEGH BAHADUR INTER COLLEGE) WARD NO. 07 UNDER ABD AREA	1.44
TOTAL				2,241.24

**Table 4.4 | Details of slum re-development projects under SCM**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1335, Rajya Sabha, 19 December 2022  
(Source: Geospatial Management Information System, as on 2 December 2022)

## SCM AND GREEN BUILDINGS

### CONSTRUCTION

To construct new green buildings and to also bring green features in existing buildings, various documents/guidelines of the central government available are as per the details below:

- I. Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS) has brought out National Building Code (NBC)-2016, which includes a Chapter on “Approach to Sustainability”. It covers the exhaustive details of various sustainability measures to help build green buildings.
- II. Central Public Works Department (CPWD) has brought out “Guidelines for Sustainable Habitat” to evaluate use of sustainable technologies and choice of material based on a sustainable index. The objective of CPWD guidelines on sustainable habitat is to help the architects/engineers take decisions on the choice of architectural design/materials/machines/equipment. CPWD is also adopting the Green Rating for Integrated Habitat Assessment (GRIHA) rating system for its projects.
- III. In addition, CPWD has taken initiative for the provision of Solar Photovoltaic system in existing buildings

wherever feasible and also for replacement of the existing light fittings with energy efficient fittings.

- IV. Energy Conservation Building Code (ECBC) brought out by Bureau of Energy Efficiency, Ministry of Power applicable to buildings or building complexes that have a connected load of 100 kW or greater or a contract demand of 120 kVA or greater and are intended to be used for commercial purposes.
- V. Eco Nivas Samhita (ENS)- Part -1 & Part 2 brought out by Bureau of Energy Efficiency, Ministry of Power applicable for residential buildings, sets minimum performance standards for building envelope.

(Unstarred Question No. 861, Rajya Sabha, 25 July, 2022)

In terms of recycling waste, organizations under MoHUA, like Central Public Works Department, National Buildings Construction Corporation Limited etc. are taking eco-friendly measures like use of recycled concrete aggregate and recycled aggregate obtained from construction and demolition waste in their works as per availability and technical feasibility in order to utilise recycled materials for construction (Unstarred Question No. 850, Rajya Sabha, 25 July 2022).

### LIGHT HOUSE PROJECTS

Member of Parliament (MP) Smt. Vandana Chavan pressed the government about its efforts to tackle global warming and the carbon emissions of the construction industry, and the steps taken by the government to achieve a ‘Net Zero Carbon Buildings Commitment’. The Ministry stated its commitment to decarbonising buildings by launching Global Housing Technology Challenge (Unstarred Question No. 850, Rajya Sabha, 25 July, 2022).

As part of the Global Housing Technology Challenge, the Government of India identified the best housing technologies across the globe. Out of the identified 54 technologies, Six Light House Projects (LHPs) using six distinct technologies were finalised, and would act as

model technologies for further mainstreaming across the country. The Prime Minister laid the foundation stone of six LHPs on 1 January 2021. These projects are to be implemented through the convergence of multiple centrally sponsored schemes like SCM, PMAY, SBM, NULM, etc. (Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, n.d.).

The LHPs are implemented to showcase the use of the world’s best innovative construction technologies in the building construction industry which are energy-efficient, rapid, sustainable, disaster resilient, cost-effective as well as fast and adaptable to suit different geo-climatic conditions in India. These technologies add a definite ‘smart’ layer to the cities by furthering the SCM goals of environmental sustainability, sustainable development, and housing, and by improving the citizens’ ease of living.

LHP LOCATION	TECHNOLOGY SELECTED	NUMBER OF HOUSES TO BE CONSTRUCTED	STATUS
CHENNAI TAMIL NADU	PRECAST CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION SYSTEM - PRECAST COMPONENTS ASSEMBLED AT SITE	1,152	COMPLETED
RAJKOT GUJARAT	MONOLITHIC CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION USING TUNNEL FORMWORK	1,144	COMPLETED
INDORE MADHYA PRADESH	PREFABRICATED SANDWICH PANEL SYSTEM	1,024	IN-PROGRESS
LUCKNOW UTTAR PRADESH	PVC STAY IN PLACE FORMWORK SYSTEM	1,040	IN-PROGRESS
RANCHI JHARKHAND	PRECAST CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION SYSTEM - 3D VOLUMETRIC	1,008	IN-PROGRESS
AGARTALA TRIPURA	LIGHT GAUGE STEEL STRUCTURAL SYSTEM & PRE-ENGINEERED STEEL STRUCTURAL SYSTEM	1,000	IN-PROGRESS

**Table 4.5 | Details of the six Light House Projects started on 1 January 2021**

*Source: Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, n.d.*

As for the progress on the LHPs, the Ministry has stated that six LHPs each at Chennai, Rajkot, Indore, Lucknow, Ranchi and Agartala comprising of total 6,368 houses with total project cost of INR 790 crore are being constructed and so far, INR 349.73 crore has been utilised. At present, there is no future plan to include more cities under the LHPs (Unstarred Question No. 870, Rajya Sabha, 25 July 2022). The LHP Chennai was completed and inaugurated by Hon'ble Prime Minister

on 26 May 2022 (Unstarred Question No. 861, Rajya Sabha, 25 July 2022).

The LHPs initiative by the government is definitely a step in the right direction, and it remains to be seen how and if these technologies are effectively incorporated by the construction sector in the years to come, especially for building resilient rental and low to middle-income housing under PMAY.

## ASSESSMENT

Under Smart Cities Mission (SCM), a Climate Smart Cities Assessment Framework (CSCAF) was launched in 2019 as a mechanism to strengthen climate sensitive development practices in cities, and to foster healthy competition among the cities. The final report of the second edition of Assessment, CSCAF 2.0 was released on 25 June 2021 (Unstarred Question No. 2539, Lok Sabha, 22 December, 2022).

The thematic frameworks of the CSCAF are: energy and green building, urban planning, green cover and biodiversity, mobility and air quality, water management and waste management. A total of 28 indicators capture a combination of mitigation and adaptation strategies that are followed across the various urban sectors.

**CSCAF 2.0 CONSISTS OF 5 THEMATIC AREAS AS FOLLOWS:**

- (i) Energy and Green Buildings
- (ii) Urban Planning, Green Cover and Biodiversity
- (iii) Mobility and Air Quality
- (iv) Water Management; and
- (v) Waste Management

INDICATORS UNDER EACH THEMATIC AREA (TOTAL 28 INDICATORS)				
ENERGY AND GREEN BUILDINGS	URBAN PLANNING, GREEN COVER, AND BIODIVERSITY	MOBILITY AND AIR QUALITY	WATER MANAGEMENT	WASTE MANAGEMENT
1. ELECTRICITY CONSUMPTION IN THE CITY	1. PROMOTION OF GREEN BUILDINGS	1. CLEAN TECHNOLOGIES SHARED VEHICLES	1. WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	1. WASTE MINIMIZATION INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN BY THE CITY
2. TOTAL ELECTRICAL ENERGY IN THE CITY DERIVED FROM RENEWABLE SOURCES	2. PROPORTION OF GREEN COVER	2. AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT	2. EXTENT OF NON- REVENUE WATER	2. EXTENT OF DRY WASTE RECOVERED AND RECYCLED
3. FOSSIL FUEL CONSUMPTION IN THE CITY	3. URBAN BIODIVERSITY IN THE CITY	3. PERCENTAGE OF COVERAGE OF NON MOTORIZED TRANSPORT NETWORK (PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE)	3. WASTEWATER RECYCLE AND REUSE	3. CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION (C&D) WASTE MANAGEMENT
4. ENERGY EFFICIENT STREET LIGHTING IN THE CITY	4. DISASTER RESILIENCE	4. LEVEL OF AIR POLLUTION	4. FLOOD/ WATER STAGNATION RISK MANAGEMENT	4. EXTENT OF WET WASTE PROCESSED
5. PROMOTION OF GREEN BUILDINGS	5. CITY CLIMATE ACTION PLAN	5. CLEAN AIR ACTION PLAN (PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION)	5. ENERGY EFFICIENT WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM	5. SCIENTIFIC LANDFILL AVAILABILITY & OPERATIONS
6. GREEN BUILDING ADOPTION	--	--	6. ENERGY EFFICIENT WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	6. LANDFILL/ DUMPSITE SCIENTIFIC REMEDIATION

**Table 4.6 | Performance of Smart Cities on Climate Smart Cities Assessment Framework 2.0**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 3089, Lok Sabha, 04 August 2022

As per the Cities Readiness Report 2021 (Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, 2021a), the following ratings are awarded to the cities based on certain criteria:

- **One Star** - Cities that are in the early stages of development. These cities are yet to consider climate change or are in the process of conceptualising climate actions.
- **Two Stars** - Cities that have initiated data analysis, established committees and are in the process of hiring technical agencies to initiate climate planning.
- **Three Stars** - Cities that have institutional mechanisms in place, this includes but not limited to functioning committees. These are also cities which

have developed action plans or are in the process of doing so.

- **Four Stars** - Cities that have allocated budgets and have initiated the implementation of identified projects
- **Five Stars** - Cities that have showcased successful implementation of climate actions and were able to showcase the impacts/benefits of such actions.

Marks are allocated to cities based on the evidence provided against each of the indicators. However, the performance of each city is understood on the basis of city tiers, geographical regions, population, and climatic zones presented for each of the indicators.

OVERALL RATING OF CITIES UNDER CSCAF 2.0			
<b>4 STAR</b>			
AHMEDABAD	PUNE	VADODARA	
INDORE	RAJKOT	VISAKHAPATNAM	
PIMPRI CHINCHWAD	SURAT	VIJAYAWADA	
<b>3 STAR</b>			
AGRA	DELHI	NASHIK	THANE
BENGALURU	GANDHINAGAR	NAYA RAIPUR	UDAIPUR
BHOPAL	GURUGRAM	RAIPUR	UJJAIN
CHANDIGARH	JAMSHEDPUR	SHIMLA	VARANASI
CHENNAI	LUCKNOW	SILVASSA	
COIMBATORE	NAGPUR	SOLAPUR	
<b>2 STAR</b>			
AJMER	GORAKHPUR	LUDHIANA	SAGAR
ALIGARH	GUWAHATI	MADURAI	SAHARANPUR
AMRAVATHI (AP)	GWALIOR	MANGALORE	SALEM
AMRAVATHI (MH)	HUBLI DHARWAD	MIRA BHAYANDAR	SANGLI MIRAJ & KUPWAD
AMRITSAR	JABALPUR	MYSORE	SATNA
BAREILLY	JAIPUR	NAMCHI	SHILLONG
BHAVNAGAR	JHANSI	NANDED	SHIVAMOGGA
BHUBANESHWAR	KAKINADA	NEW TOWN KOLKATA	SILIGURI
BILASPUR	KALYAN DOMBIVALI	PANAJI	SRINAGAR
DAHOD	KANPUR	PASIGHAT	TIRUCHIRAPALLI
DEHRADUN	KARIMNAGAR	PATNA	TIRUNELVELI
DHARAMSHALA	KARNAL	PORT BLAIR	TIRUPATI
DURGAPUR	KAVARATTI	PRAYAGRAJ	TIRUPPUR

FARIDABAD	KOCHI	PUDUCHERRY	THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
GANGTOK	KOHIMA	RANCHI	TUMAKURU
GHAZIABAD	KOLHAPUR	ROURKELA	WARANGAL
<b>1 STAR</b>			
AGARTALA	DIU	JAMMU	MORADABAD
AIZAWL	ERODE	JODHPUR	MUZAFFARPUR
AURANGABAD	GULBARGA	KARGIL	PALAMPUR
BELAGAVI	GUNTUR	KOTA	SOLAN
BHAGALPUR	HAMIRPUR	LEH	THANJAVUR
BIHAR SHARIF	IMPHAL	LONI	THOOTHUKUDI
CUTTACK	ITANAGAR	MANDI	VELLORE
DAVANGERE	JALANDHAR	MEERUT	

**Table 4.7 | Overall ratings of cities under Climate Smart Cities Assessment Framework 2.0**  
*Source: Unstarred Question No. 3089, Lok Sabha, 04 August 2022*

The assessment was open to all Smart Cities, all capital cities, and all cities above 5,00,000 in population. 126 cities participated in the exercise. 31 cities have achieved an overall rating of 1-star; 64 cities have achieved 2-star;

22 cities 3-star and 9 cities have achieved 4-star rating (Unstarred Question No. 3089, Lok Sabha, 04 August 2022).

## CONCLUSION

The SCM was launched with much fanfare and great expectations to technologize urban India. Since 2016, central assistance (CA) of INR 30,400 crore has been used towards this goal and multiple projects are at various levels of completion. The SCM related questions raised in Parliament are weak in that the questions do not encourage information on the nature of the projects, project components, reasons for delays, etc. SCM projects are executed through special purpose vehicles that are essentially private entities, making enquiries into project finances, delays, discrepancies key to ensuring public funds are being used lawfully.

A lack of consistency in SCM related questions is observed in Parliament. In 2017, SCM was a highly discussed topic in parliament with a range of probing questions on the scale, mechanism, and monitoring of the Mission (YUVA, 2017). In 2020, the parliamentary questions focused on monetary progress, frameworks to

assess smartness and ease of living, and data security (YUVA, 2020). In 2021, the focus of SCM questions was the COVID-19 pandemic, inclusive cities, and expenditure (YUVA, 2021). In 2022, we find the question raised in Parliament primarily focused on funding and building green cities. On the part of the MPs, there has been no concentrated effort to follow up on projects or initiatives undertaken by SCM.

Further, there is no clarity on the type of projects undertaken through the Mission. Through one question, it was understood that projects under SCM included everything from the installation of a national flag and a welcome gate at the airport to installation of water ATMs and an integrated traffic management system in the plans for Guwahati (Unstarred Question No. 540, Rajya Sabha 12 December 2022). Such one-off inquiries do not provide a holistic understanding of the scope of the SCM.



## CHAPTER 5

# DEENDAYAL ANTYODAYA YOJANA–NATIONAL URBAN LIVELIHOODS MISSION

---

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 of poverty reduction and reducing the economic vulnerabilities of the poor. The Mission aims at increasing incomes by providing gainful self-employment, skilled wage employment through access to the emerging job market. The strategy for improving livelihoods and poverty alleviation adopted by DAY–NULM has strong rights-based leanings, wherein linkages to other citizenship rights, urban infrastructure and social security programmes for the urban poor are prioritised.

The DAY–NULM targets the urban poor, including the homeless, across all district headquarter towns and all cities with a population of 1,00,000 and more.

The Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) oversees the implementation of the DAY–NULM.

The 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

## NATURE OF QUESTIONS

---

In 2022, most of the questions raised in Parliament with respect to the DAY–NULM centred around the progress and implementation of the loaning schemes for street vendors (~22 questions in the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha). In comparison, only a few questions pertaining to training of workers and skilling initiatives of the government (~5 questions) were raised, but not adequately answered. Similarly, while the government continues to promote women's economic empowerment through the formation of self-help groups (SHGs), the

MoHUA is not adequately questioned regarding the yearly targets and achievements. Further, no questions were raised on the qualitative impacts these initiatives have created and fostered. Only one question raised by MP Shri G.V.L. Narasimha RAO in the Rajya Sabha, directly asked the Ministry about the SHGs under DAY–NULM and the benefits extended and accrued to the women (Starred Question No. 6, Rajya Sabha, 18 July 2022).

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

---

As of February 2022, a total of 11,58,761 persons have received training through DAY–NULM since the inception of the Mission. The states of Maharashtra (1,83,087), Uttar Pradesh (1,82,943), Madhya Pradesh (1,80,575),

Jharkhand (93,959) and Gujarat (82,446) trained the maximum number of candidates. These five states make up 62.39 per cent of the total number of candidates trained since 2014. On the other hand, zero candidates

received training in Nagaland, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu, Ladakh, and Andaman and Nicobar Islands. Over the past 7 years, 105 candidates received training in Puducherry, 696 in Manipur and 1,235 in Meghalaya, i.e., only 0.24 per cent of the total number of trained candidates.

It is important to note that training and skills acquisitions does not always translate into gainful employment and placements. Only 6,20,084 trained candidates were placed, that is just over 50 per cent of the total candidates trained. The only commendable placement

numbers are presented by the five states of Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Telangana, Tamil Nadu and Madhya Pradesh. Andhra Pradesh is the only state that has placed 91.61 per cent of its trained candidates; Kerala has placed 72.36 per cent of its trained candidates and Telangana has placed 70.93 per cent of trained candidates. Tamil Nadu and Madhya Pradesh successfully placed between 60–70 per cent of their trainees. For the government to effectively improve employment rates, there appears an urgent need to address the lower placement rate, especially since the placement figures reflect 7 years of work under the DAY–NULM.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	NO. OF CANDIDATES SKILL TRAINED	NO. OF SKILL TRAINED CANDIDATES PLACED
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	80,861	74,077
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	3,020	949
3	ASSAM	14,552	3,762
4	BIHAR	27,802	7,806
5	CHHATTISGARH	41,698	15,747
6	GOA	5,636	2,761
7	GUJARAT	82,446	44,157
8	HARYANA	21,058	11,458
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	5,290	2,496
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR	3,086	403
11	JHARKHAND	93,959	39,633
12	KARNATAKA	11,641	36
13	KERALA	17,099	12,373
14	MADHYA PRADESH	1,80,575	1,14,102
15	MAHARASHTRA	1,83,087	97,228
16	MANIPUR	696	357
17	MEGHALAYA	1,235	604
18	MIZORAM	8,375	3,494
19	NAGALAND	0	409
20	ODISHA	17,026	4,475
21	PUNJAB	31,440	18,419
22	RAJASTHAN	19,805	7,995
23	SIKKIM	3294	340
24	TAMIL NADU	14,409	9,754
25	TELANGANA	24,294	17,232
26	TRIPURA	2,094	783
27	UTTAR PRADESH	1,82,943	96,526

28	UTTARAKHAND	18,484	8,162
29	WEST BENGAL	57,238	22,154
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	0	0
31	CHANDIGARH	4,717	2,240
32	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	0	0
33	DELHI	796	152
34	PUDUCHERRY	105	0
35	LADAKH	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>11,58,761</b>	<b>6,20,084</b>

**Table 5.1 | Number of candidates trained and placed under DAY-NULM since 2013**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 2674, Lok Sabha, 17 March 2022

Only relevant columns from the original table have been presented

In response to a question raised by MP Shri Neeraj Dangi in the Rajya Sabha in December 2022, since 2014–15 till 30 November 2022, more than 13 lakh urban poor have been imparted skill training to enhance their employability, out of which more than 6.78 lakh trained have been placed under self and/or wage employment

(Unstarred Question No. 134, Rajya Sabha, 19 December 2022). How the government added approximately 1.5 lakh trainees to the tally between February to November 2022 and placed 50,000 workers remains unknown and unanswered.

## SELF-EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME

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. More than 7.8 lakh self-help groups (SHGs) have been formed, more than 5.36 lakh SHGs have been assisted with a revolving fund and 7.17 lakh loans have been disbursed under the SHG bank linkage programme for taking up activities for improving incomes (Unstarred Question No. 134, Rajya Sabha, 19 December 2022).

The detailed cumulative data presented in March 2022, shows that 6,78,552 SHGs were formed between April 2014–February 2022. Of the total SHGs created, 50.94 per cent were formed in the states of Tamil Nadu (97,067), Maharashtra (79,782), Andhra Pradesh (75,063), West Bengal (52,834) and Madhya Pradesh (40,962). The benefits of the rotating funds were accessed by 67.33 per cent of total SHGs, i.e., 4,56,934

out of 6,78,555 SHGs. In terms of absolute numbers, the most number of SHGs were formed in Maharashtra (62,373), Tamil Nadu (60,280), West Bengal (56,347), Andhra Pradesh (39,606) and Kerala (27,949). The newest UT of Ladakh has formed 6 SHGs but is yet to provide the SHGs with a rotating fund. However, it is the Delhi UT that fares the worst in terms of operational SHGs. Rotating funds are provided to only those SHGs that complete six months of savings with the required standards of accountability. Of the meagre 372 SHGs formed in Delhi, 19 SHGs (5.10 per cent of the total) have received the rotating fund, indicating the Delhi SHGs are underperforming, and possibly defunct. Similar conclusions can be drawn by looking at the states of Nagaland, Telangana and Punjab where the number of SHGs having received the rotating funds is between 15–30 per cent of the SHGs formed in the state. An observed discrepancy in the data is that the number of SHGs in West Bengal, Kerala, Mizoram and Goa receiving rotating funds were higher than the number of SHGs

formed in the state. Since the DAY-NULM was only started in 2013, the possibility of rotating funds being given to pre-existing urban SHGs cannot be entertained.

A similar statistical discrepancy plagues the data on loans disbursed to the SHGs. Of the 6,78,558 SHGs created, 6,73,220 received loans under SHG-bank linkages. 62.91 per cent of the loans were given out in Andhra Pradesh (3,21,256) and Telangana (1,02,312) only. More than twice the number of SHGs created in the states are reported to be given loans. Whereas in Sikkim, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Delhi and Ladakh, no SHGs received bank linked formal loans.

A total of 7,10,816 beneficiaries have been assisted in setting up individual/group micro-enterprises till now. Together, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra share 69.58 per cent of total individual/group micro enterprises established across all states/UTs. It should be noted that Tamil Nadu has set up 2,36,303, which alone is 33.24 per cent of the total enterprises. However, not even 100 micro enterprises have been set up in Andaman and Nicobar Islands (4), Manipur (7), Ladakh (21), Sikkim (35), Chandigarh and Arunachal Pradesh (74 each) (Unstarred Question No. 4696, Lok Sabha, 31 March 2022).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	NO. OF SHGs FORMED	NO. OF SHGs GIVEN REVOLVING FUND	NO. OF BENEFICIARIES ASSISTED FOR SETTING UP INDIVIDUAL/GROUP MICRO ENTERPRISES	NO. OF LOANS DISBURSED TO SHGs UNDER SHG-BANK LINKAGE PROGRAMME
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	75,063	39,606	83,124	3,21,256
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	514	281	74	11
3	ASSAM	16,591	14,369	3,277	3,209
4	BIHAR	25,474	16,123	9,046	5,372
5	CHHATTISGARH	28,820	20,737	35,047	9,200
6	GOA	652	830	244	1
7	GUJARAT	31,237	25,120	19,321	10,052
8	HARYANA	5,787	3,301	4,424	417
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	3,860	3,519	2,995	720
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR	2,674	984	12,371	67
11	JHARKHAND	16,618	10,240	7,493	1,990
12	KARNATAKA	20,719	12,640	15,586	1,787
13	KERALA	22,148	27,949	8,320	35,019
14	MADHYA PRADESH	40,962	21,441	67,116	14,640
15	MAHARASHTRA	79,782	62,373	47,091	45,174
16	MANIPUR	2,925	2,177	7	28
17	MEGHALAYA	283	128	125	5
18	MIZORAM	1,260	1,366	2,200	208
19	NAGALAND	576	90	303	0
20	ODISHA	34,177	20,501	32,391	14,174
21	PUNJAB	7,569	2,250	7,794	8
22	RAJASTHAN	26,462	18,808	25,901	2,663

23	SIKKIM	69	37	35	0
24	TAMIL NADU	97,067	60,280	2,36,303	61,878
25	TELANGANA	37,533	7,252	12,857	1,02,312
26	TRIPURA	2,197	1,769	984	800
27	UTTAR PRADESH	40,777	24,101	60,992	6,694
28	UTTARAKHAND	2,351	1,300	6,510	254
29	WEST BENGAL	52,834	56,347	8,210	34,575
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	101	42	4	0
31	CHANDIGARH	351	242	74	0
32	DELHI	372	19	151	0
33	PUDUCHERRY	741	712	425	706
34	LADAKH	6	0	21	0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>6,78,552</b>	<b>4,56,934</b>	<b>7,10,816</b>	<b>6,73,220</b>

**Table 5.2 | Details on the Self-Employment Programme component of DAY-NULM from 1 April 2014 till 28 February 2022, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 4696, Lok Sabha, 31 March 2022.  
Only relevant columns from the original table have been presented

## SHELTERS FOR URBAN HOMELESS

The COVID-19 pandemic and the consequent lockdown plunged the already precarious urban informal workers into deeper poverty. Without work and with the cost of daily necessities piling up, many workers were not able to afford rent, forcing them to head home or to be rendered homeless. Reports of hasty and unlawful evictions of more than 2,50,000 citizens during the peak of the pandemic (Housing and Land Rights Network, 2020) also point towards an increase of instances of homelessness during the pandemic. Now, more than ever, tracking the progress of the Shelters for Urban Homeless (SUH) component of the DAY-NULM is vital to ensure the challenges of the pandemic are not intensified and repeated. However, the progress of SUH appears to have stagnated since 2020.

The guidelines of the SUH component of DAY-NULM prescribe systematic third-party surveys to be undertaken in cities/towns by the urban local bodies to identify the number of urban homeless to assess the need for shelters at suitable and convenient locations.

The most recent figures of the survey show that the number of urban homeless stood at 2,45,783 as of 25 March 2022 (Unstarred Question No. 4649, Lok Sabha, 31 March 2022). These figures are much lower than the dated Census 2011 figure of 9,38,348 urban homeless, and only marginally higher than the third-party survey figures for 2020 that stand at 2,07,847 urban homeless persons (Unstarred Question No. 739, Lok Sabha, 17 September 2020).

In 2022, Rajasthan (39,512), Gujarat (35,293), Uttar Pradesh (28,409), Maharashtra (21,882), and Haryana (19,015) have the highest population of urban homeless, making up 58.62 per cent of the total urban homeless population. However, the Revised Operational Guidelines for the Scheme of Shelters for Urban Homeless of DAY-NULM (2018) do not specify how frequently the surveys need to be conducted and therefore the accuracy of the data is called into question (Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, 2018a).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	NO. OF URBAN HOMELESS PERSONS IDENTIFIED
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	11,173
2	BIHAR	10,253
3	CHANDIGARH	2,064
4	CHHATTISGARH	10,216
5	GOA	173
6	GUJARAT	35,293
7	HARYANA	19,015
8	HIMACHAL PRADESH	879
9	JHARKHAND	3,043
10	KARNATAKA	7,282
11	KERALA	3,196
12	MANIPUR	4
13	MADHYA PRADESH	3,257
14	MAHARASHTRA	21,882
15	MEGHALAYA	48
16	MIZORAM	3,888
17	NAGALAND	49
18	ODISHA	13,651
19	PUDUCHERRY	719
20	RAJASTHAN	39,512
21	SIKKIM	13
22	TAMIL NADU	14,040
23	TELANGANA	4,629
24	TRIPURA	328
25	UTTAR PRADESH	28,409
26	UTTARAKHAND	2,202
27	WEST BENGAL	10,565
TOTAL		245783

**Table 5.3| : Urban homeless population identified through systematic third-party survey as on 25 March 2022, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No.4649, Lok Sabha, 31 March 2022

Note: The state of Arunachal Pradesh has reported no homeless persons. The UTs of Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu are not implementing SUH

It was reported by the government in March 2022 that 2,414 shelters have been sanctioned, out of which, 1,678 shelters with a capacity of 96,386 persons are operational (Unstarred Question No. 2687, Lok Sabha, 17 March 2022). The number of functional shelters increased to 1,788 by 30 November 2022 (Starred Question No. 121, Lok Sabha, 15 December 2022). There are too few shelters sanctioned and functional in the country when you consider either the Census data or the number of homeless identified by NULM third-part surveys.

This problem of too few shelters is not new. In 2017, a three-member Supreme Court Panel headed by Justice (retired) Kailash Gambhir, found that there was no shelter for 90 per cent of the urban homeless. Furthermore, the panel clearly stated they found a lack of will on the part of states/governments, wherein the construction of shelters was a farce exercise with little regard for NULM guidelines (Choudhary, 2017). The 2010 Supreme Court order directed the governments to establish one shelter per one lakh urban population, but the order has been blatantly ignored.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	FUNCTIONAL SHELTERS
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	88
2	ASSAM	1
3	BIHAR	84
4	CHANDIGARH	1
5	CHHATTISGARH	41
6	DELHI	193
7	GOA	3
8	GUJARAT	53
9	HARYANA	51
10	HIMACHAL PRADESH	19
11	JAMMU & KASHMIR	1
12	JHARKHAND	55
13	KARNATAKA	116
14	KERALA	17
15	MADHYA PRADESH	120
16	MAHARASHTRA	94
17	MEGHALAYA	4
18	MIZORAM	96
19	NAGALAND	3
20	ODISHA	48
21	PUDUCHERRY	2
22	PUNJAB	27
23	RAJASTHAN	207
24	SIKKIM	1
25	TAMIL NADU	225
26	TELANGANA	35
27	TRIPURA	7
28	UTTAR PRADESH	135
29	UTTARAKHAND	11
30	WEST BENGAL	50
TOTAL		1,788

**Table 5.4 | Number of functional shelters for the urban homeless under DAY-NULM as on 30 November 2022, state/UT-wise**

Source: Starred Question No.121, Lok Sabha, 15 December 2022

The primary responsibility of providing shelters for the urban homeless remains with the governments of the states/UTs. The SUH component of the DAY-NULM has been designed to complement their efforts. Therefore, under the Mission, central assistance is released to states/UTs as a whole, and the inter-se allocation of funds under different components of the Mission is done by the respective states/UTs, as per their requirements. (Unstarred Question No.1354, Rajya Sabha, 19 December 2022).

However, the data on the amount of funds allocated and utilised by each state/UT for the SUH programmes was not presented in Parliament in 2022. No questions were raised regarding the functioning of the shelters and the disbursement of citizenship entitlements through

the SUH. The shelters are expected to be fully equipped with basic facilities and foster convergence of various entitlements of social security, food, education and health care systems. Provision for admission of the homeless children to government school, skill training, etc. is also provided in the scheme guidelines (Starred Question No. 121, Lok Sabha, 15 December 2022).

By not monitoring and tracking the setting up of SUH across the country nor by demanding financial allocations towards SUH allocations, the central government is complicit in perpetuating the problem of urban homelessness. Over the years the Centre has merely assumed the role of a funder without demanding accountability from the states. The consequence of this inaction was direly experienced during the pandemic.

## SUPPORT TO STREET VENDORS

The precarious livelihoods of street vendors find legislative protections through the Street Vendors (Protection Of Livelihood And Regulation Of Street Vending) Act, 2014 (SVA). The SVA enables long-term protections for the vendors by: dividing public space into 'vending' and non-vending' zones, uses the

participatory management system by creating Town Vending Committees (TVC) of relevant stakeholders, mandating the TVCs to develop zones and zoning norms through democratic stakeholder involvement, and finally mandating municipal governments to undertake a periodic census of workers (ActionAid, 2019).

### IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LAW

The Ministry stated that to ensure the provision of the law finds its way to practice, from time to time, it draws attention of the states/UTs on implementation of various provisions of the Act including constitution of TVCs, by way of issue of letters/circulars and discussion in

meetings as well as conducting reviews at the level of Minister, Secretary and Mission Director. However, the law itself is implemented by respective states/UTs by framing their respective Rules, Schemes, Bye-laws and Plans for street vending (Unstarred Question No.544, Rajya Sabha, 12 December 2022).

### SURVEYS AND COV

Of the 49,48,657 street vendors identified through the survey conducted across cities in India only 28,17,897 have been issued a Certificate of Vending (CoV), i.e., only 56.94 per cent of identified street vendors have proof of work. This is in direct opposition to the Revised Operational Guidelines for Support to Urban Street Vendors (SUSV), 2018 (Ministry of Housing and

Urban Affairs, 2018b) which states that all identified street vendors must be given identity cards/certificate of vending. Between 2020 and 2022, the number of CoVs granted has risen but at the cost of the number of identified vendors falling drastically. A total of 54,70,307 street vendors were identified through the survey across states/UTs of which 22,67,728 (41 per cent of identified street vendors) were issued vending



certificates (Unstarred Question No. 1201, Rajya Sabha, 21 September 2020). The Ministry itself does not take on the responsibility of maintaining data on identified street vendors and CoVs issued and relies on information passed on from the states and UTs. Although decentralisation of responsibilities is the backbone of India's governance structures, the MoHUA on its part does not study the data submitted by the states and blindly reproduces materials presented by the states/UTs. The fact that the guidelines do not mandate the frequency of the updating of street vendor surveys too, means the Central

government lets the states/UTs off the hook for not adhering to the SVA.

Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Telangana, Andhra Pradesh, and Gujarat make up 75.56 per cent of all certificates issued until February 2022. While other rapidly urbanising states of Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, and Rajasthan are lagging far behind in the issuance of certificates, West Bengal has not conducted a single survey in its ULBs but has identified and ignored its 673 street vendors.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	SUPPORT TO URBAN STREET VENDORS		
		NUMBER OF CITIES COMPLETED STREET VENDORS SURVEY	NO. OF STREET VENDORS IDENTIFIED IN SURVEYED CITIES	NO. OF CERTIFICATES OF VENDING (COVs) ISSUED
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	1	676	676
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	110	2,56,926	2,42,049
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	31	7,605	818
4	ASSAM	79	54,984	1,775
5	BIHAR	136	1,56,965	1,56,965
6	CHANDIGARH	1	10,930	10,930
7	CHHATTISGARH	61	1,06,520	3,428
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	3	2,928	1,853
9	DELHI	0	72,457	56,422
10	GOA	11	2,881	2,262
11	GUJARAT	170	3,21,406	2,09,885
12	HARYANA	87	1,17,028	56,038
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	54	6,486	4,903
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	11	31,777	20,861
15	JHARKHAND	44	71,923	26,574
16	KARNATAKA	277	2,65,477	1,05,323
17	KERALA	93	23,154	3,210
18	LADAKH	2	427	427
19	MADHYA PRADESH	378	7,04,587	7,04,708
20	MAHARASHTRA	154	5,84,416	29,171
21	MANIPUR	4	15,698	1,472
22	MEGHALAYA	6	1,764	253
23	MIZORAM	8	3,960	3,193
24	NAGALAND	12	4,302	1,818
25	ODISHA	114	80,841	24,818
26	PUDUCHERRY	5	3,144	2,150
27	PUNJAB	165	1,49,215	67,929
28	RAJASTHAN	196	1,93,568	23,817
29	SIKKIM	0	0	0
30	TAMIL NADU	664	3,09,449	53,717
31	TELANGANA	141	5,02,233	3,57,840
32	TRIPURA	20	8,666	8,656
33	UTTAR PRADESH	128	8,49,108	6,14,798
34	UTTARAKHAND	91	26,483	19,158
35	WEST BENGAL	0	673	0
TOTAL		3,257	49,48,657	28,17,897

**Table 5.5 | Details on numbers of street vendors identified and Certificates of Vending issued since 1 April 2014, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No. 4696, Lok Sabha, 31 March 2022  
Only relevant columns from the original table have been presented

## TVCS AND VENDING ZONES

As for the status of TVCs, in response to Shri Jayant Chaudhary in the Rajya Sabha the government stated that as reported by states/UTs, Town Vending Committees (TVCs) are to be constituted in 4,452 cities/ULBs and as on 30 November 2022, 4,339 TVCs have been constituted (Unstarred Question No. 544, Rajya Sabha, 12 December 2022). As reported by states/UTs, a total of 13,403 vending zones have been identified as on 30 November 2022 (Unstarred Question No. 2710, Lok Sabha, 22 December 2022).

As per the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Bill, 2014, all vending zones will accommodate vendors up to 2.5 per cent

of the population of the ward or zone or town or city (Government of India, 2014). MP Jayant Chaudhary questioned the Ministry on increasing the holding capacity of vending zones or rehabilitating vendors in case of breach of limit. The Ministry responded that when the number of street vendors identified are more than the holding capacity of the vending zone, the TVC shall carry out a draw of lots for issuing the certificate of vending for that vending zone and the remaining persons shall be accommodated in any adjoining vending zone to avoid relocation. However, the number of identified vendors so far is well within this given norm, and there is no proposal to revise the norm (Unstarred Question No.544, Rajya Sabha, 12 December 2022).

## PRIME MINISTER STREET VENDOR'S ATMANIRBHAR NIDHI (PM SVANIDHI)

Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA) has launched the Prime Minister Street Vendor's AtmaNirbhar Nidhi (PM SVANidhi) Scheme on 1 June 2020 with the aim to facilitate collateral-free working capital loan to street vendors to restart their businesses that were impact during the Covid-19 pandemic. The salient features of the scheme are:

- i. Facilitate collateral-free working capital loan up to INR 10,000 with enhanced loan of INR 20,000 and INR 50,000 in the second and third tranches respectively, on repayment of earlier loans.
- ii. Incentivise regular repayment, through interest subsidy @ 7 per cent per annum
- iii. Reward digital transactions, by way of cashback up to INR 1,200 per year

(Unstarred Question No. 1346, Rajya Sabha, 19 December 2022).

With these objectives in mind, as on 8 December 2022, 38 lakh loans amounting to INR 4,405 crore have been disbursed under PM SVANidhi Scheme through various lending institutions (Unstarred Question No. 1346, Rajya Sabha, 19 December 2022).

A total of 58,34,635 applications have been received under the PM SVANidhi scheme of which 43,41,902 loan applications have been sanctioned (74.41 per cent), as per government numbers from December 2022. A total of 67.11 per cent of loans sanctioned have been in the states of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Telangana, Gujarat and Maharashtra. Meanwhile, the government and banks have successfully dispersed 37,80,805 loans, wherein maximum loans were disbursed in Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Telangana, Gujarat and Maharashtra (68.40 per cent of total disbursed loans). Surprisingly in Sikkim, where tourism is prominent, only 5 applications have been received from 2014 till 2022, and only one application has been processed.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	APPLICATIONS RECEIVED	APPLICATIONS SANCTIONED	LOAN DISBURSED	DISBURSED AMOUNT (IN INR CRORE)
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	882	724	637	0.8
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	3,33,945	2,58,411	2,28,763	266.71
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	6,646	4,401	3,311	3.87
4	ASSAM	96,628	77,938	66,100	71.76
5	BIHAR	1,17,373	68,239	53,982	57.7
6	CHANDIGARH	7,823	5,503	5,044	6.24
7	CHHATTISGARH	1,11,556	65,714	55,797	62.78
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	2,991	1,737	1,380	1.46
9	DELHI	1,28,386	83,560	58,585	64.36
10	GOA	2,589	1,852	1,707	2.2
11	GUJARAT	4,11,495	2,98,395	2,67,526	312.27
12	HARYANA	69,475	44,663	36,350	42.87
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	6,872	5,549	5,262	7.41
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	26,933	20,291	18,026	21.62
15	JHARKHAND	66,712	40,861	34,920	39.34
16	KARNATAKA	3,03,662	2,26,850	1,91,027	228.85
17	KERALA	19,834	15,970	14,970	19.8
18	LADAKH	598	490	458	0.64
19	MADHYA PRADESH	8,85,347	6,84,558	6,16,076	729.38
20	MAHARASHTRA	4,96,987	3,45,277	2,57,513	297.12
21	MANIPUR	20,263	11,483	9,509	10.38
22	MEGHALAYA	1,886	1,555	1,307	1.45
23	MIZORAM	996	642	616	0.75
24	NAGALAND	3,456	2,299	1,946	2.27
25	ODISHA	80,501	57,294	42,005	47.89
26	PUDUCHERRY	2,433	1,905	1,679	2.08
27	PUNJAB	1,10,852	54,520	47,312	52.96
28	RAJASTHAN	1,59,308	88,202	71,344	74.9
29	SIKKIM	5	1	1	0
30	TAMIL NADU	4,25,475	2,48,425	2,08,741	238.66
31	TELANGANA	6,21,689	5,19,339	4,47,589	544.78
32	TRIPURA	6,162	4,549	3,750	4.25
33	UTTAR PRADESH	12,44,724	10,66,569	9,97,523	1121.29
34	UTTARAKHAND	25,887	17,253	15,533	19.18
35	WEST BENGAL	34,264	16,883	14,516	14.77
TOTAL		58,34,635	43,41,902	37,80,805	4372.81

**Table 5.6 | Details on the status of loans issued under the PM SVANidhi scheme since 2020 as on 5 December 2022, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No.1391, Lok Sabha, 15 December 2022

## LOAN REPAYMENT

Under the SVANidhi Scheme 31,85,665 first tranche loans were disbursed until March 2022 (Unstarred Question No.1553, Lok Sabha, 15 December 2022). In terms of loans repaid, 14,46,441 (45.40 per cent) beneficiaries repaid the first loan of INR 10,000 amounting to INR 1,435.81 crore. This shows that largely the PM SVANidhi scheme was successful, at the implementation stage, and in its objective of providing and closing the credit loop. Most street vendors appeared to have benefitted from the money and have repaid the government. Upon timely and complete repayment of the first loan, the candidate became eligible for the second tranche. The second tranche was introduced in August 2021 to run until March 2022. However, the second round of loans of INR 20,000 do not demonstrate the same level of success. The number of second tranche loans disbursed stands much lower at 5,95,390 (Unstarred Question No.1553, Lok Sabha, 15 December 2022, see table 5.7). However, only 11,597 beneficiaries (1.94 per cent) have fully repaid the loan. The uptake of

second tranche loans is much lower, and repayment of this higher amount appears to be slower.

Since, a third tranche of an even larger amount, up to INR 50,000, has been introduced extending the scheme from March 2022 to December 2024, it remains to be seen how the vendors/beneficiaries respond to it. More insights are required into why loans of smaller amounts appear to be more popular and how street vendors acquired, utilised and repay the three different tranches (Unstarred Question No.1391, Lok Sabha, 15 December 2022).

This is especially important since several SVANidhi accounts have been classified as Non-Performing Assets (NPAs). As per information submitted by the lending institutions with Credit Guarantee Fund Trust for Micro and Small Enterprises, 4.85 lakh accounts have become NPA with total amount of INR 344 crore against the INR 3700.9 crore disbursed by the lending institutions till 27 July 2022 (Unstarred Question No. 2993, Lok Sabha, 04 August 2022).

SVANIDHI LOAN TRANCHE	1ST LOAN DISBURSED	2ND LOAN DISBURSED	3RD LOAN DISBURSED
Total Loans Disbursed (As on 5 December 2022)	31,85,665	5,95,390	7,606

**Table 5.7 | Details of the loans disbursed under the three SVANidhi tranches**

Source: Unstarred Question No.1553, Lok Sabha, 15 December 2022

\* Original table has been modified/edited to highlight relevant information

S. NO.	STATE/UT	1ST LOAN		2ND LOAN	
		LOANS FULLY REPAID	REPAID AMOUNT (IN INR CRORE)	LOANS FULLY REPAID	REPAID AMOUNT (IN INR CRORE)
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	371	0.37	5	0.01
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	97,648	97.13	439	0.94
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	1,779	1.78	22	0.05
4	ASSAM	12,235	12.32	144	0.32
5	BIHAR	21,870	21.55	33	0.07
6	CHANDIGARH	2,349	2.34	44	0.09
7	CHHATTISGARH	25,968	25.75	231	0.50
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	813	0.81	-	-
9	DELHI	24,826	24.66	37	0.08
10	GOA	982	0.98	29	0.06
11	GUJARAT	81,795	81.60	1493	3.12
12	HARYANA	15,454	15.35	183	0.39
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	2,614	2.61	216	0.44
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	8,625	8.64	135	0.28
15	JHARKHAND	15,912	15.83	98	0.21
16	KARNATAKA	80,228	80.08	1165	2.48
17	KERALA	6,793	6.75	344	0.71
18	LADAKH	252	0.25	5	0.01
19	MADHYA PRADESH	2,01,915	201.98	3627	7.68
20	MAHARASHTRA	1,05,056	104.48	740	1.59
21	MANIPUR	3,672	3.68	9	0.02
22	MEGHALAYA	262	0.27	9	0.02
23	MIZORAM	362	0.36	11	0.02
24	NAGALAND	892	0.89	7	0.02
25	ODISHA	22,787	22.54	115	0.25
26	PUDUCHERRY	840	0.84	2	-
27	PUNJAB	22,618	22.42	58	0.13
28	RAJASTHAN	39,490	39.28	22	0.04
29	SIKKIM	-	-	-	-
30	TAMIL NADU	86,980	86.24	228	0.48
31	TELANGANA	2,12,248	210.78	970	2.09
32	TRIPURA	1,373	1.37	44	0.09
33	UTTAR PRADESH	3,36,966	331.49	1050	2.24
34	UTTARAKHAND	7,359	7.32	82	0.17
35	WEST BENGAL	3,107	3.07	-	-
TOTAL		14,46,441	1,435.81	11,597	24.6

**Table 5.8 | Details of loans repaid under tranche one and tranche two of SVANidhi scheme, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No.1391, Lok Sabha, 15 December 2022

Note: The 3rd loan of upto INR 50,000 of tenure of 36 months has been started w.e.f. 01 June 2022, hence so far no loan has been fully repaid.

## INTERLINKAGES WITH SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAMMES

An extension of the PM SVANidhi scheme is the linkages to social security programs through the 'SVANidhi se Samriddhi', which was initially launched in 125 select urban local bodies (ULBs), on 4 January 2021. This programme facilitates linkages to 8 select central government welfare schemes designed to provide a safety net and social security for the eligible beneficiaries and their families. These 8 schemes are

- (i) Pradhan Mantri Jeevan Jyoti Bima Yojana
- (ii) PM Suraksha Bima Yojana
- (iii) Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana
- (iv) Registration under Building and other Constructions Workers (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act (BOCW)

- (v) Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Maandhan Yojana
- (vi) National Food Security Act (NFSA) portability benefit – One Nation One Ration Card (ONORC)
- (vii) Pradhan Mantri Janani Suraksha Yojana and
- (viii) Pradhan Mantri Matru Vandana Yojana

(Unstarred Question No. 293, Lok Sabha, 03 February 2022).

A socio-economic profile of a total of 28,68,777 vendors and their family members was completed and 25,80,121 linkages to schemes was facilitated. The state of Uttar Pradesh outperformed all other states and UTs by a very strong margin, profiling 11,73,502 citizens and processing 14,12,082 scheme linkages. Sikkim and West Bengal on the other hand did not profile a single citizen nor created any social security linkages.

S. NO.	STATE/UT	NO. OF STREET VENDORS AND FAMILY MEMBERS PROFILED	NO. OF SCHEME SANCTIONS FACILITATED
1	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	1,570	646
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	2,47,641	2,92,338
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	1,362	869
4	ASSAM	8,015	5,956
5	BIHAR	29,582	31,906
6	CHANDIGARH	8,185	948
7	CHHATTISGARH	59,533	49,240
8	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	1,871	890
9	DELHI	2,038	159
10	GOA	611	534
11	GUJARAT	97,765	16,239
12	HARYANA	19,295	4,633
13	HIMACHAL PRADESH	1,014	415
14	JAMMU & KASHMIR	21,327	747

15	JHARKHAND	24,980	31,108
16	KARNATAKA	62,459	19,791
17	KERALA	4,652	534
18	LADAKH	602	137
19	MADHYA PRADESH	3,30,399	1,28,303
20	MAHARASHTRA	1,36,986	1,19,518
21	MANIPUR	1,467	834
22	MEGHALAYA	784	148
23	MIZORAM	1,057	1,040
24	NAGALAND	2,168	249
25	ODISHA	47,960	5,303
26	PUDUCHERRY	1,981	2,346
27	PUNJAB	50,586	16,903
28	RAJASTHAN	32,356	8,685
29	SIKKIM	0	0
30	TAMIL NADU	33,405	17,261
31	TELANGANA	4,53,830	4,08,277
32	TRIPURA	993	1,063
33	UTTAR PRADESH	11,73,502	14,12,082
34	UTTARAKHAND	8,801	1,019
35	WEST BENGAL	0	0
TOTAL		28,68,777	25,80,121

**Table 5.9 | Details of SVANidhi beneficiaries and family members surveyed and scheme sanctions facilitated as on 12 July 2022, state/UT-wise**

Source: Unstarred Question No.784, Lok Sabha, 21 July 2022

## DODGED QUESTIONS

Questions pertaining to an urban employment guarantee scheme were dodged by the MoHUA. It remains unclear why the questions on an urban employment guarantee were not instead posed to the MoLE. The Ministry of Labour and Employment, Standing Committee on Labour Report (2020-2021), 2021, p. 64-64, recognised the

‘...imperative need for putting in place an Employment Guarantee Programme for the urban workforce in line with MGNREGA.’ Another pertinent recommendation of the Committee is a need to increase the incomes and spending capacities of the poor by putting money into the bank accounts of the poor.



MPs Dr. A. Chellakumar and Shri Karti P. Chidambaram questioned the government on its plans to follow through with the Standing Committee recommendation (Unstarred Question No. 789, Lok Sabha, 21 July 2022). However, the government merely stated that no such proposal on an urban employment guarantee scheme was in the works. When asked about an urban employment guarantee scheme in the backdrop of COVID-19, the Ministry simply reiterated the implementation of schemes like Affordable Rental Housing Complexes (ARHCs), PM Street Vendor's AtmaNirbhar Nidhi and Deendayal Antyodaya Yojana–National Urban Livelihoods Mission (DAY–NULM) for tackling urban unemployment and poverty (Unstarred Question No. 2619, Lok Sabha, 17 March 2022). It is important to note that the Parliamentary Standing Committee's recommendations

were published after taking into consideration the various ongoing central schemes, rendering the Ministry's response to this question a moot point.

MP Shri A. Ganeshamurthi asked the MoHUA if it was aware of the Rajasthan state run Indira Gandhi Urban Employment Guarantee Scheme and its plans to replicate it at the national level. The government responded it was aware of the scheme launched in the 2022–2023 budget but went on to correlate urban poverty with migration flows and the search for better living conditions. It stated that urban development, including urban poverty, were a state subject, and the Ministry complements the efforts of the individual states/UTs through ongoing livelihoods schemes (Unstarred Question No. 834, Lok Sabha, 21 July 2022).

## CONCLUSION

---

In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic and increased poverty, the DAY-NULM needs further deliberations and modifications.

Providing infrastructural support through homeless shelters is not enough, although currently the government is falling behind on this objective as well. The MoHUA's objective is further hindered by the infrequency or lack of homeless population surveys and a repository of country-wide data. There arises an urgent need to periodically enumerate the number of homeless persons in a city, provide them with basic citizenship documents, and link them to social security schemes in addition to the physical shelters.

In terms of linkages with gainful employment, we find more than 13 lakh urban poor have been imparted skill training to enhance their employability, but only 6.78 lakh trained have been placed under self and/or wage employment. However, there is a large discrepancy in the state/UT wise distribution of the trainees and placements. This disparity in the performance of states can also be seen in the support for microbusinesses where not even 100 microbusinesses are set up in some states and UTs.

Data on SHG creation and bank linkages remains plagued with inflated numbers and statistical errors, where 62.91 per cent of the SHG loans were given out in the two states of Andhra Pradesh (3,21,256) and Telangana (1,02,312). The government should verify the data it receives from the states/UTs. Discrepancies in the statistics presented in parliament raise questions about the Centre's oversight and states/UTs lack of accountability. Modifying the DAY–NULM monitoring, and reporting mechanisms can generate critical reflections on why states are lagging behind in the implementation of the schemes, and if the programme is achieving what it set out to do.

Additionally, it might be beneficial for the MoHUA and the various stakeholders to develop a qualitative framework to assess impact of its various schemes, and to steer programs as they progress. This qualitative framework might prove especially useful in the aftermath of the pandemic to weigh the cost versus benefit of credit schemes like the PM SVANidhi against the proposed urban employment guarantee scheme.

## CHAPTER 6

# LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

---

The report, *Women and Men in the Informal Economy* (ILO, 2018), states that 88.2 per cent of India's working population is informally employed. An astounding 78.1 per cent is in non-agricultural informal employment. This information is not new, considering official Indian statistics estimate that 86 per cent of India's population is informally employed (National Commission for Enterprises in the Unorganised Sector, 2007). The landscape of informal employment has not changed much since 2007, and with the long-term consequences of the pandemic increasing wealth-gaps and inequality (Oxfam, 2022), it becomes crucial to understand

the challenges of the world of informal work, and the policies that cater to uplifting workers. The Ministry of Labour and Employment (MoLE) is the apex institution that creates safeguards and protections for all workers, particularly the poor, disadvantaged workers who often work informally. This chapter studies the questions posed to the MoLE and the answers given, keeping the informal workers at the centre of analysis. Answers pertaining to enumeration of informal workers, welfare and social security, construction workers, domestic workers and migrant workers receive special focus.

## NATURE OF QUESTIONS

---

The questions addressed to the MoLE in the two houses of Parliament were studied, the questions pertaining to informal worker populations received deeper analysis. The answers provided by the Ministry were often repetitive as only a finite number of welfare and social security schemes apply to informal workers. As a whole, though, the questions raised and answered can be grouped into the following thematic categories:

**Urban (Un)employment and Wages:** Approximately 47 questions directly centred around the increase in formal and informal unemployment, measures taken to boost the economy and employability, data on (un)employment across sectors, worker profiles, and the need for an urban employment guarantee scheme. An additional, 9 questions analysed were seeking information on the job market, and job status in a post-Covid world.

**Welfare and Social Security Schemes:** Approximately 25 questions directly addressed the social security schemes for informal workers, specifically including domestic worker, migrants workers and construction worker. From the data it appears that the government provided standard responses across most of these

questions since a limited number of schemes have been made available to all informal workers.

**Migrant Workers:** The ~18 question raised in Parliament pertained to occupational health and safety of workers as well as the return of migrants to villages in the wake of the pandemic.

**E-shram Portal:** ~23 questions inquired about the e-Shram portal, the data collected through the portal, the challenges of accessing the portal without technical know-how, etc.

**Categories of Workers:** Surprisingly, questions specifically pertaining to the construction workers and their welfare board did not find much prominence in 2022. Two questions on construction workers were raised in the Lok Sabha, while another three were raised in the Rajya Sabha. The same indifference was seen towards domestic workers (DWs), wherein 5 questions on DWs were raised in the Lok Sabha. Six questions, in both houses, inquired about the plight of beedi workers, while a single question in the Rajya Sabha was about sanitation workers and was eventually dodged. Gig workers, however, received pertinent attention this year with eight questions being raised in both houses of Parliament.

## THE UNORGANISED SECTOR

### UNEMPLOYMENT AND WAGES

Questions on rising unemployment (across rural and urban India) and the status of wages dominated the agenda in 2022. For data on employment, the Ministry is reliant on the data generated by the Periodic Labour

Force Survey (PLFS) conducted by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (MoSPI). As per the PLFS report, unemployment rate for persons of age 15 years and above both in rural and urban areas on usual status basis is as follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (UR) (IN PER CENT)			
RURAL			
YEARS	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
2018-19	5.5	3.5	5.0
2019-20	4.5	2.6	3.9
2020-21	3.8	2.1	3.3
URBAN			
YEARS	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
2018-19	7.0	9.8	7.6
2019-20	6.4	8.9	6.9
2020-21	6.1	8.6	6.7
ALL INDIA			
YEARS	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
2018-19	6.0	5.1	5.8
2019-20	5.0	4.2	4.8
2020-21	4.5	3.5	4.2
SOURCE: PLFS, MOSPI			

**Table 6.1 | Rural and urban unemployment rate for the last three years as per the Periodic Labour Force Survey**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 1898, Lok Sabha, 19 December, 2022

On an average the Unemployment Rate (UR) in urban India is hovering around the 7 per cent mark for the past four years, and is almost double the rural unemployment rate. The female unemployment rate in urban India has held steady at approximately 9 per cent for the last three years, which shows an alarming trend. The overall unemployment rate in India was the lowest last year in 2020-2021 than it has been since 2018, and the UR is showing a declining trend. Further, when questioned

specifically on jobs creation, the Ministry responses showcased the rise in the estimated Worker Population Ratio (WPR), wherein between 2018-19 to 2020-21, the WPR increased from 47.3 per cent to 52.6 per cent (Unstarred Question No. 2164, Rajya Sabha, 04 August, 2022). Despite these positive numbers, the question raised by MPs still finds relevance as the data collected for PLFS is on an annual basis (from July to June of next year). A month-by-month tracking of

unemployment rates is not possible, resulting in a loss of data on COVID-induced unemployment spells, especially in the unregulated and seasonal informal labour market. Additionally, when the Ministry presented numbers on unemployment levels (during 2019–2020) among the educated, it was seen that overall unemployment is decidedly highest among diploma holders (14.2 per cent) and graduates (17.2 per cent) as seen in Table 6.2. These are concerning figures and the MPs should have taken

the opportunity to carefully formulate questions for the Ministry on the kinds of jobs—formal/informal, high-skill/low skill/self-employed—that are being created and offered up by the current labour markets. The Ministry on its part dodged the question by presenting pan-India figures of youth unemployment (Unstarred Question No. 694, Lok Sabha, 07 February 2022).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	GENERAL EDUCATION LEVEL (IN %)					
		SECONDARY	HIGHER SECONDARY	DIPLOMA/ CERTIFICATE COURSE	GRADUATE	POST-GRADUATE AND ABOVE	ALL
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	3.2	7.3	16.7	24.5	28.7	4.7
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	9.8	10.5	0.0	23.9	36.5	6.7
3	ASSAM	7.3	14.9	4.0	20.1	6.6	7.9
4	BIHAR	3.9	6.6	84.9	19.9	12.3	5.1
5	CHHATTISGARH	2.1	6.6	34.1	17.8	12.7	3.3
6	DELHI	5.4	10.1	14.6	13.5	16.1	8.6
7	GOA	6.7	11.6	14.8	15.0	15.3	8.1
8	GUJARAT	1.7	3.5	5.2	5.3	8.8	2.0
9	HARYANA	6.1	10.6	13.1	13.4	8.9	6.4
10	HIMACHAL PRADESH	0.9	4.5	10.8	17.9	10.8	3.7
11	JHARKHAND	6.2	9.1	24.7	14.0	14.3	4.2
12	KARNATAKA	3.0	3.5	9.9	19.8	10.4	4.2
13	KERALA	6.5	17.5	13.8	28.2	24.2	10.0
14	MADHYA PRADESH	2.5	4.6	17.1	14.7	6.3	3.0
15	MAHARASHTRA	2.5	6.3	10.9	8.6	2.5	3.2
16	MANIPUR	7.7	12.9	9.4	18.2	21.3	9.5
17	MEGHALAYA	3.8	10.0	5.9	16.6	19.7	2.7
18	MIZORAM	2.2	12.7	0.0	14.3	22.3	5.7
19	NAGALAND	26.7	34.3	34.5	46.3	56.0	25.7
20	ODISHA	10.7	16.9	28.4	25.3	10.5	6.2
21	PUNJAB	5.3	15.8	16.4	14.5	14.1	7.3

22	RAJASTHAN	3.0	5.4	14.1	22.8	16.9	4.5
23	SIKKIM	1.8	5.3	13.9	11.1	2.1	2.2
24	TAMIL NADU	3.2	6.2	16.4	20.6	13.5	5.3
25	TELANGANA	4.4	9.7	12.8	26.9	24.6	7.0
26	TRIPURA	4.4	6.6	16.3	13.8	5.6	3.2
27	UTTARAKHAND	4.5	13.8	22.0	21.9	8.3	7.1
28	UTTAR PRADESH	3.5	6.3	21.2	15.6	10.6	4.4
29	WEST BENGAL	5.8	9.1	13.9	15.2	11.5	4.6
30	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	14.4	29.4	19.7	29.8	18.9	12.6
31	CHANDIGARH	8.9	10.5	0.0	3.0	8.2	6.3
32	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	3.2	4.1	3.2	8.6	17.3	3.0
33	DAMAN & DIU	3.8	7.8	5.6	3.4	0.0	2.9
34	JAMMU & KASHMIR	5.2	14.6	49.6	21.9	21.2	6.7
35	LADAKH	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
36	LAKSHADWEEP	7.6	27.8	29.3	35.2	0.0	13.7
37	PUDUCHERRY	2.6	9.1	10.1	19.8	8.4	7.6
<b>ALL INDIA</b>		<b>4.1</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>17.2</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>4.8</b>

**Table 6.2 | Unemployment rate among educated working population (15 years and above) as per the PLFS 2019–20, state/UT-wise**

*Source: Unstarred Question No.694, Lok Sabha, 07 February 2022 and Annual Report PLFS, 2019–20; M/o Statistics and Programme Implementation*

On the question of minimum wages for workers, the MoLE stated the mechanisms for ensuring wage payments under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948. This Act, however, only applies to scheduled categories of employment and excludes a large number of informal workers. When it comes to setting the contested national minimum floor wage for workers, the Ministry informed that the National Floor Level Minimum Wage was last revised from INR 160 to INR 176 per day, w.e.f. 1 June 2017 (Unstarred Question No. 249, Rajya Sabha, 03 February 2022). The Code on Wage, 2019 makes provisions for the Centre to set the floor wage but this provision remains incomplete as the Code on wages is still to come into force. Yet again, the Ministry dodged the nuances of the question

posed by MP Shri Elamaram Kareem by abstaining from answering the components that are being considered while formulating the floor wage or planning the mechanisms for its enforcement (Unstarred Question No. 249, Rajya Sabha, 03 February 2022). Similarly, it dodged MP Shri Mohammed Nadimul Haque's question on implementing the recommendations of the Expert Committee on National Minimum Wage and raising it to INR 375 (Unstarred Question No. 260, Rajya Sabha, 08 December 2022). The dodging of these pressing questions by the Ministry is concerning since it shows the Ministry is not ready to guarantee informal workers a liveable wage upon the implementations of the Code of Wages. It also makes apparent that the government is not

ready with a plan and adequate enforcement machinery to ensure that incomes do not fall below floor wages in the coming years.

Within the realm of unsure wages and (un)employment was indeed important to ask the MoLE about an urban employment guarantee program. However, this question was raised to the MoHUA instead and consequently dodged by both Ministries. No such proposal was under consideration at the Centre. Instead, as urban development and poverty alleviation fall under state subjects, the onus has been shifted to the states. Some states like Kerala and Rajasthan have started their own

urban employment guarantee programmes. However, this response by the Central Ministry is problematic as it looks at the categories of poverty, livelihoods, jobs, minimum wages, etc. in silos. Rather, an urban employment guarantee scheme, if conceived and implemented, will put guaranteed money in the hands of the poor. Such a scheme will imagine the urban poor not as passive recipients of dole, but as active workers, and rational-choice consumers. It also proves beneficial in the long-run as it equips the poor to improve their standard of living without continued financial or physical interventions of the government.

## **REGISTRATION AND ENUMERATION: E-SHRAM PORTAL**

The e-Shram portal was launched on 26 August 2021 with the aim of creating a comprehensive National Database of the Unorganised Workers, as a manner of streamlining the administration and delivery of benefits to the informal sector. The main objective of the portal is to maintain a dynamic database of workers, provide Universal Account Numbers (UAN), facilitate delivery of social security and welfare benefits, ensure portability of benefits, opportunities for job search and skill development by linkages to National Career Service (NCS) portal, Aatmanirbhar Skilled Employee Employer Mapping (ASEEM) portal and Udyam portal (Unstarred Question No. 3538, Lok Sabha, 08 December 2022). The database is maintained along the following parameters: type of occupation (including construction workers, gig and platform workers, street vendors, domestic workers, agriculture workers, migrant workers and similar other workers seeded with Aadhaar) and worker profiles through Aadhaar related information (name, date of birth, gender, photo), personal details (marital status, disability status etc.), contact details, address information (present, permanent), occupation details, bank details, nominee details etc., (Unstarred Question No. 254, Rajya Sabha, 08 December 2022).

As of 12 December 2022, a total of 28,45,65,622 informal workers have been registered on the portal. Five states—Uttar Pradesh (8,29,76,968), Bihar (2,85,16,784) West Bengal (2,57,06,239), Madhya Pradesh (1,67,77,749) and Maharashtra (1,33,36,139)—have the highest number of e-Shram registrants and account for 58.79 per cent of all registrations.

The enumeration of informal workers is the first step in a positive direction, and the registration numbers and its quick uptake across the country, reflect the portals' necessity and demonstrate workers' demands to be officially recognised as workers. In response to questions raised in the Parliament about the inaccessibility of the e-Shram portal owing to its 'online' status, the Ministry responded by stating that workers can easily get themselves registered through 3 modes: (i) self registration (ii) through Common Service Centres (CSCs) (iii) through State Seva Kendras (Unstarred Question No. 254, Rajya Sabha, 03 February 2022). Although, the government has made provisions to help workers navigate the online space, the fact that these questions are still being raised then point towards the accessibility, availability and nearness of these Seva Kendras, as only 5,51,612 CSCs are functional across the country (Unstarred Question No. 4083, Rajya Sabha, 07 April 2022).

Further, there is no clarity on whether the CSCs will assist informal workers in accessing the National Career Service (NCS) portal, an employment service portal. The e-Shram portal has been integrated with the NCS portal, where e-Shram workers can now register as a job seeker based on their Universal Account Number (UAN) and date of birth. The NCS portal brings together jobseekers and employers on one platform and post registration workers can apply for potential jobs as per their skill set (Unstarred Question No. 259, Rajya Sabha, 08 December 2022). The NCS project is being implemented by the Government to provide a variety of employment related services like job search and matching, career counselling, vocational guidance, information on skill development courses, etc. on a digital platform [www.ncs.gov.in]. The integration of the NCS portal with the state employment portals is also underway. The integration of the portals of 20 states/UTs is completed and 7 states/UTs are directly using the NCS portal for jobseeker registration. The integration of the nine states/UTs is pending at the state government's level due to the state portals being under development/upgradation, etc. (Unstarred Question No. 1040, Rajya Sabha, 15 December, 2022). The initiative to bring informal workers into formal job-seeking platforms is commendable, but

the lack of technical know-how among workers, and low levels of access to digital technology is bound to be a barrier. CSC centres could bridge this gap in the interim. In the long-run, individual workers may be able to access this platform with technical training and through awareness campaigns about this initiative.

Issues of Aadhaar card linkage were also raised in Parliament by MP Shri. Sujeet Kumar who inquired if the government had undertaken any survey to determine the presence of Aadhaar cards and proof of residence among informal workers. In a way, this question addressed the exclusion of some workers from the portal owing to the lack of Aadhaar Cards, but the question was dodged by the Ministry. The Ministry responded by stating that the address of workers at the time of registration was fetched from the Aadhaar database but in addition, current and permanent addresses are also provided by the workers on self-declaration basis. Furthermore, approximately 7.6 crore workers out of 28.4 crore workers (i.e., 26.70 per cent) registered on e-SHRAM did not have their bank account linked with Aadhaar and the Ministry has been advising such unorganised workers to update their details by revisiting e-Shram portal (Unstarred Question No. 185, Rajya Sabha, 08 December 2022).

S. NO.	STATE/UT	TOTAL REGISTRATIONS
1	UTTAR PRADESH	8,29,76,968
2	BIHAR	2,85,16,784
3	WEST BENGAL	2,57,06,239
4	MADHYA PRADESH	1,67,77,749
5	MAHARASHTRA	1,33,36,139
6	ODISHA	1,33,13,228
7	RAJASTHAN	1,27,18,450
8	JHARKHAND	91,08,389
9	GUJARAT	90,83,620
10	TAMIL NADU	82,55,545
11	CHHATTISGARH	82,32,132
12	ANDHRA PRADESH	78,38,400
13	KARNATAKA	72,59,331
14	ASSAM	68,42,349
15	KERALA	59,01,070
16	PUNJAB	54,92,110
17	HARYANA	52,39,133
18	TELANGANA	39,92,442
19	JAMMU & KASHMIR	33,46,412
20	DELHI	32,45,844
21	UTTARAKHAND	29,69,616
22	HIMACHAL PRADESH	19,20,969
23	TRIPURA	8,42,201
24	MANIPUR	4,03,695
25	MEGHALAYA	2,78,907
26	NAGALAND	2,18,316
27	PUDUCHERRY	1,76,186
28	CHANDIGARH	1,73,744
29	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	1,39,729
30	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI AND DAMAN & DIU	72,752
31	MIZORAM	57,970
32	GOA	48,563
33	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	28,345
34	LADAKH	27,845
35	SIKKIM	22,081
36	LAKSHADWEEP	2,369
TOTAL		28,45,65,622

**Table 6.3 | Number of workers registered on the e-Shram portal as on 07 December 2022, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 772, Lok Sabha, 12 December 2022



## LABOUR CODES

The Government notified four Labour Codes, namely, the Code on Wages, 2019 on 8 August 2019 and the Industrial Relations Code, 2020, the Code on Social Security, 2020 and the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020 on 29 September 2020. 'Labour' is a subject in the Concurrent List, within the Constitution of India, and under the Codes the power to make rules has been entrusted to the central government, state government and appropriate governments. There is a requirement of publication of

rules in their official gazette for a period of 30 or 45 days for public consultation. As of 2022, 31 states/UTs have pre-published the draft Rules under Code on Wages, 2019, 26 states/UTs have pre-published the draft Rules under the Industrial Relations Code, 2020, 25 states/UTs have pre-published the draft Rules under the Code on Social Security, 2020 and 24 states/UTs have pre-published the draft Rules under the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020 (Unstarred Question No. 576, Rajya Sabha, 21 July 2022).

NAME OF CODE	STATE/UT
The Code on Wages, 2019	Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Mizoram, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, UTs of Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Jammu & Kashmir, Ladakh, NCT of Delhi and Puducherry (31)
The Industrial Relations Code, 2020	Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Odisha, Punjab, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, UTs of Chandigarh, Jammu & Kashmir, Ladakh and Puducherry (26)
The Code on Social Security, 2020	Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Odisha, Punjab, Telangana, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, UTs of Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Jammu & Kashmir, Ladakh and Puducherry (25)
The Occupational Safety Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020	Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Odisha, Punjab, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, UTs of Chandigarh, Jammu & Kashmir and Ladakh (24)

**Table 6.4 | State/UTs that have pre-published the draft Rules on the four Labour Codes**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 22, Lok Sabha, 18 July 2022

The Ministry, however, did not provide any more information on the status of implementation of the Codes and exact times of when the Codes are expected to come into force. Only six direct questions raised in Parliament quizzed the Ministry on the applicability and features of the new labour codes. As a response, the Ministry highlighted some standout features of the Codes aimed at strengthening the protection available to workers, including unorganised workers, in terms of statutory minimum wage, social security and healthcare of workers. The features of the Codes are as follows:

1. A statutory right for minimum wages and timely payment of wages has been made available to all workers to support sustainable growth and inclusive development.
2. To avoid multiple interpretations and litigations, uniform definition of 'wages' across all the four Labour Codes has been provided that is simple, coherent and easy to enforce.
3. Provision for annual health check-up and medical facilities has also been made which enhances labour productivity and increases life expectancy.
4. Statutory provision has been made for the first time to issue appointment letters to every employee of the establishment which leads to a formalised contract of employment that increases job security and enables a worker to claim statutory benefits such as minimum wages, social security etc .
5. Provision of Re-skilling Fund for skill development of workers.
6. The gig worker and the platform worker have been defined for the purpose of formulating schemes to provide social security benefits. Social security schemes can be formulated from the contribution of aggregators and the other sources can include funds from the Central and State Governments.
7. The Central Government may extend benefits to unorganised workers, gig workers and platform

workers and the members of their families through Employees' State Insurance Corporation or Employees' Provident Fund Organization.

8. A worker engaged under Fixed Term Employment is entitled for all the benefits which are available to permanent employees and has also been made eligible for gratuity if he renders service for a period of one year.
9. Every worker is entitled to annual leave with wages after working for 180 days in comparison to 240 days at present. Provision for encashment of leave on demand by a worker while in service at the end of calendar year
10. Applicability of Employees' Provident Fund has been extended to all industries as against scheduled industries at present

(Unstarred Question No. 809, Lok Sabha, 12 December 2022)

A majority of these standout features are applicable to employees or formal workers or workers falling in scheduled employment. MP Shri Anubhav Mohanty raised this exact concern, citing 70 per cent of the organisations in India employ less than 6 people. However, the Ministry stuck to its standard response. The Code on Wages, 2020 has universalized statutory right for minimum wages and timely payment of wages to all workers and that the cover of social security has been extended to the informal workers through features like : Employees' State Insurance Corporation (ESIC) coverage on voluntary basis for establishments having less than 10 employees, Social Security Fund for formulating schemes for welfare of the unorganised workers, gig workers and platform workers, Central Government has been empowered to extend benefits to unorganised workers, gig workers and platform workers and the members of their families through ESIC or Employees' Provident Fund Organization (Unstarred Question No. 3658, Lok Sabha, 08 August 2022). As and when the draft rules are published across

states/UTs and are brought into force, the picture on 'if, when and how' these vague provisions for the informal are implemented, across states boundaries, will become clearer.

## MIGRANT WORKERS

---

As per Census 2011 data, the total number of inter-state migrant workers in the country were 4,14,22,917 (Unstarred Question No. 1857, Rajya Sabha, 22 December 2022). During COVID-19, migrant workers returned to their villages in large numbers. The issue of these 'return migrants' returning to states like Odisha, Chhattisgarh was raised, along with the exodus of migrants in the third wave. As a response to the migrant crisis triggered by the pandemic, the Ministry has adopted a three pronged approach.

Firstly, the Government of India entrusted the Labour Bureau to conduct the 'All India Survey on Migrant Workers' with the objective to generate basic quantitative information on migrant workers and the impact of COVID19 pandemic on their work. This updated survey aims to throw light on the socio-economic conditions of migrant workers, their education level, vocational/ technical training, gender, social group, accommodation (housing), consumption expenditure, income, financial inclusion, and change in income after migration. The survey was launched on 1 April 2021 (Unstarred Question No. 4085, Rajya Sabha, 07 April 2022). However, no additional information on the status of the survey was offered by the Ministry.

Secondly, the government has opened monitoring centres to track the movement of migrants across the country. At present, the government is running 22 monitoring

centres in India, and there is no proposal being considered to set up any additional monitoring centres as the existing monitoring centres are adequate. These centres address complaints/ grievances related to pending wages, termination of job or other service matters for initiating action for redressal. If the complaint belongs to the State sphere, then it is forwarded to the respective State Government. Details for the budgetary allocation for these centres was requested by MP Shri Neeraj Dangi. However, the Ministry responded by saying that no separate budget is required for the centres. However, this response did not answer MP Dangi's primary question of funding for the centres (Starred Question No. 29, Rajya Sabha, 03 February 2022). The list of the 21 Migrant Monitoring Centres is presented in Table 6.5.

Thirdly, the Ministry relies on the Inter-state Migrant Workmen (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1979 to safeguard the workers. This Act has now been subsumed in the Occupational Safety, Health and the Working Conditions Code and provides for decent working conditions, minimum wages, grievance redressal mechanisms, protection from abuse and exploitation, enhancement of skills and social security to all categories of workers including migrant workers. Migrant workers are engaged in various occupations (Unstarred Question No. 2367, Lok Sabha, 01 August 2022). However, this code is yet to come into force.

S. NO.	NAME OF MONITORING CENTRE	AREA OF JURISDICTION
1	AHMEDABAD	GUJARAT & UT OF DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI, DAMAN & DIU
2	AJMER	RAJASTHAN
3	ASANSOL	ASANSOL AREA OF WEST BENGAL (BURDWAN, BIRBHUM, BANKURA & PURULIA DISTRICTS)
4	BANGALORE	KARNATAKA
5	BHUBANESWAR	ODISHA
6	CHANDIGARH	HIMACHAL PRADESH, HARYANA, PUNJAB, UT OF CHANDIGARH, LADAKH AND JAMMU & KASHMIR
7	CHENNAI	TAMIL NADU AND UT OF PUDUCHERRY
8	COCHIN	KERALA AND UT OF LAKSHADWEEP
9	DEHRADUN	UTTARAKHAND AND WESTERN UTTAR PRADESH
10	DELHI	DELHI
11	DHANBAD	JHARKHAND
12	GUWAHATI	ASSAM, MIZORAM, MANIPUR, NAGALAND, TRIPURA, MEGHALAYA, ARUNACHAL PRADESH
13	HYDERABAD	TELANGANA, & ANDHRA PRADESH & YANAM OF UT OF PUDUCHERRY
14	JABALPUR	MADHYA PRADESH
15	KANPUR	UTTAR PRADESH EXCEPT WESTERN UTTAR PRADESH
16	KOLKATA	WB EXCEPT BURDWAN, BIRBHUM, BANKURA & PURULIA DISTRICTS, UT OF ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS, & SIKKIM
17	MUMBAI	MAHARASHTRA EXCEPT THE JURISDICTION OF NAGPUR REGION & GOA
18	NAGPUR	NAGPUR AREA OF MAHARASHTRA (NAGPUR, BHANDARA, AKOLA, WARDHA, BULDHANA, JALGAON, CHANDERPUR, NANDED, LATUR, BEED, YEOTMAL)
19	PATNA	BIHAR
20	RAIPUR	CHHATTISGARH
21	CLC(C)- HQ, NEW DELHI	WHOLE OF INDIA

**Table 6.5 | List of Monitoring Centres for inter-state migrants as of 2022**  
Source: Starred Question No. 29, Rajya Sabha, 03 February 2022

## CONSTRUCTION WORKERS

---

On the specific question of a uniform wage for all construction workers in government projects across the country, the Ministry stated that under the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948, both the central and the state governments are the appropriate government in their respective jurisdiction. The minimum wages in this scheduled employment may vary across jurisdictions and even within jurisdiction. Currently, the current minimum rates for construction employees under the jurisdiction of the central government ranges from INR 437 (Area C) to INR 864 (Area A) depending on the skill levels of the workers. The Ministry vaguely mentioned that the enforcement of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 in the central sphere is secured through the inspecting officers of the Chief Labour Commissioner (Central) commonly designated as Central Industrial Relations Machinery and in the State Sphere through the State Enforcement Machinery. The designated inspecting officers conduct regular inspections and in the event of detection of any case of non-payment or under-payment of minimum wages, they direct the employers to make payment of the shortfall of wages (Unstarred Question No. 4080, Lok Sabha, 28 March 2022). The Ministry dodged a question – within its own jurisdiction – on whether all states/UTs are strictly following uniform patterns of payments and action taken by the government in ensuring wage payments for central projects. Given the backdrop of the Code on Wage, 2019, an opportunity was lost to discuss the need, provisions and guarantee for a minimum wage for construction workers across the country, irrespective of jurisdiction or project of employment.

The MoLE dodged another pertinent question on the number of welfare claims made and number of beneficiaries reached on two occasions as the details regarding welfare claims were maintained by state/UT Building and Other Construction Workers' (BoCW) Boards. As per Section 3 of the Building and Other Construction Workers' Welfare Cess Act, 1996, the State Governments are mandated to collect the cess and as

per Section 22 of the Building and Other Construction Workers (RE&CS) Act, 1996, the state/UT governments through state/UT Welfare Boards are empowered and entrusted to implement welfare schemes for BOCW relating to life and disability cover, health and maternity cover, financial assistance for education of wards, transit housing, skill development, awareness programs, pension etc. Under Section 60 of BOCW Act, 1996 the Central Government issued instructions to state/UT Governments to ensure proper utilisation of the cess fund as per mandate of the Act (Unstarred Question No. 251, Rajya Sabha, 03 February 2022). At the end of 2021, more than four crore construction workers (4,56,67,175) have been registered across India and INR 78,521.24 crore cess funds have been collected to ensure the social security and other welfare measures for construction workers and their families. Across India, INR 35,399.4 crore has been spent over the years in the implementation of these welfare schemes. The states of Kerala and Mizoram have run into a negative balance and have spent above the collected cess to ensure the welfare of construction workers and their families. 24 states and UTs have 50 per cent or more of the collected funds pending utilisation in their BoCW accounts.

RANK	STATE/UT	NO. OF REGISTERED BOCW WORKERS	CUMULATIVE CESS COLLECTED (IN INR CRORE)	CUMULATIVE EXPENDITURE (IN INR CRORE)	BALANCE AVAILABLE (IN INR CRORE) (INCLUDING BANK'S INTEREST)
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	19,73,592	2,374.71	519.17	1,855.54
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	44,136	297.69	115.16	182.53
3	ASSAM	5,43,275	1,688.18	290.21	1,397.97
4	BIHAR	19,70,680	2,433.51	1,383.18	1,490.33
5	CHHATTISGARH	20,20,732	1,763.65	1219.49	544.16
6	GOA	16,060	263.50	4.86	258.64
7	GUJARAT	6,83,000	2,013.84	545.29	1,468.55
8	HARYANA	8,93,957	3,337.23	1,395.61	1,941.62
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	3,39,049	737.27	327.68	409.59
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR (INCLUDING LADAKH)	6,10,738	1,295.74	789.37	506.37
11	JHARKHAND	12,05,939	845.23	485.43	296.82
12	KARNATAKA	31,65,495	11,108.87	3,656.96	7,451.77
13	KERALA	20,30,730	2,533.34	3,914.32	-1,380.98
14	MADHYA PRADESH	12,30,250	5,371.03	3,524.34	1,846.69
15	MAHARASHTRA	30,40,210	11794	3,181.67	8,612.33
16	MANIPUR	1,51,459	188.59	136.59	52
17	MEGHALAYA	82,059	195.33	34	161.13
18	MIZORAM	52,947	134.48	139.72	-5.24
19	NAGALAND	32,399	113.21	52.96	60.25
20	ODISHA	29,00,349	2,805.05	2,543.92	261.13
21	PUNJAB	5,79,212	1,501.11	831.36	669.75
22	RAJASTHAN	28,39,216	3,384.63	2,491.20	707.14
23	SIKKIM	38,361	188.25	56.75	131.50
24	TAMIL NADU	16,75,896	4,649.11	1,776.07	4,079.30
25	TELANGANA	12,13,696	2,557.58	601.98	1,955.59
26	TRIPURA	1,15,692	237.14	55.99	181.15
27	UTTAR PRADESH	1,19,36,594	7,144.50	2,873.69	4,270.81
28	UTTARAKHAND	4,01,365	655.06	518.22	136.84
29	WEST BENGAL	31,83,744	3,648.69	1,266.48	2,382.21
30	DELHI	5,87,184	2,750.51	469.29	2,281.22
31	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	21,488	111.63	28.78	113.16
32	CHANDIGARH	28,053	131.42	21.42	167
33	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	10,228	69.38	6.62	62.76
34	DAMAN & DIU	12,718	38.90	8.18	30.72
35	LAKSHADWEEP	434	9.36	2.36	9.36
36	PUDUCHERRY	36,238	149.52	131.08	72.53
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,56,67,175</b>	<b>78,521.24</b>	<b>35,399.40</b>	<b>44,662.24</b>

**Table 6.6 | Number of registered building and other construction workers and cess fund details, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 251, Rajya Sabha, 03 February 2022 and  
As per reports received from State/UT BOCW Welfare Boards

## DOMESTIC WORKERS

As per Census 2011, there were 47,81,355 domestic workers in India. However, since the launch of the e-Shram portal, 2.76 crore domestic and household workers have been registered under the portal. For more clarity of the number of domestic workers and their socio-economic conditions, the Labour Bureau under the Ministry of Labour and Employment has launched the fieldwork for the All India Survey on Domestic Workers (DW) in the month of January, 2022. Approximately 1.5 lakh households across 12,766 (6,190 rural + 6,576 urban) blocks are proposed to be covered in all states/UTs (Unstarred Question No. 56, Lok Sabha, 18 July 2022). Yet, a year into the launch of an All India survey on DWs, the Ministry failed to disclose the physical progress on enumerating the DWs or the estimated time for its completion.

As domestic work takes place in households and not establishments, the Ministry stated that the central government was not the appropriate body to take a decision regarding the inclusion of DW under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (Unstarred Question No. 2463, Lok Sabha, 01 August 2022). Only 10 states so far have classified domestic work as scheduled employment, setting a DW's minimum wage. In two of these states—Karnataka and Tamil Nadu—the bottom 30 per cent of domestic workers need to work in 6 low-paying households to earn the minimum wage, despite the minimum wage rules. The employers, on the other hand, believe they pay the workers generously (Bhan et al., 2022).

Given these conditions, a National Policy on Domestic Work would standardise the work, wages and working conditions for DWs across India. However, the Ministry stated that the draft National Policy for Domestic Workers was not under consideration (Unstarred Question No. 3552, Lok Sabha, 08 August 2022). Rather, on the questions for the rights and welfare schemes for domestic workers, the Ministry offered its standard response stating that the Unorganized Workers' Social Security Act, 2008,

was now subsumed in the Code on Social Security, 2020, which provides for social security to all unorganised workers including domestic workers. The following centrally sponsored welfare provisions were listed as applicable to all unorganised/informal workers including domestic workers:

- Pradhan Mantri Jeevan Jyoti Beema Yojana (PMJJBY) and Pradhan Mantri Suraksha Beema Yojana (PMSBY) provide life and disability cover, while Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Man Dhan Pension Yojana (PM-SYM) provides pension.
- Ayushman Bharat Pradhan Mantri Jan Arogya Yojana (PMJAY), for secondary and tertiary health benefits, are given to all unorganised workers including domestic workers who are covered as eligible beneficiaries as per Socio Economic Caste Census Data, 2011.
- The four Labour Codes provide for decent working conditions, wages, occupational safety, grievances redressal mechanism and social security benefits to all categories of workers including domestic workers.
- The Domestic Workers Sector Skill Council under the Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship is imparting various skill development training programmes to domestic workers. Under Skill India Mission, the Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship is implementing Pradhan Mantri Kaushal Vikas Yojana (PMKVY) under which training/orientation in the Domestic Workers Sector, is given to candidates in four job roles namely, child caretaker (non-clinical), elderly caretaker (non-clinical), general housekeeper and housekeeper-cum-cook aligned to the Domestic Workers Sector Skill Council. Under PMKVY, as on 30 June 2022, around 1.92 lakh candidates have been trained / oriented in the domestic worker sector

(Unstarred Question No. 2463, Lok Sabha, 01 August 2022).

RANK	STATE/UT	STATE AND GENDER WISE DOMESTIC WORKERS TRAINED UNDER PMKVY 2.0 AND 3.0 SCHEMES			
		FEMALE	MALE	TRANSGENDER	GRAND TOTAL
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	865	363	0	1,228
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	672	527	1	1,200
3	ASSAM	43,017	5,649	18	48,684
4	BIHAR	5,468	2,370	0	7,838
5	CHHATTISGARH	1,305	142	0	1,447
6	DELHI	10,630	1,224	0	11,854
7	GOA	1	0	0	1
8	GUJARAT	2,258	2,002	0	4,260
9	HARYANA	1,856	691	0	2,547
10	JAMMU & KASHMIR	3,152	1,106	1	4,259
11	JHARKHAND	3,734	3,447	0	7,181
12	KARNATAKA	1,229	2,115	0	3,344
13	KERALA	711	1,097	0	1,808
14	MADHYA PRADESH	18,362	4,666	0	23,028
15	MAHARASHTRA	14,104	5,126	0	19,230
16	MEGHALAYA	99	31	0	130
17	MIZORAM	100	0	0	100
18	NAGALAND	1,873	796	1	2,670
19	ODISHA	4,917	585	0	5,502
20	PUDUCHERRY	58	0	0	58
21	PUNJAB	4,249	1,441	0	5,690
22	RAJASTHAN	4,624	2,240	0	6,864
23	TAMIL NADU	1,174	927	0	2,101
24	TELANGANA	3,572	1,307	0	4,879
25	TRIPURA	1,532	283	0	1,815
26	UTTAR PRADESH	10,465	3,297	1	13,763
27	UTTARAKHAND	641	413	0	1,054
28	WEST BENGAL	8,142	1,184	0	9,326
GRAND TOTAL		1,48,810	43,029	22	1,91,861

**Table 6.7 | Domestic workers trained under Pradhan Mantri Kaushal Vikas Yojana 2.0 and 3.0, state/UT-wise**  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2525, Lok Sabha, 01 August 2022

## GIG WORKERS

Some questions were asked about the status of gig workers. The Code on Social Security, 2020, defined 'gig worker' and 'platform worker' for the first time. Since the launch of the e-Shram portal, gig/platform workers have begun registering in an official capacity, and as on 28 January 2022, a total of 7,17,686 gig and

platform workers are registered in categories like beauty and wellness, automobile & transportation, tourism & hospitality, food industry, education, etc (Unstarred Question No. 1239, Lok Sabha, 25 July 2022). Furthermore, it captures details of workers working in various occupations such as delivery boy/partner/



delivery associate for food and grocery/door-to-door salespersons, etc. (Unstarred Question No. 2499, Lok Sabha, 01 August 2022)

In addition, the Ministry reiterated that the Code provides for social security, including life and disability, accident insurance, health and maternity benefits, old age protection, crèche and any other benefits as may be determined by the central government through formulation of schemes for gig and platform workers. A Social Security Fund has also been provided for under the Code and one of the sources of fund, is contribution from aggregator between 1 to 2% of annual turnover of an

aggregator subject to the limit of 5% of the amount paid or payable by an aggregator to such workers. However, no scheme has been finalised as the provisions under the Code relating to gig and platform workers have not come into force (Unstarred Question No. 248, Rajya Sabha, 03 February 2022). A toll free number and helpline to disperse information on workers' social security schemes has also been envisaged in the schemes (Unstarred Question No. 836, Lok Sabha, 12 December 2022). However, the ministry dodged important questions on a minimum mandatory entitlement for gig/platform workers and a redressal mechanism upon violation of labour laws.

## WELFARE SCHEMES AND SOCIAL SECURITY

25 questions were raised on informal worker welfare programmes and social security schemes in general or pertaining to construction workers, migrants, domestic workers or gig workers. From the responses it is understood that all social security schemes created for the informal workforce are equally applicable to all informal workers irrespective of their job, unless explicitly stated otherwise.

As per the Unorganised Workers' Social Security Act, 2008, the Government is mandated to provide Social Security to the workers of the informal sector by formulating suitable welfare schemes on matters relating to (i) life and disability cover, (ii) health and maternity benefits, (iii) old age protection and (iv) any other benefit as may be determined by the Central Government (Unstarred Question No. 2159, Rajya Sabha, 04 August 2022).

More recently, the Code on Social Security, 2020 was passed and Section 141 of the Code envisages establishment of a Social Security Fund by the Central Government for social security and welfare of the unorganised workers, gig workers and platform workers. Section 45 of the Code also envisages framing of schemes by the Central Government for unorganised workers, gig workers and platform workers and the

members of their families for providing benefits admissible under Chapter IV of the said Code by the ESIC. However, the said Code is yet to come into force (Unstarred Question No. 2169, Rajya Sabha, 04 August 2022).

With this statutory mandate, the Centre has made available a host of schemes for informal workers, the features and progress of which are as follows:

1. The Life and Disability cover is provided through Pradhan Mantri Jeevan Jyoti Bima Yojana (PMJJBY) and Pradhan Mantri Suraksha Bima Yojana (PMSBY). PMJJBY is available to the people in the age group of 18 to 50 years having a bank/post office account and who give their consent to join/enable auto debit. Risk coverage under this scheme is for INR 2 lakh in case of death of insured, due to any reason, at an annual premium of INR 436, which is to be auto-debited from the subscriber's bank/post office account. As on 31 May 2022, a total number of 12.89 crore beneficiaries have been enrolled under PMJJBY. The Pradhan Mantri Suraksha Bima Yojana (PMSBY) is also available to the people in the age group of 18 to 70 years with a bank/post office account who give their consent to join/enable auto debit. The risk coverage under the scheme is for INR 2 lakh in case

of accidental death or total permanent disability and INR 1 lakh for partial permanent disability due to accident at a premium of INR 20 per annum which is auto-debited from the account holder's bank/post office account (Unstarred Question No. 95, Lok Sabha, 18 July 2022). As on 31 October 2022, 14.02 crore beneficiaries have enrolled under PMJJBY and 30.57 crore beneficiaries have enrolled under PMSBY (Unstarred Question No. 709, Lok Sabha, 12 December 2022)

2. Old age protection is provided to informal workers, including gig and platform workers, via the Pradhan Mantri Shram Yogi Maan-dhan (PM-SYM) launched in March, 2019. Under this Scheme, any worker including self-employed persons can become a member. PM-SYM provides a monthly minimum pension of INR 3000 after attaining the age of 60 years. This is a voluntary and contributory pension scheme shared between the beneficiary and the central government on a 50:50 basis. The workers in the age group of 18–40 years whose monthly income is INR 15,000 or less and not a member of Employees' Provident Fund Organisation/Employees' State Insurance Corporation/National Pension System (government funded) can join the scheme (Unstarred Question No. 220, Lok Sabha, 18 July 2022). The premium ranges from INR 55 to 200, depending on the age of the beneficiary. The central government's contribution towards this scheme is provided to Life Insurance Corporation who is the designated fund manager. If the beneficiary dies when receiving the pension, his/her spouse is only entitled to receive fifty per cent of the pension received by the main beneficiary. Provisions have been made for family/partners to continue or withdraw from the scheme in cases of beneficiary's death, accident, or disability. (Unstarred Question No. 1241, Lok Sabha, 25 July 2022).

The government has taken conscious steps to popularise and create awareness about the PM-SYM,

the foremost being its linkage to the e-Shram portal. The states/UTs were granted INR 11.73 crore in FY 2019–20 for undertaking IEC activities. SMSs have been sent to eligible beneficiaries registered under e-Shram and falling in the age group of 18–40 years to encourage them to also enrol under the PM-SYM scheme. Furthermore, extensive social media campaigns have been launched and Pension Saptah was celebrated from 7 to 13 March 2022 across the country, through states/UTs and CSC-SPV machinery. At present, there is no proposal for revision of pension amount under the scheme (Unstarred Question No. 99, Lok Sabha, 18 July 2022). As on 08 December 2022, 49.18 lakh workers, including rural and farm labourers, have been enrolled under the scheme (Unstarred Question No. 709, Lok Sabha, 12 December 2022).

3. The Pradhan Mantri Laghu Vyapari Maan-dhan Yojana 2019 (Central Sector Scheme) renamed as the National Pension Scheme for Traders, Shopkeepers and Self-Employed Persons, 2019 was launched on 12 September 2019. It is a voluntary and contributory pension scheme and provides old age protection to small shopkeepers/retail traders and self-employed persons. A monthly minimum assured pension of INR 3,000 is paid after attaining the age of 60 years. The traders in the age group of 18–40 years, with an annual turnover, not exceeding INR 1.5 crore and who are not members of Employees' Provident Fund Organisation/ESIC/National Pension Scheme (NPS) (government funded)/PM-SYM or not an income tax payer, are eligible to join the scheme. Under the scheme, 50 per cent monthly contribution is payable by the beneficiary and equal matching contribution is paid by the central government. The government's contribution is released to Life Insurance Corporation (LIC) of India, which is the designated fund manager of the scheme and responsible for the pension payout (Unstarred Question No. 3545, Lok Sabha, 08 August 2022). As on 27 June 2022, 50,529 beneficiaries have

been enrolled under NPS Traders pension (Unstarred Question No. 95, Lok Sabha, 18 July 2022) .

4. The Rashtriya Swasthya Beema Yojana has been subsumed in Ayushman Bharat- Pradhan Mantri Jan Arogya Yojana (AB-PMJAY) which was launched on 23 September, 2018. The AB-PMJAY provides an annual health cover of INR 5 lakh per eligible family for secondary and tertiary care hospitalisation corresponding to 1,949 treatment procedures across 27 specialties. It is a completely cashless and paperless scheme. All eligible beneficiaries are entitled to free healthcare services under AB-PMJAY from the day of the implementation of the scheme in their state/UT. Beneficiaries can visit the empanelled hospitals to verify their eligibility and avail healthcare services. The empanelled hospitals subsequently raise pre-authorisation requests for the treatment proposed to be given to the verified beneficiaries. The beneficiary families under ABPMJAY have been identified from the Social Economic Caste Census of 2011 on the basis 6 deprivation and 11 occupational criteria across rural and urban areas. Issuance of Ayushman cards or smart cards is a continuous process based on the demand for services and eligibility criteria. However, the Government is making all-out efforts to scale-up the issuance of Ayushman cards across the country. (Unstarred Question No. 2149, Rajya Sabha, 04 August 2022). As on 06 December 2022, a total of 21.02 crore individuals have been verified and provided with the Ayushman Cards (Unstarred Question No. 709, Lok Sabha, 12 December 2022).
5. The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education (RTE) Act, 2009, mandates the appropriate Government to provide free and compulsory elementary education to every child of the age 6 to 14 years in a neighbourhood school. Education is a subject in the concurrent list of the Constitution and the majority of the schools are under the control of the respective State Governments (Unstarred Question No. 2159, Rajya Sabha, 04 August 2022).
6. The Government has a grievance resolution mechanism where complaints/grievances received from beneficiaries through Centralized Public Grievance Redress and Monitoring System (CPGRAMS) portal or other modes are resolved as per standing instructions and guidelines of Government of India. In FY 2021–22, on the Centralized Public Grievance Redress and Monitoring System 94,377 complaints were received of which 93,040 were disposed (Unstarred Question No. 2169, Rajya Sabha, 04 August 2022)
7. Apart from these schemes, Atal Pension Yojana, Public Distribution System under National Food Security Act, Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, Deen Dayal Upadhyay Gramin Kaushal Yojana, Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana, National Social Assistance Programme, Gareeb Kalyan Rojgar Yojana, Mahatma Gandhi Bunkar Bima Yojana, Deen Dayal Upadhyay Antyodaya Yojana, PMSVANidhi, Pradhan Mantri Kaushal Vikas Yojana, are also available to the informal workers, across the rural and urban landscape and depending upon their eligibility criteria (Unstarred Question No. 1377, Rajya Sabha, 28 July 2022).

YEAR	FUND ALLOCATED (IN INR CRORE)	EXPENDITURE (IN INR CRORE)
2019-20	408	359.95
2020-21	330	319.71
2021-22	350	324.23

**Table 6.8** | *Details of funds allocated, and expenditure incurred under PM-SYM in the last three years*  
Source: Unstarred Question No. 2333, Lok Sabha, 01 August 2022

## CONCLUSION

The launch and publication of the domestic workers survey and migrant workers survey will plug existing information gaps on the socio-economic demographic. However, informal workers are a highly heterogeneous category. There needs to be more concentrated efforts to identify and formally recognise these categories of informal workers and their challenges to make a meaningful impact on their livelihoods. The Code on Social Security of 2020, especially groups the entire informal workforce into the informal/unorganised umbrella and proposes the same social security benefits for all. Rather, each category of workers have different needs and challenges which have to be understood and met through customised schemes and services encompassing health, education and social security

benefits. The Code on Wages too makes provisions for a floor wage rather than advocating for living wages for all workers. How state governments react and enforce all the provisions within the Codes remains to be seen. In the interim, the focus must be on improving the economy and creating jobs with the economy. The calculations of workers participation and unemployment rates under the PLFS have been critiqued (Mitra and Srivastav, 2021) and these critiques hold value if inflated numbers are indeed masking under-employment and poor quality employment (Thapar, 2021). The immediate, effective and timely use of mechanisms like e-Shram is critical to improve access to livelihoods, jobs, health, education and social security.

## REFERENCES

---

ActionAid. (2019). *Enhancing Livelihoods, Building Collectives: A review of engagement with street vendors across eight cities of India*. New Delhi. Retrieved from:

<https://www.actionaidindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Enhancing-Livelihoods-Building-Collectives.pdf>

Akhilesh, P., and Gudavarthy, A. (2022, January 18). A Failed Attempt to Create an Equally Sanitary India. *The Wire*. Retrieved from

<https://thewire.in/government/a-failed-attempt-to-create-an-equally-sanitary-india>

Athar, S., White, R., & Goyal, H. (2021). Financing India's urban infrastructure needs. Retrieved from

<https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099615110042225105/p17130200d91fc0da0ac610a1e3e1a664d4>

Bhan, G., Ravindranath, D., Chowdhury, A. R., Mehra, R., Sinha, D., Kiran, A., and Malladi, T. (2022). Deficits in decent work: employer perspectives and practices on the quality of employment in domestic work in urban India. Retrieved from

[https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/---sro-new\\_delhi/documents/publication/wcms\\_864848.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/---sro-new_delhi/documents/publication/wcms_864848.pdf)

Bharatiya Janata Party. (2014). Election Manifesto 2014. Retrieved from

<https://www.bjp.org/bjp-manifesto-2014>

Census of India. (2011). Retrieved from

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

Centre extends timeline for implementation of Smart Cities Mission to June 2023 (2021, December 2), *The Economic Times*. Retrieved from

<https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/india/centre-extends-timeline-for-implementation-of-smart-cities-mission-to-june-2023/articleshow/88055520.cms?from=mdr>

Choudhary, A.A. (2017, August 27). No shelter for 90% of urban homeless: SC panel study. *The Times of India*. Retrieved from

<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/no-shelter-for-90-of-urban-homeless-sc-panel-study/articleshow/60240240.cms>

Government of India. (2014, February 19). Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Bill, 2014 Passed by Rajya Sabha [Press Release].

<https://pib.gov.in/newsite/printrelease.aspx?relid=103949>

Government of India. (2021a, September 27). *Azaadi@75: Swachh Survekshan 2022 Launched with 'People First' at its Core* [Press Release].

<https://pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=1758560ce>

Government of India. (2021b, September 30). *PM to launch Swachh Bharat Mission-Urban 2.0 and AMRUT 2.0 on 1st October* [Press Release].

<https://pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=1759593>

Government of India. (2022a, April 29). *Swachh Bharat Mission-Urban 2.0 launches National Behaviour Change Communication Framework for Garbage Free Cities* [Press Release].

<https://pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=1821417>

Government of India. (2022b, June 25). *Swachh Bharat Mission- Urban 2.0 launches Revised Swachh Certification Protocols to sustain Open Defecation Free Status across Urban India* [Press Release].

<https://pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=1836975>

Home and Away, Here's How India's Lawmaking and Diplomacy Fared in 2022 (2022, December 31), *The Wire*. Retrieved from

<https://thewire.in/government/parliament-2022-differences-business>

Housing and Land Rights Network. (2020). *Forced Evictions in India in 2020: A Grave Human Rights Crisis During the Pandemic*, Housing and Land Rights Network, 2021. New Delhi. Retrieved on 10 February 2023 from

[https://www.hlrn.org.in/documents/Forced\\_Evictions\\_2020.pdf](https://www.hlrn.org.in/documents/Forced_Evictions_2020.pdf)

International Labour Organisation. (2018). Women and men in the informal economy: a statistical picture. Retrieved from

[https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/publication/wcms\\_626831.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/publication/wcms_626831.pdf)

Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs. (n.d.). Global Housing Technology Challenge India. Retrieved from

<https://ghhc-india.gov.in/Content/LHP.html>

Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (2018a). Revised Operational Guidelines for Scheme of Shelters for Urban Homeless (SUH) under Deendayal Antyodaya yojana-National Urban Livelihoods Mission (DAY-NULM). New Delhi. Retrieved from

[https://nulm.gov.in/PDF/NULM\\_Mission/NULM-SUH-Guidelines.pdf](https://nulm.gov.in/PDF/NULM_Mission/NULM-SUH-Guidelines.pdf)

Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (2018b). Revised Operational Guidelines for Support to Urban Street Vendors (SUSV) under Deendayal Antyodaya yojana-National Urban Livelihoods Mission (DAY-NULM). New Delhi. Retrieved from

[https://nulm.gov.in/PDF/NULM\\_Mission/NULM-SUSV-Guidelines.pdf](https://nulm.gov.in/PDF/NULM_Mission/NULM-SUSV-Guidelines.pdf)

Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (2021a). ClimateSmart Cities Assessment Framework 2.0: Cities Readiness Report June 2021. Retrieved from

<https://niua.in/intranet/sites/default/files/75.pdf>

Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (2021b). Swachh Bharat Mission- Urban 2.0: Operational Guidelines October 2021. New Delhi. Retrieved from

<https://sbmurban.org/storage/app/media/pdf/swachh-bharat-2.pdf>

Ministry of Labour and Employment. (2021). Impact Of Covid-19 On Rising Unemployment And Loss Of Jobs/ Livelihoods In Organised And Unorganised Sectors. Standing Committee On Labour (2020-21). Retrieved from

[https://eparlib.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/810441/1/17\\_Labour\\_25.pdf](https://eparlib.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/810441/1/17_Labour_25.pdf)

Ministry of Urban Development (2015). Smart Cities Mission Statement & Guidelines. New Delhi. Retrieved from <https://smartcities.gov.in/themes/habikon/files/SmartCityGuidelines.pdf>

Mitra, A and Shrivastav, P.K. (2021). Reliability of PLFS 2019–20 Data. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 56(39), 18–21.

National Commission for Enterprises in the Unorganised Sector (2007). Report on Conditions of Work and Promotion of Livelihoods in the Unorganised Sector. New Delhi. Retrieved from

[http://dcmsme.gov.in/Condition\\_of\\_workers\\_sep\\_2007.pdf](http://dcmsme.gov.in/Condition_of_workers_sep_2007.pdf)

Nearly One in Five Households in India Practise Open Defecation: NFHS-5 Data (2022, May 9), *The Wire*. Retrieved from

<https://thewire.in/government/nearly-one-in-five-households-in-india-practise-open-defecation-nfhs-5-data>

Oxfam India (2022). Inequality Kills India Supplement 2022. Retrieved from

[https://d1ns4ht6ytuzzo.cloudfront.net/oxfamdata/oxfamdatapublic/2022-01/India%20Supplement%202022%20lo-res%20single.pdf?qpboOXJULM6jrm1QUPjW\\_e2zSPYHVDVhx](https://d1ns4ht6ytuzzo.cloudfront.net/oxfamdata/oxfamdatapublic/2022-01/India%20Supplement%202022%20lo-res%20single.pdf?qpboOXJULM6jrm1QUPjW_e2zSPYHVDVhx)

Rajalakshmi, T.K. (2022, May 30). NFHS-5 findings: The good, the bad & the ugly. Frontline. Retrieved from:  
<https://frontline.thehindu.com/the-nation/public-health/the-good-the-bad-the-ugly-nfhs-5-report-documents-changes-in-india/article65463437.ece>

Thapar, K. (2021, August 19). Watch | 'Claim of PLFS Data Showing Falling Unemployment Rate Misleading': Radhicka Kapoor. *The Wire*. Retrieved from:  
<https://thewire.in/economy/watch-karan-thapar-radhicka-kapoor-unemployment>

UN Habitat. (2022). World Cities Report 2022: Envisaging the Future of Cities. Retrieved from  
[https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2022/06/wcr\\_2022.pdf](https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2022/06/wcr_2022.pdf)

Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action. (2017). Parliamentary Watch Report: An analysis of questions asked on urban issues to the MoHUPA during 2014-16. City Say. Mumbai: India. Retrieved from:  
[https://yuvaindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/PWR\\_2014-16Final.pdf](https://yuvaindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/PWR_2014-16Final.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. Mumbai: India. Retrieved from:  
[https://yuvaindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Yuva\\_PW\\_Report-2019.pdf](https://yuvaindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Yuva_PW_Report-2019.pdf)

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. City Say. Mumbai: India. Retrieved from:  
<https://yuvaindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/PWR-2020.pdf>

Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action (YUVA) (2022). Parliamentary Watch Report: An Analysis of Questions Asked on Urban Issues in the Indian Parliament in 2021. City Say. Mumbai: India. Retrieved from:  
[https://yuvaindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/PWR-2021\\_Web.pdf](https://yuvaindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/PWR-2021_Web.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.

---