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# Checklist – Consolidated State Annual Action Plan of all ULBs to be sent for Assessment by MoUD (as per table 6.2)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S.No. | Points of Consideration | Yes/No | Give Details |
| 1. | Have all the Cities prepared SLIP as per the suggested approach? |  |  |
| 2. | Has the SAAP prioritized cities for investment as per priority sectros and gap assessment? |  |  |
| 3. | Is the indicator wise summary of improvements proposed (both investments and management improvements) by State in place? |  |  |
| 4. | Have all the cities under Mission identified/done baseline assessments of service coverage indicators? |  |  |
| 5. | Is the SAAP derived from an approach towards meeting Service Level Benchmarks agreed by Ministry for each Sector? |  |  |
| 6. | Is the investment proposed commensurate to the level of improvement envisaged in the indicator? |  |  |
| 7. | Are State Share and ULB share in line with proposed Mission approach? |  |  |
| 8. | Is there a need for additional resources and have state considered raising additional resources (State programs, aided projects, additional devolution to cities, 14th Finance Commission, external sources)? |  |  |
| 9. | Does State Annual Action Plan verify that the cities have undertaken financial projections to identify revenue requirements for O&M and repayments? |  |  |
| 10. | Has the State Annual Action Plan considered the resource mobilization capacity of each ULB to ensure that ULB share can be mobilized? |  |  |
| 11. | Has the process of establishment of PDMC been initiated and completed? |  |  |
| 12. | Has a roadmap been prepared to realize the resource potential of theULB? |  |  |
| 13. | Is the implementation plan for projects and reforms in place (Timelines and yearly milestones)? |  |  |
| 14. | Has the prioritization of projects in ULBs been done in accordance withpara 7.2 of the guidelines? |  |  |

State Mission Director

# Minutes of State High Powered Steering Committee (SHPSC) Meeting

# Chapter 1: Project Background and Summary

Provide brief description of AMRUT Mission as applicable to your State, thrust areas under mission, coverage of cities under mission, program management structure and funding allocation. (Two pages)

Here fill out Tables 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3 and 1.4 (pgs. 32 - 35); Tables 3.2 (pg.43) and 3.4 (pg.45) given in the AMRUT Guidelines.

# Chapter 2: Review of SAAPs

The state is required to prepare SAAP every year and get it approved by the Apex Committee. Before preparing the current year’s SAAP, a key requirement is to review the performance of the approved SAAP of the previous years. This chapter reviews the performance of the implementation of the past SAAPs on key themes in the AMRUT Guidelines.

**Project Progress**

In this section the physical and financial progress is reviewed. Please complete the following table and respond to the questions.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl.No | Name ULB | Approved SAAP | DPR (Y/N) | SLTC (Y/N) | Work Order (Y/N) | Implementation Progress | Amount disbursed till date |
| Project name | Amount | Physical (%) | Financial (%) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Have DPRs been prepared for all projects approved earlier? If not then which are the projects for which DPR is pending and why? (500 words)
* What is the the plan of action for the pending DPRs? (300 words)
* How many SLTC meetings had been held in the State? How many DPRs have been approved by the SLTC till date? (250 words)
* By when will the pending DPRs be approved by the SLTC and when will implementation start? (250 words)
* Based on the identification of delayed projects and the reasons for slow physical progress, what is the plan of action to speed-up the projects? (300 words)
* How much amount has been utilized and what is the percentage share of the funding agencies? Are there any deviations from the approved funding pattern approved by the Apex Committee? (tabular form and 500 words)
* List out the projects where release of funds to ULBs by the State was delayed?
* In how many ULBs implementation was done by agencies other than ULBs? Was a resolution taken from all ULBs? (tabular and 200 words)
* List out the projects where the assessed value approved by the Apex Committee was greater than the tendered value and there was a saving? Was this addressed by the HPSC in the present SAAP? (tabular and 200 words)
* List out the number of city-wise projects where the second and third installments were claimed. (Tabular form).
* List out the city-wise completed projects. Was the targeted benchmark achieved? Explain the reasons for non-achievement (tabular form and 400 words)
* List out the details of projects taken up in PPP model. Describe the type of PPP (tabular; 300 words)
* List out and describe any out-of-the-box initiatives/Smart Solutions/resilience used/incorporated in the projects under implementation. What is the nature of the innovation in the projects? (tabular; 300 words)

**Service Levels**

The focus of AMRUT is to achieve service level benchmarks, such as universal coverage in water supply, sewer connections, and so on. In the approved SAAPs, the States/ULBs have targeted the benchmark of universal coverage. The SAAP has to review the progress towards targets set by the States/ULBs to move towards achievement of universal coverage, etc. Please complete the following table and respond to the questions based on the table.

|  |
| --- |
| Sector: |
| Name of City | Service Level Benchmark | SAAP Baseline(as in 2015) | SAAP MissionTarget | For the last Financial Year |
| Target upto beginning of current FY | Achievement upto beginning of current FY |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

* In how many projects, city-wise, have targets not been achieved? What is the Plan for Action to achieve the targets? (tabular form; 500 words)
* What are the status of the ongoing DPR preparation and the plan of action for the pending DPRs? (300 words)
* How many SLTC meetings had been held in the State? How many DPRs have been approved by the SLTC till date? (250 words)

**Capacity Building**

There are two types of capacity building – individual and institutional. The Apex Committee had approved the annual capacity building plan and the SAAP of the current year has to review the progress of the capacity plan. Please fill out following table and answer the questions.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SlNo | Name of ULB | Name of Department | Total number to be trained in Mission period | Target to be trained during the previous Financial Year | Number fully trained during the previous Financial Year | Name training institute |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* In how many departments was training completed as approved in the SAAP of the last Financial Year? In how many departments was training partially done and in how many departments training not done at all? Please give reasons (300 words)
* List out the training institutes that could not complete training of targeted functionaries. What were the reasons and how will this be avoided in future? (tabular; 300 words)
* What is the status of utilization of funds? (250 words)
* Have the participants visited best practice sites? Give details (350 words)
* Have the participants attended any national/international workshops, as per guideline (Annexure 7)? (350 words)
* What is the plan of action for the pending activities, if any? (400 words)

**Reforms**

According to Guideline 4.3, incentives of previous year will be given at the start of succeeding year, for which States are required to do a self-assessment, on receipt of which incentives will be awarded. A key requirement to claim incentives is to achieve at least 70 per cent Reforms for that year. Some of the criteria to be considered while doing the assessment are as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S.No | Reform Type | Milestones | Target for the last FY | Achievement for the last FY | Number of ULBs achieved 70 percent | Number of ULBs not achieved 70 percent |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Have the Reform formats prescribed by the TCPO furnished?
* Did the State as a whole complete 70 percent of Reforms? If, yes was the incentive claimed? (100 words)
* What was the amount of incentive claimed? How was it distributed among the ULBs and what was it used for? (tabular; 300 words)
* What is the status of Reforms to be completed in the Mission period? Has advance action been taken and a Plan of Action prepared? (500 words)
* Give any instances of innovation in Reform implementation. (300 words)

**Use of A&OE**

* What are the items for which the A&OE has been used? (tabular; 250 words)
* Are the items similar to the approved items in SAAP or there is any deviation? If yes, list the items with reasons (tabular; 300 words)
* What is the utilization status of funds? (tabular; 250 words)
* Has the IRMA been appointed? What was the procedure followed?(250 words)
* If not appointed, give reason for delay and the likely date of appointment (100 words)
* Have you taken up activities connected to E-Municipality as a Service (E-MAAS)? Please give details. (250 words)
* Have you displayed the logo and tagline of AMRUT prominently on all projects? Please give list. (tabular; 100 words)
* Have you utilised the funds on any of the inadmissible components (para 4.4)? If yes, give list and reasons. (tabular; 350 words)

**Funds flow**

One reason for project delay has been delayed release of funds. In the following table indicate the status of funds release and resource mobilization.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S.No | City name | Project name | Funds flow |
|  |  |  | GoI | State | ULB/Others | Total funds flow to project | Total spent on project |
|  |  |  | Approved amount | Disbursed | Approved amount | Disbursed | Approved amount | Disbursed |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* In how many projects, city-wise, has the full funds been sanctioned and disbursed? (tabular form; 500 words)
* Identify projects where delay in funds release led to delay in project implementation? (300 words)
* Give instances of doing more with less during implementation. (400 words)

**Funds disbursements and Conditions**

* How many project fund request has been made to the GoI? (250 words)
* How many installments the GoI has released? (250 words)
* Is there any observation from the GoI regarding the claims made? (350 words)
* List out the conditions imposed by the Apex Committee, State HPSC and the SLTC. Have all the conditions been complied with? If, no identify the conditions not complied with and give reasons for non-compliance. (tabular; 500 words)

# Chapter 3: STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN (SAAP)

The SAAPs are aggregated from the SLIPs. Please fill out the Master Plan of projects (Table 3.1; pg.43) and the state level plan for achieving service levels (Table 3.5; pg.46 of AMRUT Guidelines).

Also, in the table below please give the details of the projects sector wise that are being posed for approval to the Apex Committee.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S.No | City name | Project name | Estimated cost and share | Change in service levels |
|  |  |  | GoI | State | ULB/Others | Total | Indicator | Existing | After project completion |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Principles of Prioritization

Under this section states will prioritize and recommend projects for selection under AMRUT (AMRUT Guidelines; para 7). The States will identify project based on gap analysis and financial strength of ULBs. While prioritizing projects, please provide information responding to the following questions, in words, not more than as indicated against each question:

* Has consultation with local MPs/ MLAs, Mayors and Commissioners of the concerned ULBs been carried out prior to allocation of funding? Give details of dates and number of participants (tabular; 250 words)
* Has financially weaker ULBs given priority for financing? Please give list.(200 words)
* Is the ULB with a high proportion of urban poor has received higher share? Please give list. (250 words**)**
* Has the potential Smart cities been given preference? Please give list (200 words)
* What is the quantum of Central Assistance (CA) allocated to the State during 2016-17? (100 words)
* Has the allocation to different ULBs within State is consistent with the urban profile of the state? (260 words)
1. Importance of O&M

It has been observed that ULBs pay little attention to the operation and maintenance of infrastructure assets created after completion of projects. This tendency on the part of implementing agencies leads to shear loss off national assets. Please fill out the Plan of action for A&OE expenses given in Table 4 (pg-48) of AMRUT Guidelines and answer the following questions.

* Do projects proposed in the SAAP include O&M for at least five years? What is the nature of O&M? (tabular; 300 words)
* How O&M expenditures are propose to be funded by ULBs/ parastatal? (200 words)
* Is it by way of levy of user charges or other revenue streams? (100 words)
* Has O&M cost been excluded from project cost for the purpose of funding? (100 words)
* What kind of model been proposed by States/ULBs to fund the O&M? Please discuss. (250 words)
* Is it through an appropriate cost recovery mechanism in order to make them self-reliant and cost-effective? How? (250 words)
1. Reform Implementation

In order to become eligible to claim the 10% incentive, the State is required to implement the Reforms prescribed by GoI. The states are also required to a self-assessment and based on the score the Apex committee will decide the eligibility of the state. Please fill out Table 5.2; pg. 52 of AMRUT Guidelines and respond to the following.

Some of the criteria that should be considered while preparing the SAAP:

* Fill out the tables prescribed by the TCPO. What are the Reform type, steps and Target for 2016-17? (tabular; 300 words)
* Fill out Table 5.5 (pg. 54) given in the AMRUT Guidelines. What is the outcome of the self-evaluation done for reporting progress on reform implementation in order to receive the 10% incentive? (tabular; 350 words)
* Have any issues been identified during the review by HPSC on Reforms implementation? What are the issues? (250 words)
* Have these issues been considered while planning for reform implementation? How? (tabular; 250 words)
1. Annual Capacity Building Plan

The state is required to submit a Capacity Development Plan along with the SAAP for approval by the MoUD, to empower municipal functionaries and lead to timely completion of projects. Please prepare the individual and institutional capacity building plan by filling out Tables 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3 and statement in Table 7.2.4 (pgs. 70 – 72) of AMRUT Guidelines and give the following responses.

• What is the physical and financial Progress of capacity development at state level? (350 words)

• Do you feel that there is a need to include any other category of official, new department or module? (400 words)

• What are the issues that are been identified during the review? (350 words)

* Have the activities in your current year Capacity Building Plan – training, exposure visits (ULB staff and electerd representatives), seminars/workshops, etc. – been vetted/approved by NIUA?
* What is the present institutional capacity in the ULBs of the state; have the RPMC, UMC, etc. been appointed? Are there other PMUs, PIUs, etc. which are still operational?
* What has been the progress during the previous year/s in institutional capacity building, especially but not only in the seven areas that are mentioned in the AMRUT Guidelines? (p. 67)
* Attach the Quarterly Score Cards on p. 73 of the Mission Guidelines.

• Have those issues been addressed? How? (500 words)

1. A&OE

The 10% allocation for A&OE has been divided into two parts, 8% State fund and 2% GoI fund. Please fill out the Plan of Action Table given in the AMRUT Guidelines (Table 4; pgs.48, 49) and answer the following questions.

• What is the committed expenditure from previous year? (200 words)

• What are the issues that are been identified during the review? (350 words)

• Have the A&OE fund used only for admissible components? (200 words)

• How the ULB/State wants to carry out the implementation of the projects, (establishment of IRMA/PDMC/SMMU/CMMU)? (350 words)

1. Financing of Projects

Financing is an important element of the SAAP. Each state has been given the maximum share that will be given by the Central Government. (Para 5 of AMRUT Guidelines). The State has planned for the remaining resource generation at the time of preparation of the SAAP. The financial share of cities will vary across ULBs. Information responding to the following questions regarding financing of the projects proposed under AMRUT, in words has been indicated below:

* What is the State contribution to the SAAP? (should be greater than 20 percent, Para 7.4 of AMRUT Guidelines) (150 words)
* Fill out Table 3.4 at pg.45 of AMRUT Guideline. How the residual financing (over and above Central Government share) is shared between the States, ULBs? (tabular; 200 words)
* Fill out Table 3.3 at pg 44 of AMRUT Guidelines. Has any other sources identified by the State/ULB (e.g. PPP, market borrowing)? Please discuss. (tabular; 250 words)
* Whether complete project cost is linked with revenue sources in SAAP? Please describe? (250 words)
* Has projects been dovetailed with other sectoral and financial programme of the Centre and State Governments? (250 words)
* Has States/UTs explored the possibility of using Public Private Partnerships (PPP), as a preferred execution model? Please discuss. (300 words)
* Are PPP options included appropriate Service Level Agreements (SLAs) which may lead to the People Public Private Partnership (PPPP) model? How? (300 words)

# Chapter 4: TABLES:

**Table 1.1Breakup of total MoUD allocation for AMRUT**

 FY \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of State: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total Centralfunds allocated to State | Allocation ofCentral funds for A&OE (@ 8% of Total given in column 1) | Allocation offunds for AMRUT (Central share) | Multiply col. 3 byx3) for AMRUT on col. 4 (project proposal to be three- times the annual allocation - CA) | Addequal (col. 4) State/UL B share | Total AMRUTannual size(cols.2+4+5) |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Sector | Centre | State | ULB | Convergence | Others | Total |
| Mission | 14th FC | Others | Total | 14thFC | Others | Total |
| 1 | Water Supply |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Sewerage and Septage Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Drainage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Urban Transport |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Others |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Grand Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 1.2.2: Abstract-Break-up of Total Fund Sharing Pattern**

(Amount in Rs.) FY

**Table 1.3: Abstract-Use of Funds on Projects: On Going and New**

(Amount in Rs.) FY

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl.No. | Sector | TotalProject Investment | Committed Expenditure (if any) fromPrevious year | Proposed Spending during CurrentFinancial year | Balance Carry Forward for NextFinancial Years |
| Centre | State | ULB | Centre | State | ULB | Centr e | State | ULB |
| 14thFC | Others | Total | 14thFC | Others | Total | 14thFC | Others | Total | 14thFC | Others | Total | 14thFC | Others | Total | 14thFC | Other s | Total |
| 1 | WaterSupply |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Sewerageand Septage Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Drainage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | UrbanTransport |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Others |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GrandTotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 1.4: Abstract-Plan for Achieving Service Level Benchmarks**

 FY

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ProposedPriorityProjects | Total ProjectCost | Indicator2 | Baseline3 | Annual Targets based on Master Plan(Increment from the Baseline Value) |
| FY 2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 | FY2020 |
| H1 | H2 |
| **Water Supply** |
|  |  | 1. Household level coverage of direct watersupply connections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2. Per capita quantum of water supplied |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3. Quality of water supplied |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sewerage and Septage Management |
|  |  | 4. Coverage of latrines (individual orcommunity) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 5. Coverage of sewerage network services |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 6. Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 7. Efficiency in treatment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drainage |
|  |  | 8. Coverage of storm water drainage network |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban Transport |
|  |  | 9. Service coverage of urban transport in thecity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 10. Availability of urban transport per 1000population |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Others |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

2 As per SLB framework for water supply, sewerage, solid waste management and drainage and proposed SLB indicator for urban transport

3 Detailed information for arriving at % target against baseline shall be worked out from details provided by Cities so as to arrive at state indicators

**Table 3.2: SAAP - Sector Wise Breakup of Consolidated Investments for all ULBs in the**

**State**

Name of State:

FY

(Amount in Rs.)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name ofCity | WaterSupply | Sewerage andSeptageManagement | Drainage | UrbanTransport | Others | Reforms | Total |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Project Investments |  |
| A&OE |  |
| Grand Total |  |

**Table 3.4: SAAP - Year Wise Share of Investments for All Sectors (ULB Wise)**

Name of State

FY

(Amount in Rs.)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nam e of City | Total Project Investme nt | Committed Expenditure (if any) fromPrevious year | Proposed Spending during CurrentFinancial year | Balance Carry Forward for NextFinancial Years |
| Ce ntr e | State | ULB | Cen tre | State | ULB | Ce ntr e | State | ULB |
| 14thFC | Oth ers | Tot al | 14thFC | Other s | Tot al | 14thFC | Other s | Tot al | 14thFC | Othe rs | Tot al | 14thFC | Other s | Tot al | 14thFC | Other s | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 7.4: Quarterly Score Cards for States**

**Financial and physical progress on capacity building (State level)**

**Total number of ULBs:**

**Quarter ending**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of ULBs above/below proportionate target ( from table 7.3 of AMRUT guideline) | Name of the department/position | Physical | Financial | Total number trained, if relevant, upto quarter | Total funds utilized upto quarter |
| Total target in FY | Proportionate target upto quarter | Funds allocated in current FY | Proportionate target upto quarter |
| above | Individual training |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Institutional capacity building |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Below | RPMC and UMC |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other- specify |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Other-specify |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3.1: SAAP – Master Plan of all projects details to achieve universal coverage during the current Mission period based on Table 2.1 (FYs 2015-16 and 2019-20) (Amount in Rs.)**

**Name of State:**

**Current Mission period 2015-20**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Sr. No. | Name ofULB (water supply and sewerag e) | Total numberof projects to achieve universal coverage | EstimatedCost | Number of years to achieve universalcoverage |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3.5: SAAP- – State level Plan for Achieving Service Level Benchmarks**

**Name of State – Current Mission Period- 2015-16**

| Proposed Priority Projects | Total Project Cost | Indicator | Baseline | Annual Targets based on Master Plan (Increment from the Baseline Value) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FY 2016 | FY 2017 | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 2020 |
| H1 | H2 |
| Water Supply |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Household level coverage of direct water supply connections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per capita quantum of water supplied |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of water supplied |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sewerage and Septage Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Coverage of latrines (individual or community) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coverage of sewerage network services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency in treatment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drainage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Coverage of storm water drainage network |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban Transport |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Service coverage of urban transport in the city |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Availability of urban transport per 1000 population |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Others |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 4: SAAP - Broad Proposed Allocations for Administrative and Other Expenses**

**(Amount in Rs.)**

**Name of State:**

**FY**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sr.No | Itemsproposed forA&OE | TotalAllocation | CommittedExpenditure from previous year (if any) | Proposedspending for Current Financial year | Balance to CarryForward |
| FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 | FY2020 |
| 1 | Preparation ofSLIP andSAAP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | PDMC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. | ProcuringThird Party Independent Review and Monitoring Agency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Publications(e-Newsletter, guidelines, brochures etc.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | CapacityBuilding andTraining- CCBP, if applicable- Others |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Reformimplementation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Others |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 5.2: SAAP - Reforms Type, Steps and Target for AMRUT Cities FY-2016-2017**





|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No** | **Type** | **Steps** | **Implementation****Timeline** | **Target to be set by states in SAAP** |
| **April to****Sep,****2015** | **Oct, 2015****to Mar,****2016** | **April to****Sep,****2016** | **Oct, 2016****to Mar,****2017** |
| 1 | E-Governance | 1. Coverage with E-MAAS (from the date of hosting thesoftware) Registration of Birth, Death and Marriage, Water & SewerageCharges,Grievance Redressal, Property Tax, Advertisement tax, Issuance of Licenses, Building Permissions, Mutations,Payroll,Pension and e- procurement. | 24 months |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Constitution andprofessionalization of municipal cadre | 1. Establishment of municipalcadre.2. Cadre linked training. | 24 months |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Augmentingdouble entry accounting | 1. Appointment of internalauditor. | 24 months |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Urban Planning and CityDevelopment | 1. Make a State Level policy for implementing the parametersgiven in the National Mission | 24 months |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Plans | for Sustainable Habitat. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Devolution offunds and functions | 1. Implementation of SFCrecommendations within timeline. | 24 months |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Review ofBuilding by-laws | 1. State to formulate a policyand action plan for having a solar roof top in all buildings having an area greater than500 square meters and all public buildings.2. State to formulate a policy and action plan for having Rainwater harvesting structures in all commercial, public buildings and new buildings on plots of 300 sq. meters and above. | 24 months24 months |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Set-up financialintermediary at state level | 1. Establish and operationalizefinancial intermediary- pool finance, access external funds, float municipal bonds. | 24 months |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Credit Rating | 1. Complete the credit ratings ofthe ULBs. | 24 months |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Energy and Wateraudit | 1. Give incentives for greenbuildings (e.g. rebate in property tax or charges connected to building permission/development charges). | 24 months |  |  |  |  |

**Table 5.5: SAAP - Self- Evaluation for Reporting Progress on Reform**

**Implementation**

**For Financial Year (Last financial year)**

The reforms achievement will be measured every year after the end of financial year by allocating 10 marks for each reforms milestone achieved as against the targets set by the MoUD.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S. No | Year | No of milestones | Maximum Score |
| 1 | 1st year | 28 | 280 |
| 2 | 2nd year | 13 | 130 |
| 3 | 3rd year | 8 | 80 |
| 4 | 4th year | 3 | 30 |

**Incentive based grant release calculation:**

The States will be required to fill the following Self-Assessment Form. Step 1: Fill the following table

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S. No | Name of ULBs | Maximum Score possible during the year | Score obtained ULB Wise |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 1 |  |  |  |
| Subtotal ULB |  |  |
|  | State |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |
| Subtotal State |  |  |
| Overall |  |  |

Step 2: Calculate the overall score in percentage obtained by the state (State score plus

ULB score).

Step 3: Only those States achieving 70 percent and above overall reform score will be considered for incentive.

Step 4: If the overall score is greater than 70 percent, the incentive amount will be distributed among the states depending upon the number of ULBs that have achieved a score of more than 70 percent in the state.

Table 7.2: Annual Action Plan for Capacity Building

Name of State –FY- 2015-16

**Form 7.2.1 -** **Fund Requirement for Individual Capacity Building at ULB level**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Name of ULB | Total numbers to be trained in the current financial year, department wise | Name of the Training Institution (s) identified | No. of Training Programmes to be conducted | Fund Reqd. in current FY (₹ in Crore) |
| Elected Reps. | Finance Dept. | Engineering Dept. | Town Planning Dept. | Admin. Dept. | Total |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 7.2: Annual Action Plan for Capacity Building

Name of State –FY- 2015-16

**Form 7.2.2 -** **Fund Requirement for State level activities**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | State Level activities | Total expenditure upto current FY | Unspent funds available from earlier releases | Funds required for the current FY (In Crore) |
| 1 | RPMC (SMMU) |  |  |  |
| 2 | UMC |  |
| 3 | Others (Workshops, Seminars, etc.) are approved by NIUA |  |
| 4 | Institutional/ Reform |  |
|  | **Total** |  |  |  |

Table 7.2.3: Annual Action Plan for Capacity Building

Name of State –FY- 2015-16

**Form 7.2.3 -** **Total Fund Requirement for Capacity Building**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Fund requirement | Individual (Training & Workshop) | Institutional/ Reform | SMMU/RPMC/CMMU | Others | Total (In Crore) |
| 1 | Total release since start of Mission (2015) | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | Total utilisation-Central Share | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | Balance available-Central Share | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Amount required-Central Share | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | Total fund required for capacity building in current FY 2015-16 |  |  |  |  |  |

 Form 7.2.4 Details of Institutional Capacity Building

a. Is the State willing to revise their town planning laws and rules to include land pooling?

b. List of ULBs willing to have a credit rating done as the first step to issue bonds?

c. Is the State willing to integrate all work done in GIS in order to make GIS useful for decision making in ULBs?

d. Is the State willing to take assistance for using land as a fiscal tool in ULBs?

e. Does the State require assistance to professionalize the municipal cadre?

f. Does the State require assistance to reduce non-revenue water in ULBs?

g. Does the State require assistance to improve property tax assessment and collections in ULBs?

h. Does the State require assistance to establish a financial intermediary?

**Name of State**

**FY**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.3: SAAP - ULB Wise Source of Funds for All Sectors****(Amount in Rs.)** |
| **Name of****City** | **Centre** | **State** | **ULB** | **Convergence** | **Others****(e.g. incentive)** | **Total** |
| **14th****FC** | **Others** | **Total** | **14th****FC** | **Others** | **Total** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Grand****Total** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |